

BYU Studies

A Voice for the Community of LDS Scholars
Spring 1974 Brigham Young University

THE KEEPAPITCHININ.

A Semi-Occasional Paper, Devoted to Cents, Scents, Sense and Nonsense.

VOL. III.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, JULY 4, 1871.

No. 1.



THE WISE MEN OF THE EAST ARE ATTRACTED BY A "STAR." THEY WILL LEND MONEY TO ANY ONE WHO HAS A "MINE" TO ASK FOR IT.

GRAND S CAMP MEETING ON BEAR RIVER.

Our special reporter sends by the Corinne steamer and sub-marine cable the following interesting synopsis of the great Indian pow-wow on Bear River.

Perhaps the 25th day of June, 1871, opened on as beautiful a scene as any upon which the sun ever shone, and perhaps it did not. But that's neither here nor there. As far as the eye could discern north, south, east and west, curled up the blue smoke from the wigwams of the brave warriors of the great basin, warriors who had traveled many a weary mile over the arid sage plains of the great west to meet their brethren the owners of this mighty Continent for the purpose of smoking the pipe of peace, catching suckers and exchanging stolen horses for some of their own.

As the smoke from the signal hill ascended in circling clouds until lost in the deep blue sky, the doughty nomads came flocking in thousands to participate in the grand reunion. The wampum belts, the crimson paint, the glittering tomahawk in contrast with the dusky hair, the eagle eye, the bright blue vault above and the green foliage of the sage brush, made up a scene of savage beauty, not soon to be forgotten. After the pipe of peace had passed in dignified silence round the large circle of braves, the great

SMOKY TAIL,

"the noblest Roman of them all", arose to his full height, and stretching forth his right hand in the direction of the rising sun, while his richly embroidered robe drooped in graceful folds from his massive shoulders, spoke as follows:

"Me Smoky Tail—big chief; (here he smote himself gracefully on the breast,)

"me heap brave—me talk to um white man so—me big chief heap a like it whiskey—you gib it to me biscuit, gib it to me carrabine flour beef—no hog any, Ka shumbany; gib it to me shont a tea-cup—me good injun, like um white man, mebbe so, ugh!" And folding his arms across his swarthy breast he took his seat.

The next to address the assembled braves was old *Sowiet*, whose English it will be perceived was somewhat broken.

"Ugh! me shont a big chief—*Too-ledge tebits tiquen*"—(pounding himself vigorously on the breast.) "Big Injun me. Me heap a steal horses—me heap a drink it whiskey—*Niny Ashanten arient*, heapa shoot um Kyote—me big mad! me brave! me heap a holler! *Kats ashantep heshadne teacup in a muck Oregon kawit, you ka sheit; you gib it to me hap a dorra. Me big Injun. Me Goshute, ugh!*"

The celebrated Notnoskeesicks, or Sheep-Stealer, said, "Me no sqaw! me big Injun—heap a kill um sheep—heap a sell white man his own sheep-skin for buck-skin. Me big brave—catch um shont a rabbit, shont a sucker—me gib sucker to Saxey, he heap a like it. Me big chief. Ugh!"

Each succeeding speaker seemed determined to be a bigger Injun than his predecessor, and eventually the meeting busted up in a row in which our reporter was shot 75 times and scalped 27 times by these fierce denizens of the forest, but eventually succeeded in reaching our sanctum without further difficulty. He says he entertains a profound admiration for the Red man almost verging on reverence, but if it's all the same to us he would like us to send some other reporter to the next Indian congress. He is now using Brown's Vermifuge and Fitz Jones' Katalairon for the hair.

THE GOLOONDA.

Snodgrass says he does not want any poor man to speak to him or look at him, from this time forth. He has struck a ledge of pure horn silver, with liberal traces of gold; it covers several acres and reaches down an indefinite number of miles, in the direction of Canton, China. He has already sold enough to pay the national debts of the world, and is offered seventeen million and a half per foot for the balance. He says if any one will give him \$25,000,000 per foot for the remaining three acres, he will sell, but will not take a cent less—his family must live!

Meantime he'd like to borrow four bits till to-morrow.

THE MARKET.

Mark it. The butchers are about to pull up *steaks*. The *sells* for the *sellers* are now in course of erection. People have been busy cutting *stakes* in the new location and some have gone so far as to take up their *quarters* there. The Danes will be glad to learn that *Ole Bull* will shortly visit them. It is to be hoped they will kill the fatted calf. When we see them installed in their stalls, with the long *rose* of red ribs we shall be led to exclaim, *bully!* No one can now say the market is not up to the *Mark*, why mark it Mark the market is even now at your door.

A short time since a Mr. Knott was tried in an interior court of Georgia for a violation of law. The verdict of the jury was, "We find the defendant Knott guilty." The Judge was at a loss whether to sentence Knott or not.

Cover: Pages 1 and 4 of the 4 July 1871 special issue of *The Keep-A-Pitchinin*. For photographs of pages 2 and 3 see pages 336-337 inside. Photo by courtesy of Special Collections at the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University. Layout by Robert Milberg, BYU Press Graphic Communications.

EDITORIAL BOARD

JAMES B. ALLEN	professor of history, Brigham Young University, and assistant Church historian, Church Historical Department
RICHARD L. ANDERSON	professor of history and religion, Brigham Young University
R. GRANT ATHAY	professor of astrophysics, High Altitude Observatory, Boulder, Colorado
JOE J. CHRISTENSEN	associate commissioner, Church Education
STANFORD CAZIER	president, Chico State College
BRUCE B. CLARK	dean, college of humanities, Brigham Young University
SOREN F. COX	chairman, department of linguistics, Brigham Young Univ.
C. BROOKLYN DERR	assistant professor of graduate education, Harvard University
W. FARRELL EDWARDS	coordinator of general education, Utah State University
BRUCE C. HAFEN	assistant to the president, Brigham Young University
HOLLIS R. JOHNSON	professor of astronomy, Indiana University
EDWARD L. KIMBALL	professor of law, Brigham Young University
NEAL E. LAMBERT	associate professor of English, Brigham Young University
T. EDGAR LYON	research historian, Nauvoo Restoration, Inc.
TRUMAN G. MADSEN	Richard L. Evans professor of Christian understanding, Brigham Young University
ROBERT J. MATTHEWS	assistant professor of ancient scriptures, Brigham Young Univ.
EARL E. OLSON	assistant managing director, Church Historical Department
ERNEST L. OLSON	director, university press, Brigham Young University
SPENCER J. PALMER	professor of history and religion, Brigham Young University
CHAUNCEY C. RIDDLE	dean, graduate school, Brigham Young University
CHARLES D. TATE, JR.	associate professor of English, Brigham Young University

Volume 14

Spring 1974

Number 3

Brigham Young University Studies is published quarterly, Autumn, Winter, Spring, and Summer by Brigham Young University Press, Provo, Utah, 84602. Second class postage permit pending, Provo, Utah, 84602.

BYU studies

A Voice for the Community of LDS Scholars

VOLUME 14

SPRING 1974

NUMBER 3

The Law of Adoption:
One Phase of the Development of the
Mormon Concept of Salvation, 1830-1900

Three poems

The Silver Connection: A Review of
How to Prepare for the Coming Crash

The *Keep-A-Pitchinin*
or the Mormon Pioneer Was Human

On Doing Theology

THE WORDS OF SAINT PETER, A Poem

THE PLAN, A Poem

Uintah Dream:
The Ute Treaty—Spanish Fork, 1865

The Historians Corner

Physical Beginnings of the Church Welfare
Program

A Note on the Nauvoo Library and
Literary Society

A Little Known Account of the Murders
of Joseph and Hyrum Smith

Book Reviews

LaMar C. Berrett's *Discovering the
World of the Bible*

David W. Barrus's *The Way to the Sun*

Annie C. Tanner's *A Mormon Mother:
An Autobiography*

Gordon Irving 291

Marden Clark 315

Larry T. Wimmer 319

Ronald W. Walker 331

M. Gerald Bradford 345

Carma Anderson 360

Ronald F. Malan 359

Gustive O. Larson 361

382

Paul C. Child 383

Kenneth W. Godfrey 386

Jan Shipps 389

393

Gilbert W. Scharffs 393

J. Lewis Taylor 395

John B. Harris 396

Editor

Book Review Editor

Historians Corner Editor

University Editor

Charles D. Tate, Jr.

Robert J. Matthews

James B. Allen

Ernest L. Olson

The opinions and statements expressed by contributors to *Brigham Young University Studies* are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University, the editor or editorial board.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY PRESS
PROVO, UTAH 84602

The Law of Adoption: One Phase of the Development of the Mormon Concept of Salvation, 1830-1900

Gordon Irving*

As established in 1830, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was hardly a finished product. Although the new faith possessed distinctive characteristics, many significant aspects of Mormon thought and practice were revealed and developed in the years that followed. Among these was the law of adoption, which lay at the heart of the Mormon conception of salvation, and which grew out of theological principles taught by the founding prophet, Joseph Smith. These principles were given a special interpretation by Brigham Young and his generation and were finally refined by a revelation announced by Wilford Woodruff in the 1890s which broadened and universalized the concept of salvation which had been preached in the Church for fifty years.

THE MORMON CONCEPT OF SALVATION, 1830-1844

After Joseph Smith founded the then-named Church of Christ in April 1830, early members appear to have accepted the traditional Christian view of a heaven for the righteous and a hell for the wicked. Salvation, which was defined as being attainable through faith in Christ and baptism by immersion, meant going to dwell with God after this life.¹

In February, 1832, Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon proclaimed to the world a revelation declaring that "every man

*Gordon Irving is an historical associate for the Historical Department of the Church.

¹The Book of Mormon (Palmyra, 1830), pp. 118-20, 150, 160, 188, 191-92, 478, 510, 512, 535, 547, 584.

shall receive according to his own works, his own dominion in the mansions which are prepared." There were three heavens or "kingdoms of glory," admission into any of which constituted salvation. Only those few "sons of perdition," who had committed the "unpardonable sin," would forfeit salvation entirely. The revelation reaffirmed the existing position that baptism, followed by faithfulness, would qualify one to dwell with God and angels in the "celestial kingdom."²

Mormon respect for divine authority and the importance of doing things in the Lord's way early led them to conclude that mankind was acting without authority in religious matters and had been since the apostolic age. This concern led to the idea of adoption as a means of bringing contemporary humanity into the kingdom of God. The first written exposition of the doctrine of adoption by baptism of the living appeared in Parley P. Pratt's *A Voice of Warning*, published in 1837. "Aliens" might become citizens of the kingdom of God, Elder Pratt declared, through the process of adoption which could be accomplished through baptism, preceded by faith and repentance and accompanied by the Holy Ghost.³

But if entrance into the kingdom depended on baptism, only a small portion of mankind could be saved since most of the human family had lived and died at a time when the gospel and the priesthood were not on the earth. This was an untenable position to Mormons because they believed that God is no respecter of persons. The Prophet Joseph had taught in early 1832 that the gospel was taught to the dead (D&C 76:73), but did not discuss the question of whether the dead needed to be baptized. However, this left unsolved the question of how one baptizes the dead if baptism is necessary for salvation.⁴

²Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Kirtland, 1835), pp. 225-31; see D&C 76 in modern LDS editions.

³Parley P. Pratt, *A Voice of Warning and Instruction to all People, containing a declaration of the faith and doctrine of the church of the Latter Day Saints, commonly called Mormons* (New York, 1837), pp. 103-04. Also Orson Pratt, "The Kingdom of God," part II, pp. 1-2, in *A Series of Pamphlets* (Liverpool, 1851); Thomas Ward, "The Law of Adoption," *Millennial Star* 4 (1843):17-19. See also Joseph Smith as cited in *The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, B. H. Roberts, ed., 7 vols., 2nd ed. rev. (Salt Lake City, 1969), 6:58 (cited hereafter as H.C.); and David H. Kimball, "Reflections on the Economy and Ordinances of the Kingdom of God," *Millennial Star* 8 (1846):23.

⁴Warren A. Cowdery discusses the question of salvation for the dead in *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* 3 (1837):471, 523. Joseph Smith reiterates the D&C 76:73 point in much less detail in *The Elders' Journal of the Church of Latter Day Saints* 1 (1838):42-43.

In 1836, he announced as revelation that "All who have died without a knowledge of this Gospel, who would have received it if they had been permitted to tarry, shall be heirs of the celestial kingdom."⁵ But again he said nothing about baptism. He offered a solution to the problem of whether the dead need baptism in an 1840 letter to the Twelve: "The Saints have the privilege of being baptized for those of their relatives who are dead, whom they believe would have embraced the Gospel."⁶ The impartiality of God, the necessity of baptism, the opportunity of the departed to accept the gospel, and the principle that those who would have accepted the gospel in life should be heirs to the celestial kingdom were all woven into a generally applicable synthesis much broader than the individual ideas themselves.

In the early 1840s this concept of salvation through adoption by baptism was supplemented with a whole new level of doctrine relating to a patriarchal order made possible by adoption through sealing. When the concept of sealing first emerged in the late 1830s, Joseph Smith identified sealing with election into the House of Israel. In September of 1842 he wrote of the need to link all the generations of the human family through baptism for the dead.⁷ Then in 1843 the Prophet announced that "in the celestial glory there are three heavens or degrees."⁸ Salvation in the highest degree, soon known as exaltation, was explained in terms of family ties. Orson Spencer, writing in the 1850s, asserted that God's own family in heaven was the pattern by which he had organized his children on earth. Parley P. Pratt saw the family not only as the basis for the organization of God's children here on earth and in the premortal existence but also in the celestial kingdom as well.⁹

Joseph Smith, already teaching as early as 1840 that families were in some way to be transformed into eternal units, sought to find what the "welding link" might be. Within a

⁵H.C., 2:380-81, under date of 21 January 1836.

⁶Letter dated 19 October 1840 in H.C. 4:231.

⁷H.C. 5:151.

⁸H.C. 5:392, see also D&C 131.

⁹Orson Spencer, *Patriarchal Order, or Plurality of Wives!* (Liverpool, [1853?]) pp. 1-2. See also Spencer's comments in *Letters Exhibiting the Most Prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* . . . (Liverpool, 1848), p. 168. Also Parley P. Pratt, "Celestial Family Organization," *The Prophet* 1 (1844-45), unpagged [pp. 1-2 of no. 51]; reprinted in *Millennial Star* 5 (1845):189-94.

year after announcing in 1842 that the tie was baptism for the dead, the Prophet presented a more adequate way of joining families together. A man could be "sealed" to his wife and after death God would recognize the validity of their union. In the same way parents and children could also be bound together in an eternal family unit through special sealing ordinances soon to be made available to faithful Mormons in the temple being built in Nauvoo.¹⁰

God, according to Mormon belief, had joined Adam and Eve for eternity as husband and wife and placed them at the head of the human family. Since their union was effected by the authority of God, their children were natural "heirs of the priesthood" and were "born in the covenant" and recognized by God as legitimate members of his family and legal heirs to his kingdom.¹¹ As each new family came into being, it became another link in the chain of families stretching back to Adam, who was linked to God. Thus the "family of God" became more than metaphor.

Exaltation depended on being part of that chain. While one could reach the celestial kingdom by being baptized and enduring to the end, one had to be sealed to enter the highest level of heaven. Still, though the Prophet taught his followers that he had received power to seal men and women and parents and children, the newly sealed families would not automatically be part of the priesthood-joined chain of families extending back to Father Adam since no new links had been added to the chain for more than a thousand years. Inasmuch as the priesthood had been lost through apostasy, a new and higher law of adoption was presented whereby Mormons could be "grafted" into the patriarchal order, thus becoming "legal heirs," and acquiring the "fathers in the priesthood" necessary to link each one to the chain of families built up in the days of the patriarchs.¹² Adoption in this sense

¹⁰Parley P. Pratt recalls Smith's conversing with him on the subject of the eternal family in the winter of 1839-40 in *The Autobiography of Parley Parker Pratt* (New York, 1874), p. 329. H.C. 5:501-07.

¹¹Orson Pratt sermon, *Journal of Discourses* 1:58; H.C. 3:386-87.

¹²Wilford Woodruff reports that Brigham Young taught in a sermon in 1847 that as all the gospel ordinances administered since the apostasy were illegal, so also were all the marriages performed without force, and that all men had to be "adopted into the Priesthood in order to become sons and legal heirs of Salvation." Wilford Woodruff diary, 15 August 1847, holograph, Wilford Woodruff Collection, Church Archives, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, cited hereafter as C.A. See D.H. Wells sermon in *Millennial Star* 34 (1872):417 and Brigham

can be seen as an important part of the enlarged vision of the Kingdom of God on earth that came to Joseph Smith during the Nauvoo period.

But while sealing was accepted doctrine by 1844, the Saints in general had little chance to become practically acquainted with the sealing doctrine prior to the death of Joseph Smith. Experience with the practice as well as clarification of doctrine and procedure came only in the post-Joseph Smith period of Mormon history.

THE LAW OF ADOPTION AT NAUVOO, 1842-1846

No consensus exists with regard to the date when the first adoptions were performed; any conclusions as to whether the ordinance was practiced during Joseph Smith's lifetime must be viewed as tentative.¹³ It is certainly possible, perhaps probable, that Joseph Smith did initiate certain trusted leaders into the adoptionary order as early as 1842.

The history of adoption following Joseph Smith's death is less a mystery. In late 1845 it was decided that the temple then under construction in Nauvoo was sufficiently complete to permit the administration of its ordinances to as many of the faithful as time would permit. Although adoptions were performed there for nearly a month, the forced departure of the Church leaders from Nauvoo prevented the general membership from being adopted or having their own children sealed to them.

It would appear that while some prominent older men in the Church were allowed to have persons adopted to them, adoption was mainly restricted to those holding the apostleship. Seventy-four percent of those adopted, excluding natural children and relatives, were linked to Apostles Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards, John Taylor, or Brigham Young. The

Young discourse in *Journal of Discourses* 16:186-87, as well as sermon by Heber C. Kimball, reported in *The Journals of John D. Lee*, Charles Kelly, ed. (Salt Lake City, 1938), pp. 90-91. Also of interest is a Brigham Young sermon reported in *Journals of John D. Lee*, p. 81, and in the Woodruff diary, 16 February 1847. See also Lee's reminiscences in his *Mormonism Unveiled: or the Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop, John D. Lee*. . . . (St. Louis, 1878), p. 165, and a Joseph Smith sermon in H.C. 6:249-54.

¹³See Juanita Brooks, *John Doyle Lee: Zealot, Pioneer, Builder, Scapegoat*, 2nd ed. (Glendale, 1972), p. 73; *On the Mormon Frontier: The Diary of Hosea Stout*, Juanita Brooks, ed. ([Salt Lake City], 1964): 1:178 note 50; T.B.H. Stenhouse, *Rocky Mountain Saints* (New York, 1873), p. 503; Edward Tullidge, *History of Salt Lake City* (Salt Lake City, 1886), p. 637.

majority were young couples in their twenties and thirties although there was also a significant number of persons in their forties. Some of the adopted would become well-known Saints, but only one or two ever occupied positions of the first rank in the Church. The rest were apparently ordinary members of the Church.¹⁴

ADOPTION AS SOCIAL EXPERIMENT, 1846-1848

Although adoption was meant to secure one's eternal future, in the first years after the departure from Nauvoo the doctrine was given a temporal interpretation as well. Mormons saw adoption as making men not only "fathers in the priesthood" but also fathers in fact. Some adopted Saints took the surname of their new fathers. John D. Lee, for example, at times signed his name "John D. Lee Young" inasmuch as he considered himself to now be Brigham Young's son. Lee in turn added his surname to the names of some of his adopted children and even referred to their offspring as his grandchildren.¹⁵

As interesting as what Mormons called each other may be, the social significance of adoption lay in what fathers and children did for each other. John D. Lee, looking back after thirty years, characterized the adoptionary system as follows:

. . . I was adopted by Brigham Young, and was to seek his *temporal* interests here, and in return he was to seek my *spiritual* salvation, I being an heir of his family, and was to to share his *blessings* in common with his other heirs.¹⁶

The sons were to give the fathers the benefit of their labor while the fathers offered their children not only some measure of security in the next world but counsel and direction in this world as well.

¹⁴Nauvoo Sealings and Adoptions, 1846-1857, Bk A, microfilm of holograph, Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City. This document is apparently a compilation made from the original manuscripts about 1870. There are apparently some omissions inasmuch as no adoptions to John D. Lee are listed while Lee's journals and those of others clearly show that persons were sealed to him. Very possibly there are other omissions as well. The discussion here is based upon what information was included in this copy.

¹⁵Title page of John D. Lee's journal, February to August, 1846, holograph C.A. Also entries for 10 January 1846, 7, 8, 19, and 26 April 1846, etc; *Journals of John D. Lee*, pp. 65-66; *On the Mormon Frontier*, 1:178, note 50. Brigham Young didn't like his family to address him as "Father Brigham" as he felt "Father" was a title more properly belonging to Adam, the father of all. He preferred to be addressed as "Brother Brigham."

¹⁶Lee, *Mormonism Unveiled*, p. 197. Lee's italics.

The circumstances of 1846 made such a practical application of the adoption doctrine particularly appealing to the Church leadership. Apart from problems of member loyalty left over from the succession crisis which had followed the murder of Joseph Smith, the Church was also faced with the confusion inherent in breaking up homes and moving *en masse* to an unsettled wilderness. People had to be moved; supplies had to be found; camps and temporary cities had to be located and established; morale, not to mention faith, had to be maintained; and always present was the uncertainty of the Church's future course. In the midst of turmoil, uncertainty and weariness, Mormon leaders were sufficiently impressed with the potential of adoption, already part of the Mormon doctrinal system, as a unifying force to take seriously its this-worldly implications. So in what can be viewed as an experiment, the organization of Mormon society along family lines was tried out on a small scale within the families of the leaders. Part of this experiment was the expansion of the adoptionary system to include a larger number of people. As there was no temple in the wilderness, there could be no further formal adoptions. This difficulty was overcome by treating persons desiring to join one's family as though they had already received the temple sealing. Later, when a temple could be built, they would go through the formal ceremony.¹⁷

Church leaders were not averse to accepting prospective children into their families. Some actually encouraged the Saints to join with them. Hosea Stout recorded on 13 July 1846, that Apostle Orson Hyde "desired all who felt willing to do so to give him a pledge to come into his kingdom when the ordinance could be attended to." Apostle George A. Smith admitted in February, 1847, that he had "lectiionered" with all his might to get people to join him.¹⁸

¹⁷John D. Lee journal, 9 August 1846. Lee reports Brigham Young as saying "With reference to sealing there will be no such thing done untill we build another Temple. I have understood that some of the 12 has held fourth an Idea that such things would be attended to in the wilderness. But I Say Let no man hint such things from this time fourth for we will not attend to Sealings till an other Temple is built." An example of such postponed sealings as described in the text is found in Brigham Young's official diary entry for 6 January 1847: "Thomas Alvord had made covenant to be sealed to bro Sam'l Bent and attached to his kingdom. Advised him, when a Temple should be built, to have himself sealed to Bent." *Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 1846-1847*, Elden J. Watson, ed. (Salt Lake City, c1971), p. 493. Letters of application for 275 persons to be members of Young family appear in Nauvoo Sealings and Adoptions, 1846-1857, Bk A, pp. 787-94.

¹⁸*On the Mormon Frontier* 1:178; *Journals of John D. Lee*, pp. 93-94.

Wilford Woodruff describes in his journal the creation of several "families":

President Brigham Young met with his company or family organization of those who had been adopted unto him or were to be, and organized them into a company out of which may grow a people that may yet be called the tribe of Brigham And they did enter into a covenant with uplifted Hands to Heaven with President Young and each other to walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord our God

President Heber C. Kimball organized his family company this night at the Council House consisting of about 200 persons. I, Wilford Woodruff, organized my family company this night at my own House consisting of 40 men, mostly Head men of families. Those that joined me entered into a covenant with uplifted Hands to Heaven to keep all the commandments and Statutes of the Lord our God and to sustain me in my office.¹⁹

Once such families were organized, family meetings were held in which children were given practical instruction as well as exhorted to live better lives. Brigham Young, for example, called a two-day family meeting in February, 1847, during which time he chastened his children because some were jealous of others and because trouble had arisen over the practice of plural marriage. The president then explained to the group how his family organization was intended to function. Between sessions of the family conference a dinner was served. On the second day there was a dance in the evening.²⁰

The Kimball family meetings as a general rule were held on Sundays, and following Apostle Kimball's sermons the sacrament was administered to the group. His family also held several parties and dances.²¹

The family system was not only tested as a means of regulating community behavior at Winter Quarters, but Church leaders also sought to take advantage of relationships established by adoption to make the trek westward more orderly. Brigham Young's announcement in January, 1847, that companies crossing the Great Plains should be divided into hun-

¹⁹Woodruff diary, 18, 19 January 1847.

²⁰*Journals of John D. Lee*, pp. 75-95; Woodruff diary, 16, 17 February 1847.

²¹Biography of Joseph Grafton Hovey, 1812-68, p. 95; Helen Mar Whitney, "Our Travels Beyond the Mississippi," *Women's Exponent* 12 (1883-84):102; Whitney, "Scenes and Incidents at Winter Quarters," *Women's Exponent* 14 (1885-86):66.

dreds, fifties, and tens, all with their respective captains, followed by almost a year the organization of his own "family" into four companies of ten.²² In the first company of 1847 more than a dozen men can be identified as members of Brigham Young's adopted family, about the same number belonging to Heber C. Kimball's group, with a handful of others in the families of Apostles Willard Richards, Amasa Lyman, and Wilford Woodruff. Counting fathers and sons, a minimum of one-fourth the men in that company were bound by ties of adoption.²³

Because of lack of supplies and equipment, very few of the Saints made the trip across the plains in 1847. Among those who remained behind that first year, adoption also had a part to play in terms of social organization. Before going west, Brigham Young, disgusted by the lack of preparation of most Mormons for the trip, had announced that he was going to leave his adopted children on a farm where they could support themselves and leave "others to do as they pleased with their selfishness. . . ." The site selected for the farm lay about eighteen miles north of Winter Quarters and was referred to as "Summer Quarters" or "Brother Brigham's Farm." Isaac Morley, the eldest of Young's adopted children, was in charge, with orders to raise crops which could provision overland companies in 1848. Heber C. Kimball followed Brigham's example by leaving a number of his children in charge of a Kimball family farm.²⁴

Although Mormon leaders had faith enough in the family relationships set up through adoption to begin to organize settlements and emigration in terms of family groupings, a large-scale adoptionary order encompassing the whole membership of the Church was not to be established, since problems soon arose which resulted in the abandonment of adoption as a social experiment.

Difficulties began when it became apparent that adoption gave one a special status and that not all the adopted enjoyed

²²John D. Lee journal, 17 February 1846.

²³Based on the writer's comparison of the list of those in the pioneer company with lists of adopted persons in Nauvoo Sealing and Adoptions, Howard Egan's *Pioneering the West* (Richmond, Utah, 1917), and the journals of Wilford Woodruff and John D. Lee. See the account of the Kimball family meeting upon arriving in the Salt Lake Valley in Egan, pp. 107, 116, and a briefer version in Heber C. Kimball diary, 25 July 1847, holograph, C.A.

²⁴*Journals of John D. Lee*, pp. 130, 132-36. See map following p. 160. *On the Mormon Frontier* 1:189 note 56, 270 note 50, 273, 242-43 note 35.

the same status. Albert P. Rockwood, for example, as the first son adopted to Brigham Young was given special responsibilities as described by Norton Jacob in a September 1846 journal entry:

I have come to the conclusion that it is the policy and intention to put down every spirit in the Camp of Israel that would seek to establish a selfish independence, and that Brother Rockwood is to be made an instrument to accomplish that thing as he is Brother Brigham's eldest son by adoption. Well, I say, "Amen," for there must be less of that spirit before a proper union can prevail among the Saints.

But others were less pleased than Jacob with the authority vested in Rockwood.²⁵

An example of bad feelings in a "family" is the quarrel between John D. Lee and Andrew Lytle, both adopted sons of Brigham Young:

. . . Andrew Little [Lytle] was in the battalion, and at the request of Brigham Young I let his family have \$258 worth of goods, and Brigham said I should have my money when Little returned, but I never got any of it. Little was also an adopted son of Brigham Young, and consequently did about as he pleased.

After Lytle returned to Winter Quarters, Lee took him before the bishop's court, where each accused the other of improper behavior.²⁶

Friction between parents and children was also apparent at the Summer Quarters farm soon after the Young family took up residence there early in April of 1847. John D. Lee, acting as assistant to Morley, was a stern taskmaster and hard words were soon traded within his family. George Laub, one of Lee's adopted sons, describes in his journal some of the problems that arose. After a trip to Missouri to buy grain Thomas S. Johnson, another son, refused to turn over the corn purchased there to Lee, swearing that he was not "agoing to be a Negrow for John D. Lee any longer and that he was going to work for himself." Laub himself and Lee quarreled

²⁵Norton Jacob, *Record of Norton Jacob*, C. Edward Jacob and Ruth S. Jacob, eds. (Salt Lake City, 1949), p. 25; *On the Mormon Frontier*, 1:129, 149, 152; Lee, *Mormonism Unveiled*, pp. 169-70.

²⁶Lee, *Mormonism Unveiled*, p. 198; *A Mormon Chronicle: The Diaries of John D. Lee, 1848-1876*, Robert G. Cleland and Juanita Brooks, eds., 2 vols. (San Marino, California, 1955) 1:5-7.

several times over Lee's keeping what seemed to Laub too large a portion of the fruits of his son's labors.²⁷

Problems within the Lee group were soon matched by problems between Lee and other members of Brigham Young's family at Summer Quarters. Young gave Lee's children a special status when he "told them that he wanted me and those that belonged to my family to have what land I wanted to till."²⁸ Members of the family also resented Lee's efforts to make them work harder. Ill feelings were climaxed by a fight after Charles Kennedy lured one of Lee's young plural wives away from him. Kennedy brought charges against Lee and a trial was held before the council in Winter Quarters. The court decided that Lee was in the wrong and that he should apologize not only to Kennedy but to the entire Summer Quarters settlement. Part of the council's decision was that any of Lee's wives or adopted children who desired to could leave him. Brigham Young later upheld the verdict and several individuals then "desolved covenants" with Lee.²⁹

Adoption as a system of social organization was troubled not only by fathers who demanded too much of their sons, but also by some of the children who in turn expected too much from their fathers. Brigham Young noted in February, 1847, that he hoped the day would come when his adopted children would "have to provide temporal blessings for me instead of my boarding from 40 to 50 persons as I now do. . . ." A year earlier John D. Lee had had to leave almost thirty of his family at Mount Pisgah for lack of means to take them further west.³⁰ Whatever their feelings about their children's demands, even the leading members of Mormon society were in no position to support them.

Problems also arose because some of the brethren supposed that adoption to one of the apostles would block the building

²⁷*Journals of John D. Lee*. Read the entries for the spring of 1847. *A Mormon Chronicle* 1:46. George Laub journal, pp. 168, 180-81, typescript, Utah State Historical Society Library, Salt Lake City, Utah.

²⁸*Journals of John D. Lee*, p. 145 and note.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 183ff; *On the Mormon Frontier* 1:277-78; Woodruff diary, 9 December 1847; Laub journal, p. 194; Nauvoo Sealings and Adoptions, 1846-1857, Bk A, p. 803. Kelly and Brooks view this as the end of the law of adoption, which is accurate only if adoption is viewed merely in terms of the social experiment of the 1840s.

³⁰*Journals of John D. Lee*, p. 83; Woodruff diary, 16 February 1847; Lee journal, 31 May 1846. Lee in 1848 was financially unable to help all his families emigrate to Utah. *A Mormon Chronicle* 1:25.

of their own kingdoms. In theory the importance of adoption lay in the validation of one's sonship in the family of God. But some were more interested in being fathers and exercising authority over others than they were in being sons of God. Kingdom-building, or the gathering together of a large number of people over whom one could rule in eternity, enjoyed a good deal of popularity. Brigham Young complained:

were I to say to the elders you now have the liberty to build up your kingdoms, one half of them would lie, swear, steal and fight like the very devil to get men and women sealed to them. They would even try to pass right by me and go to Jos[eph]

Young countered such potential challenges to his authority by warning that the best way to advance was by "boosting up . . . instead of trying to pass."³¹

One actual challenge to constituted authority was presented by the case of James Emmett, who was in charge of a Church colony in Iowa and South Dakota. Trouble there in 1846 resulted in Emmett's being "striped of his kingdom and him and all his followers put under Bishop Miller." It was brought out a year and a half later at the trial of Emmett that he had tried to imitate the adoptionary order by binding to him by covenant those over whom he presided.³²

Besides rebuking those who were overly eager to be rulers, Brigham Young also had to reassure those who were to be ruled that adoption to the apostles would not block their own progress. In January, 1847, for example, he explained:

I said some men were afraid they would lose some glory if they were sealed to one of the Twelve, and did not stand alone and have others sealed to them. A Saint's kingdom consisted of his own posterity, and to be sealed to one of the Twelve did not diminish him, but only connected him according to the law of God by that perfect chain and order of Heaven, that will bind the righteous from Adam to the last Saint.³³

Brigham Young reported in February, 1847, that Joseph Smith had appeared to him in a dream and told him with regard to adoption to "tell the people to be humble and faithful, and be sure to keep the spirit of the Lord and it will lead

³¹*Journals of John D. Lee*, pp. 80, 88-89.

³²*On the Mormon Frontier* 1:168-69, 294-95.

³³*Manuscript History of Brigham Young*, p. 505.

them right.”³⁴ Adoption might have worked among the strong-willed men who had joined the Church had they submitted to the “quiet spirit of Jesus.” However, the decision of the saints to assert their “selfish independence” destroyed any possibility that an authoritarian, hierarchical system such as adoption could function successfully among them. They were not ready for adoption any more than they had been ready for the law of consecration in the 1830s or would be for the United Order in the 1870s.

Mormon leaders must have hoped that family life in adoption would bring their people together and enhance the Church’s efforts to make a new life for the Mormon community in the West. But while the experiment with adoption was certainly not responsible for all the problems the Church was undergoing, it could clearly be seen by the spring of 1848 that it had failed to produce the anticipated benefits. Confused and unauthorized attempts to practice adoption had even spread to Great Britain, where *Millennial Star* editor Orson Spencer felt the need to warn the English saints that the advocacy of adoption was “ill-timed and uncalled for in the present state of the British Churches. . . [and] actually peril[s] indirectly the salvation of those who are taught [it].”³⁵

Adoption might be good doctrine, but it had failed to work as a principle of social organization. With confusion at home and abroad, Church leaders saw fit to discontinue the effort to make the ties of adoption the basis of organization for the Mormon community.

ADOPTION IN ABEYANCE, 1848-1877

Once Mormon leaders abandoned adoption as a social experiment, their publicly expressed interest both in the doctrine and the practice appears to have fallen off sharply for some time. Even so there are indications that adoption was not altogether forgotten by the general membership of the Church.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 529; *On the Mormon Frontier* 1:238-39. Stout quotes Joseph in the dream as instructing the people to “keep the quiet spirit of Jesus.” See also a report of the dream in *Millennial Star* 35 (1873):597-98.

³⁵Orson Spencer, editorial in *Millennial Star* 10 (1848):138. Mormon splinter groups were also having problems with adoption. The Strangites had to discipline John C. Bennett for trying to gain influence through adoption while there were also problems between the followers of Lyman Wight and George Miller in Texas. S. S. Ivins research notebooks, 2:234-37; 15:48-49, holograph, Utah State Historical Society Library, Salt Lake City, Utah. The index to the Ivins notebooks proved most helpful in locating many of the sources which were used in preparing this paper.

Between 1849 and 1854 the "waiting list" of those desiring to join Brigham Young's family increased by 175 names.³⁶ In his short autobiography, Albert K. Thurber recalled that in 1850 Benjamin F. Johnson approached him and "in a round about way proposed for me to be adopted to him." Thurber put him off by telling him, "I thought it would be as well for him to be adopted by me."³⁷

Others were curious about what duties the doctrine might impose upon them. Andrew Siler wrote to Apostle Parley P. Pratt in 1851 to inquire if he, coming to Zion without parents or relatives, should be adopted to some Church family. Pratt, who so often speculated about other aspects of Mormon theology, chose to answer the question in the *Deseret News* with an abrupt "I do not know." In printing Pratt's response the editor added that too much attention paid to the "mysteries" would lead the Saints to neglect more pressing duties.³⁸

The adoption experiment of the late 1840s continued to affect Mormon society in the 1850s to some degree. Historian Edward Tullidge concluded in 1886 that adoption "explain[s] certain things which were done by the pioneers, in relation to the 'land question,' when they took possession of these valleys, and also many other affairs and features noticeable in the community, especially during the first ten years after the entrance of the pioneers, in 1847."³⁹ Such legal and economic after-effects remain to be examined. Personal relations also continued to be influenced by the adoption experience. John D. Lee's, journals for example, show that cordial relationships were again established in the late 1850s and the 1860s between Lee and some of the "sons" with whom he had so much trouble in the late 1840s, bad feelings apparently cooling with the passage of time.⁴⁰

As time went on, Mormon leaders began again to preach adoption from the pulpit. Adoption into the family of God that one might be a legal heir to exaltation was still very much

³⁶Nauvoo Sealings and Adoptions, 1846-1857, Bk A, pp. 794-800. Aside from the 83 persons listed in 1852 only about two families per year entered their names in the record. No names appear after 1854.

³⁷*Treasures of Pioneer History*, Kate B. Carter, ed. (Salt Lake City, 1956) 3:288.

³⁸*Deseret News*, 11 January 1851, p. 187.

³⁹*History of Salt Lake City*, p. 638.

⁴⁰*A Mormon Chronicle* 1:157, 326 note 54; 2:11, 18, 35, 136. See also Biography of Joseph Grafton Hovey, 1812-68, for description of relations within the Kimball family.

a part of Mormon doctrine. As unpleasant memories of the experiences of the 1840s faded, Brigham Young and others increasingly stressed the importance of adoption in Mormon theology. For example, in general conference in 1862, President Young made reference to the "principle that has not been named by me in years." As he would continue to do, Brigham stressed the need to complete the "chain of the Priesthood from Adam to the latest generation . . . in one unbroken continuance." Still, although adoption was necessary, he did not feel his people were ready for it:

It is a great and glorious doctrine, but the reason I have not preached it in the midst of this people, is, I could not do it without turning so many of them to the Devil. Some of them would go to hell for the sake of getting the Devil sealed to them.

I have had visions and revelations instructing me how to organize this people so that they can live like the family of heaven, but I cannot do it while so much selfishness and wickedness reign in the Elders of Israel.⁴¹

Brigham Young's sermons about adoption in later years were somewhat more positive as he began to approach the subject more in terms of spiritual and theoretical considerations and less in terms of past failures.

A point frequently made in sermons during the 1860s was that the Church had no place where adoptions could be performed. Although the Endowment House had functioned in Salt Lake City since 1855 for the performance of certain ordinances, President Young was firm on the point that adoptions and sealings of children to parents could not be solemnized there. They were "advanced ordinances" of the priesthood which could be performed only in a temple.⁴²

Once construction began on a temple in St. George in 1871, Church leaders again and again stressed the necessity of the saints' being adopted into the chain of the priesthood in order to reach the highest glory of the celestial kingdom so they would take advantage of the opportunity to be adopted and have their children sealed to them once the temple was completed.⁴³

⁴¹Brigham Young sermon in *Journal of Discourses* 9:269; also *Millennial Star* 24 (1862):466.

⁴²Brigham Young sermons in *Journal of Discourses* 10:254, 12:161-67, 16:186-89; *Millennial Star* 27 (1865):771, 31 (1869):203-04.

⁴³D. H. Wells sermon in *Millennial Star* 34 (1872):417; Brigham Young sermon in *Journal of Discourses* 16:185-89. Young in his sermons refers to

ADOPTION IN FULL FLOWER, 1877-1894

The sealing rooms of the St. George Temple were dedicated in January, 1877; and Wilford Woodruff, president of the temple, then recorded on March 22 that he had that day adopted two couples to President Brigham Young.⁴⁴ Thousands of persons were thereafter adopted at St. George as well as in temples subsequently constructed. With the beginning of adoption on such a scale, it became necessary to establish policies to govern the practice. The principal rules under which adoptions were performed are here summarized.

1. *Sealing or Adoption.* Church policy directed that children of faithful members of the Church not "born in the covenant" be *sealed* to their natural parents, whether any or all of those involved were living or not. If natural parents had not been baptized Mormons during life or had apostatized from the Church, their children were to be *adopted* to someone else. The sealing of a person to a dead non-Mormon was seen as being risky since the departed parent might not accept the gospel in the spirit world. Such uncertainty about one's position in the next life was unacceptable, especially to converts whose parents had been strongly opposed to Mormonism during life.

The same ruling applied in part to sealings of husbands and wives. If both were dead, the sealing could be performed whether the two had been members of the Church in life or not. But if the widow of a non-Mormon came to Utah, as so many did, she was to be sealed to some good brother in the Church rather than to her late husband. Again the reasoning was that the ladies risked their exaltation by being sealed to those who might not accept the gospel. In many cases this meant that women become plural wives. Had the Church permitted widowed converts to be sealed to dead husbands who never joined the Church, there might have been a good many fewer women participating in polygamy. Children of such widows were to be sealed, rather than adopted, to their mother and her new husband. The dead husband was often adopted to his wife's second husband to keep him in the family.⁴⁵

adoption as the sealing of "men to men." This should be understood as the linking of generations in the chain of the priesthood. Women and children, inasmuch as they are sealed to men, are also part of the chain.

⁴⁴Woodruff diary, 22 March 1877.

⁴⁵J.D.T. McAllister to John Watson, 27 May 1887, St. George Temple Letterbook, pp. 255-56, holograph, C.A.; McAllister to J. L. Dalton, 15 January

2. *Free Choice in Selecting a New Father.* Those to be adopted were allowed to choose whomever they liked as their new fathers. Church leaders were emphatic that one's freedom of choice was not to be abridged, going so far in a few cases as to cancel adoptions because the person adopted had not been advised of his rights. Not only was the choice to be freely made, but the initiative was also to be left with the person seeking adoption.⁴⁶ A man could be adopted either to a living or dead person. If he chose a living father he would then write or speak to the man. If he chose to be adopted to someone who had died, he would apply to that person's heir.

3. *Heirship.* Members of families in the Church were to agree on a worthy male member of the family to be designated "heir" who would then manage the family temple work for dead ancestors.⁴⁷ In families of deceased general authorities of the Church, where so many applied for adoption, the heir had a special importance as at first he had to approve such applications. With the opening of new temples and the increase in applications, heirs were later permitted to delegate such authority to the temple presidents.⁴⁸

4. *Presidential Control and Approval.* Joseph Smith's basic revelation regarding the sealing power vests full control of temple work in the president of the Church. Inasmuch as the first three temples built in Utah were at some distance from

1889, St. George Temple Letterbook, pp. 211-12; Wilford Woodruff sermon, "The Law of Adoption," *The Deseret Weekly* 48 (1894):542-43; Wilford Woodruff to Lorenzo Snow, 24 April 1894, Wilford Woodruff Letterbook, p. 347, holograph, C.A.; Woodruff to Marriner W. Merrill, 15 May 1894, Woodruff Letterbook, p. 406. Some were even uneasy about being sealed to their parents who *were* in the Church whose way of life would not qualify them for the celestial kingdom. J.D.T. McAllister to Franklin Spencer, 17 December 1883, St. George Temple Letterbook, p. 115; D. H. Cannon to Wilford Woodruff, 19 August 1892, St. George Temple Letterbook, p. 23.

⁴⁶James G. Bleak to L. John Nuttall, 5 July 1893; St. George Temple Letterbook, pp. 156-57. John Taylor wrote the following to J. S. Morris, 15 February 1887: "You ask me to recommend you to some good Man to whom you can be Adopted. The better way will be for you to select some one for yourself, and if he be a man in full fellowship it will be agreeable to me." Manuscript copy of letter in Samuel Roskelley Genealogical and Temple Record, p. 121, microfilm of holograph, C.A.

⁴⁷J.D.T. McAllister to Abraham Kimball, 17 January 1882, St. George Temple Letterbook, pp. 14-15; Kimball to McAllister, 20 April 1882, pasted to p. 15 of St. George Temple Letterbook.

⁴⁸See the following letters in St. George Temple Letterbook: McAllister to Brigham Young, Jr., 19 January 1882, pp. 15-17; McAllister to Wilford Woodruff, 20 January 1882, pp. 18-19; McAllister to Joseph F. Smith, 16 February 1882, pp. 29-30; Brigham Young, Jr. to McAllister, 22 February 1882, pasted to p. 17; statement of H. J. Richards, 24 October 1882 and statement of A. A. Kimball, 30 September 1882, both on p. 57.

Church headquarters, Presidents Young, Taylor, and Woodruff had to delegate a certain amount of this authority, although they attempted to maintain a close supervision and control of temple work by selecting apostles as temple presidents. President John Taylor further tightened presidential control by ruling that recommends for adoptions and some other ordinances were not acceptable unless countersigned by him.⁴⁹

5. *Adoptions of Dead Relatives.* Once the Saints had their own temple work taken care of, they were eager to bring loved ones into God's family as well. But a Mormon could have adoptions performed back only one generation beyond the first member of the family to join the Church. Thus a convert could have only his dead parents, brothers, and sisters adopted to some family in the Church while the son of convert Mormons could go back one generation further to grandparents, uncles and aunts,⁵⁰ had his parents not done the work. Many adopted Mormons chose to have dead relatives adopted into the same family into which they had been adopted so all could be together in the celestial kingdom.

6. *Adoptionary Practice.* An understanding of adoption after 1877 is to be sought not only in the consideration of policies but also in the study of statistics.⁵¹ Over the period more persons, both living and dead, were sealed to their own parents than were adopted, although there were important differences between the sealing patterns for the living and for the dead. Through 1893 there were approximately 19,000 living persons sealed to their own parents while only 1,200 were adopted. Many of those sealed were young children, the rest being the adult children of Church members. Living persons adopted were in almost all cases adults whose parents had never joined the Church. While it is possible that a significant number of Mormons after 1877 were second generation in the Church, it is also possible that many who under Church

⁴⁹J.D.T. McAllister to L. John Nuttall, 24 January 1882, St. George Temple Letterbook, p. 22; John Taylor to McAllister and David H. Cannon, 13 September 1884, John Taylor Letterbook, pp. 633-34, holograph, C.A.

⁵⁰See the following in St. George Temple Letterbook: J. D. T. McAllister to John Rowley, 21 February 1882, p. 88; McAllister to Wilford Woodruff, 27 February 1889, pp. 229-30; D. H. Cannon to the First Presidency, 15 May 1894, p. 284.

⁵¹The data upon which this discussion is based are found in annual statistical summaries of temple work on file in the Church Archives. Data relating to numbers of persons adopted to general authorities were collected through examination of temple records on film at the Genealogical Society Library, Salt Lake City.

policy should have been adopted to someone failed to have the ordinance performed for some reason.

With regard to work for the dead, about 16,000 sealings were performed through 1893 as compared with slightly over 13,000 adoptions. This sharp divergence from the pattern of sealing work for the living can largely be accounted for by the nature of the groups for whom the work was done. The dead who were sealed were generally those who had died during infancy or childhood while the dead who were adopted were usually the parents, brothers and sisters, and other relatives of Church members, of whom there would be large numbers.

A pattern of sealing work within each temple district is apparent. When a new temple opened the faithful saints in the area would eagerly take their children and the names of their dead to the temple and have the necessary ordinances performed. Less diligent Mormons and new immigrants arriving in Utah brought their children and names in after the initial surge of enthusiasm had subsided. This is not to say that some did not make the trip to St. George, Logan, or Manti seeking temple work, but the data suggests that most people were satisfied or obligated by economic considerations to wait until a temple opened fairly close to home.

Because of the great mass of data only the simplest statistical aspects of adoption will be examined here. The records show that 66 percent of the living and 77 percent of the dead who were adopted were adopted to general authorities. Roughly half of those who were not adopted to general authorities were adopted either to temple officials who were not general authorities or to other prominent Church officials living in the area.

Most of the general authorities to whom considerable numbers of persons were adopted were apostles, many having also served in the First Presidency. Of the seventeen apostles who died in the faith prior to 1894, fourteen had persons adopted to them. Of sixteen (including the First Presidency) living in 1894, only nine were so favored, while none of the four chosen between 1894 and 1900 had people adopted to them. Related to this is the fact that of those adopted to general authorities 60 percent of the living and 68 percent of the dead persons were adopted to deceased general authorities. Partly this reflects the respect of Church members for the heroes of

the Mormon past, but also it results from temple procedures. If a person were to be adopted to a living general authority, that Church leader would have to be present for the ceremony, which was often difficult, especially when none of the temples was particularly close to Salt Lake City. If no general authority were living or visiting in the area of the temple, it was much easier to choose a dead apostle or member of the First Presidency since someone else could stand proxy for him. Convenience also partially explains why so many were adopted to temple officials.

Of course other considerations besides convenience motivated the saints in their choice of fathers in the priesthood. Local popularity and devotion had a part to play, as evidenced by the large number of adoptions to Apostle Erastus Snow at St. George, where he was the area's spiritual leader, and at Manti, where so many Scandinavians honored him as the man who opened their homelands to proselyting. In several cases large numbers were adopted to dead general authorities in the first year or two following their deaths, reflecting a special expression of devotion evoked by their passing. More timeless and general was the feeling for Joseph Smith, the Church's greatest hero, who led all others in the number of persons choosing to be adopted themselves or to have their dead adopted to him.

ADOPTION TRANSFORMED, 1894-1900

With the passage of time, it became apparent that not everyone was pleased with the policies governing adoption and sealing. One example of dissatisfaction is Edward Bunker's statement regarding adoption in the early 1880s:

I believe it is a correct principle and when it runs in the lineage it looks consistent, but the adoption of one man to another out of the lineage, I do not understand and for that reason I would not enter into it. And adopting the dead to the living is as adopting the father to the son. I don't believe there is a man on earth that thoroughly understands the principle. If there is I have never heard it taught so that I could understand it. I believe it is permitted more to satisfy the minds of the people for the present until the Lord reveals more fully the principle.⁵²

⁵²Biography of Edward Bunker, holograph, C.A. Section including Bunker's remarks on adoption follows the biography proper.

Others had been able to trace their ancestry back several generations and must have felt that all their ancestors should be able to be sealed or adopted to someone. Multitudes of good people who had no chance to hear the gospel of Christ in life were, they felt, left out of the family of God.

Even the general authorities were troubled, as is indicated by their desire to modify policies governing sealings to non-Mormon parents and work for distant ancestors.⁵³ Their feeling in this regard led to authorization for several members of the Church to be sealed to parents who had not been Mormons. In other cases adoptions already performed were canceled so that those involved could be sealed to their parents. Apostle Marriner W. Merrill noted in his journal in July, 1893, that it had been decided that temple presidents were to use their own judgment with regard to some of the policies governing sealing work. In essence this meant the Church was hesitating midway between two positions.⁵⁴

The problem was solved for the Church by President Wilford Woodruff's announcement in the April general conference of 1894 that he had received a revelation on adoption. Rather than proclaiming the change in policy as a new departure, he was careful to point out that the revelation was based on the foundation laid by Joseph Smith. He began his discourse by having George Q. Cannon read Section 128 of the Doctrine and Covenants, in which the Prophet teaches the need for a "welding link" between the generations of the human family. Having so prepared the people to receive what he might say, the president went on:

You have acted up to all the light and knowledge that you have had; but you have now something more to do than what you have done. We have not fully carried out those principles in fulfillment of the revelations of God to us, in sealing the hearts of the fathers to the children and the children to the fathers. I have not felt satisfied, neither did President Taylor, neither has any man since the Prophet Joseph who has attended to the ordinance of adoption in the temples of our God. We have felt that there was more to

⁵³Abraham H. Cannon journal, 18 December 1890, photocopy of holograph, C.A.; also J.D.T. McAllister to J. L. Dalton, 15 January 1889, St. George Temple Letterbook, pp. 211-12.

⁵⁴J.D.T. McAllister to Erastus Snow, 3 February 1888, St. George Temple Letterbook, p. 87; Wilford Woodruff to M. W. Merrill, 4 April 1894, Woodruff Letterbook, p. 293; Nauvoo Sealings and Adoptions, 1846-1857, Bk A, pp. 517-18, 535-38; Marriner W. Merrill diary, 12 July 1893, holograph, C.A.

be revealed upon this subject than we had received. . . and the duty that I want every man who presides over a Temple to see performed from this day henceforth and forever, unless the Lord Almighty commands otherwise, is, let every man be adopted to his father. . . . That is the will of God to this people. . . . I say let every man be adopted to his father; and then you will do exactly what God said when he declared He would send Elijah the prophet in the last days. . . . We want the Latter-day Saints from this time to trace their genealogies as far as they can, and to be sealed to their fathers and mothers. Have children sealed to their parents, and run their chain through as far as you can get it. When you get to the end, let the last man be adopted to Joseph Smith, who stands at the head of this dispensation. This is the will of the Lord to this people, and I think when you come to reflect upon it you will find it to be true.⁵⁵

President Woodruff was declaring publicly that not only *should* the Saints be sealed to their own parents but that henceforth they *had* to be sealed to them if they were to be sealed at all. Inasmuch as previous Church policy had been based on the fear that many of the dead would not accept the gospel, President Woodruff in announcing his revelation also broadened the Latter-day Saint conception of the preaching of the gospel in the spirit world. Referring to Joseph Smith's teaching that all who would have received the gospel had they heard it would go to the celestial kingdom, he added, "So will it be with your fathers. There will be very few, if any, who will not accept the Gospel."⁵⁶

The president went to some pains to assure the people that being sealed to one's parents rather than to one of the apostles did not lower one at all. Indeed, as President George Q. Cannon said when he spoke following President Woodruff, the new revelation was seen as protecting the Church from being "divided into tribes and clans, each man having his own following. . . ."⁵⁷

The immediate response of the general Church membership appears to have been strongly favorable. The only real problem was what to do about the more than 13,000 souls, most of them dead, who had already been adopted to persons other

⁵⁵Woodruff's sermon was published in several places. Text quoted taken from *The Deseret Weekly* 48 (1894) 541-44. See also *The Deseret Evening News*, 14 April 1894.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*

⁵⁷The text of President Cannon's sermon is found in *The Deseret Weekly* 48 (1894) 544-45.

than their natural parents. After some consideration the First Presidency and the Twelve ruled that these people should be sealed to their own parents but that the old records should be left standing. Any possible problems would be straightened out in the hereafter.⁵⁸

There was a great increase in the number of living and dead sealings to parents in 1894 and 1895. This suggests that the saints almost immediately had great numbers of their dead who had been previously adopted sealed to their own parents in accord with President Woodruff's directions. Perhaps some of the living who had resisted adoption also now came forward gladly to be sealed to their parents. And some part of the increase is due to temple work for distant ancestors whose names had already been collected by families interested in genealogy.⁵⁹ The revelation on adoption also opened the way for the organization of the Church-sponsored Genealogical Society of Utah in November, 1894—since Mormons could now do sealing work for distant ancestors, new interest was awakened in genealogical research and the Society was then set up to make available to members records which would enable them to seek out their ancestors.⁶⁰

SUMMARY

Consistent with the Later-day Saint belief that the Lord gives revelation "line upon line and precept upon precept" as needed and as the Church is ready to accept it, the Mormon concept of salvation was continually broadened and deepened throughout the nineteenth century. From a simple picture of an afterlife divided into a heaven and a hell, the saints went on to learn of varying degrees of glory and finally of the god-like status of those who win exaltation. Originally seen as at-

⁵⁸Wilford Woodruff and Joseph F. Smith to David H. Cannon, 4 May 1894, Woodruff Letterbook, p. 383; Abraham H. Cannon journal, 14 June 1894; copy of notes made by J.D.T. McAllister in connection with interview with First Presidency, 30 July 1894, St. George Temple Letterbook, p. 312.

⁵⁹Of interest in this regard is Joseph Christenson's statement in *Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine* 28 (1937):149. "At the General Conference in 1894, when President Woodruff gave instructions concerning the sealing of family groups, I got to thinking of our records and family. With my father I went over the records we had, and as he knew most of the people recorded, we were able to tabulate all names in family groups with the exception of about twenty names."

⁶⁰See entries in the following journals for 1 November 1894: Abraham H. Cannon, Wilford Woodruff, Franklin D. Richards, holograph, C.A. Richard's journal, 13 November 1894, describes the organization of the Society.

tainable through baptism, which was eventually extended to the unbaptized dead as well as the living, salvation in its highest sense was later defined as available to those who were sealed and adopted into the family of God. With the 1894 revelation the doctrine of sealing was broadened to include all the saints' ancestors who had ever lived. For fifty years the policies governing adoption had meant that exaltation was limited to the small patriarchal society that the Church then was and to a few thousand dead relatives of the saints. Now, with the new light received by President Woodruff, exaltation was made available to millions of persons, provided they accept the gospel, and Woodruff told his people that very few would reject it. Living Mormons were now important not so much as fathers and heads of kingdoms but as agents acting for the rest of the human family. George Q. Cannon recognized the implications of the expansion of the law of adoption as he spoke the following:

How wide-spread and far-reaching is the ordinance to which allusion has been made, by which children will be sealed to their parents, one generation connected with another, and the whole human family be brought within the family of God, to be His recognized and acknowledged sons and daughters, bound together by the power of the everlasting Priesthood and in the new system of salvation spread out before us in the contemplation of that which the Lord has revealed! What a feeling of tenderness and love wells up in our hearts in thinking that we are the children of God, and that we shall be bound together by ties that can never be broken.⁶¹

The chain of the priesthood so often referred to by Brigham Young could now better be viewed as a network into which all men and women can be brought as members of the family of God. While the limited view of salvation held before 1894 was possibly appropriate for a church confined to the limits of the Great Basin, the new understanding better prepared the Church to fulfill its mission to spread into all the world in the new century.

⁶¹George Q. Cannon sermon in *The Deseret Evening News*, 19 May 1894, p. 10.

Three Poems

Marden Clark*

TOO LATE ON MOTHER'S DAY

And so at last she died.
But fought it still for fourteen months
Four hundred days for her to bear
And us to bank against the lonely hours.

I reckon up the debits first:
Four hundred days of drab, explosive pain
Hers from twisted, swollen joints, from migraine hell,
From any bug or enzyme chancing by
Ours from simply looking on.
My God! but pain like that!

The credits won't add up.
The columns waver, twist, and swell
As though themselves were full of life and pain,
But still they're long:
Her gentle pain-seared face
An hour or two of simple chat
Some moment-hours of
Son-mother love
A few hour-moments of
Mother-son depth.
Field-fresh iris from Mary and Arch
Or Zinnias or spears of glads or columbine,
Or mums.
She loved beauty so.

More subtly
We felt and feel the bond
Of empathy
We nine to her
But each to other too
A bond of pain—
But pain like that!

*Dr. Clark is professor of English at Brigham Young University.

Our father's gentleness
Slowborn of pain
Now hedges each of us about
And ties us back to him
To her.

We're in the black—no question now.
Columns of intangibles more delicate and real
Than all my words—they tilt the balance.
Even the interest we pay on pain—remembered pain—
Has softened into credit now. And dividends of love
Accrue without our even sensing them—
No audit wanted here:
The dividends of love
From life like that
From love like that
Oh God! from pain like that.

IN A WORD ON EASTER

What's in a name?

In a name

a single word

at once

Annunciation and

Beatitude and

Benediction

In a name

a single word not a touch

touch me not but infinite

Communion

In a name

a single word

at once

Definition and

Summation of her and of

Him

at once

Definition and

Summation an utterly

new and utterly

ineffable

Relation between

Him and her

and between

Him and all

Mankind

In a name

from a carpenter a gardener

from the Word

in a word

"Mary"

TO THE BABY WE DIDN'T EVEN KNOW
WE WEREN'T GOING TO HAVE

You surprised us, like the heavy snow of September,
Neither counted on nor wished for.
Nothing yet to suggest new life or love.
And two years since, we'd thought to make an end.

The pang of loss is ours by right.
That at least her labor should have earned.
But only blood, the flow and clot, we had,
A woman's pain, a husband's helpless scurry.
You couldn't even come clean for us. A surgeon's knife
And scraping. D and C, they called it. And charged as much
As if they'd brought new life.

"Give life," we hear. "In this you act the role
of God." It must be true. But such flawed actors
For such a role. Creators ought to start
With perfect image and power perfect, too, to realize
In creature the perfection of themselves.
We didn't even make a start, not with you,
Not with the others.

We count our six and sense the strength.
I guess we feel they're share enough.
But now we'll never know the unknown road
That you have led us down. We'll never know
What new capacities for love or joy or fear
You would have brought. We'll never know
Ourselves, the us that you'd have made of us—for you
Could not have dodged the role, no more than we.

In tranquil moments now we think of what we missed.
September snow can never stay; but soft and wet
It softens all the earth, though branches break
And wires snap. The pain soon fades. But you're not here
To take its place. And we can only know the sense
Of what should be the sense of loss, can only know
You're not—and we're the same.

The Silver Connection: A Review of How to Prepare for the Coming Crash*

Larry T. Wimmer**

During the past three years, I have been asked a number of times regarding my impression, as a professional economist, of Robert Preston's book, *How to Prepare for the Coming Crash* (Hawkes Publications, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1971). The book has received sufficient attention and acceptance—particularly in the Intermountain area—to warrant serious consideration.

Let me state as accurately as I can what I believe to be the basic theme of Mr. Preston's book (hereafter referred to as *The Coming Crash*). The first half identifies a secret, world-wide conspiracy that is led by international bankers, and that is effectively represented in the United States by the Federal Reserve System. The Communist Party is but a political appendage to this sinister union of international bankers, which intends to create in the United States the most serious depression that has ever been experienced and thus to cause total collapse and anarchy from which it alone will profit and gain ultimate control. This part of *The Coming Crash* is a restatement of W. Cleon Skousen's thesis in *The Naked Capitalist* (published by Mr. Skousen, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1970). However, *The*

*This article is adapted from a paper delivered to a student-faculty economic seminar on 27 July 1972. During the 1972-73 school year, the author was a visiting professor in the Republic of China (Taiwan), which delayed publication and made updating possible. The author wishes to express appreciation to Professor Clayne Pope for his editorial assistance and to the reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

**Dr. Wimmer is associate professor of Economics at Brigham Young University.

¹Robert L. Preston, *How to Prepare for the Coming Crash* (Salt Lake City: Hawkes Publications, 1971), p. 113.

²*Ibid.*, p. 59.

Coming Crash goes further than *The Naked Capitalist* by declaring that "nothing, absolutely nothing"¹ can be done to stop the crash, and that it will occur "before 1975" and most likely "as early as 1973."² Preston then identifies ten steps which families should follow in preparation for the crash. Two of the more controversial steps are (1) to sell your home if you live in an urban area and move to a rural retreat where you should prepare to provide for and defend yourself, and (2) to invest your wealth in silver bullion after providing for the basic necessities.

The Coming Crash can be judged from two points of view: first, the validity of its claim of a conspiracy of international bankers; and second, whether or not the steps advocated constitute adequate preparation for a depression of the magnitude suggested.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY OF BANKERS

I will add very little to the conspiracy debate. Instead, I refer the reader to the Autumn-Winter 1971 issue of *Dialogue*,³ which contains a critical review of the Skousen-Preston thesis by Dr. Louis Midgley of the Political Science Department at Brigham Young University, plus a letter from Dr. Carroll Quigley, professor of History at Georgetown University, and a response by Mr. Cleon Skousen.

The idea of a bankers' conspiracy is not new. It was heard in Europe as early as the late eighteenth century, but was seldom mentioned in this country until the late nineteenth century. The charge was often anti-Semitic in nature, with one of the earliest groups accused being the Illuminati—an eighteenth century secret society of Jewish intellectuals. Later the combination reportedly included international bankers, Zionists, and Communists in one monolithic conspiracy. Following the increased wealth and influence of America's famous banking families after the 1870s, the idea gained some support in this country. However, with the diminished power of bankers resulting from the Great Depression of the 1930s, the charge of conspiracy virtually disappeared.

For reasons not easily understood, in the late 1960s some American conservatives revived the idea of a conspiracy among

³William Fort, Louis Midgley, Carroll Quigley, and Cleon Skousen, "Round Table Review," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 6:99-116 (Autumn, Winter 1971).

bankers. Perhaps it was due to the lack of business support of Senator Goldwater in 1964 or it may have reflected their disillusionment with certain so-called "liberal" policies of President Richard Nixon. According to Cleon Skousen, however, it was the result of disclosures made by Dr. Carroll Quigley, supposedly an insider to the conspiracy, which triggered its revival. Dr. Quigley's book, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), therefore, plays a crucial role in the arguments of both Skousen and Preston. In a letter accompanying his 155-page review of Quigley's book, Skousen states that:

Our main problem has been to discover precisely WHO was behind some of the insane things which have been happening. I have waited thirty years for someone on the 'inside' to talk and now Dr. Carroll Quigley has done it. He boastfully describes how the most powerful syndicate in the world is setting us up for a global socialist society. To accomplish their purposes, the Constitutional structure and independence of the United States must be destroyed. And that is what they are intent on doing.⁴

Dr. Quigley, however, has a very different view of his role as chief witness and authority on the existence of a bankers' conspiracy.

. . . Skousen has simply taken extended passages from my book, in violation of copyright, and put them together in terms of his own assumptions and preconceptions to make a picture very different from my own. Skousen is apparently a political agitator; I am a historian. My book merely tried to give an account of what happened in the world in the early part of the 20th century. . . .

Midgley has pointed out the chief distortions of my materials in Skousen's book. My picture of 'Financial Capitalism' said that it was prevalent in the period 1880-1933. [In fact, Quigley identifies six periods during which the accumulation of wealth led to a great deal of power. Only one of those six periods is the period of financial capitalism (bankers) from 1880 to 1933. Quigley maintains emphatically that that period ended in 1933.] Skousen quotes these dates (1890-1933), yet he insists that these organizations are still running everything. I said clearly that they were very powerful, but also said that they could not control the situation completely and were unable to prevent things they disliked, such as income and inheritance taxes. Moreover, I thought I had made it clear that the control of bankers

⁴Letter from W. Cleon Skousen, Salt Lake City, Utah, no date.

was replaced by that of self-financing or government-financed corporations . . . I saw a quite different alignment of American politics since 1950. Skousen implies that financial capitalism was not only omnipotent but immoral, both of which I denied.

I must say that I was surprised at the picture of myself which I found in Skousen. Midgley is correct in his statement that I never claimed to be an 'insider' of the Eastern Establishment, as Skousen seems to believe I was; I simply said that I knew some of these people, and generally liked them, although I objected to some of their policies.⁵

Since Quigley's book is central to the discovery and comprehension of the international bankers' conspiracy which is a major factor in both *The Naked Capitalist* and *The Coming Crash*, Quigley's letter emphatically denying that view of his book casts serious doubt upon the entire proposition.

In my examination of *The Coming Crash*, I found its scholarship suffering from two major faults: first, a number of inaccuracies exist which, with more documentation⁶ and care, could have been avoided; and second, there are numerous errors of logic that appear to result from an inadequate understanding of some basic tools of economics.

The following examples illustrate some of the inaccuracies. In discussing the consequences of inflation, Preston concludes that

. . . finally it is hopeless, and the money is completely worthless; no one will take it. Then all the factories and stores shut down. Rioting, robbing, looting, and all types of crime begin to stalk the streets. The cities turn into concrete canyons with savages hunting down their prey of other human beings who might have food and drink. Blood flows like rain water in the gutters. It has happened before, in France and in Germany.⁷

No documentation is given, but the last sentence is apparently referring to the hyper-inflations in France during the 1790s and in Germany during the 1920s. The description is not accurate, however. In fact, the record of these inflations stands as evidence against the conclusion that the current inflation in this country is necessarily leading to political and economic collapse. In contrast to the current inflation in the United

⁵Carroll Quigley, "Round Table Review," pp. 109-110.

⁶Preston's 112-page book contains only 50 footnotes, of which 6 are from Skousen, 5 from other conservative publications, 10 from popular books, and 14 from newspapers or monthly periodicals.

⁷Preston, p. 32.

States of 8 percent per year, the countries of Germany and France experienced rates of inflation as high as several *billion* percent, and yet, as serious as the consequences were, neither country suffered the total collapse and anarchy which is erroneously ascribed to them in the above quote.⁸

The Coming Crash claims that the United States must have a devaluation of at least 75 percent⁹ (no footnotes) and later declares that a secret agreement has been made for the United States to devalue 50 percent after the 1972 election¹⁰ (no footnotes). During the spring of 1973, the United States devalued by 10 percent—an amount many economists had been calling for in order to bring the dollar closer to its true commercial value in foreign markets. Since that time there has been little change in the value of the dollar with respect to other countries.

One also finds frequent misuses of quotes. For example, Preston states:

Well, that is all well and good, except that that is peanuts compared to what really goes on with the Federal Reserve. Now remember that the 12 banks which operate the Federal Reserve System—they don't own it, but they operate it—are all private banks. That means they are privately owned. But who owns them? No one really knows. Why? Because they have never been audited, never turned in an audited statement. . . .¹¹

The source cited is an article in the *New York Times*, "The Federal Reserve May Face Audit," which, in contradiction to the above statement, declares that "the Federal Reserve Board's position has always been that it is already carefully audited by its own specialists with a double check by private accountants."¹² This audit is published each year as the *Annual Report*.¹³

Later in *The Coming Crash*, we find that "Bernard Baruch financial consultant to numerous Presidents, emerged a multi-billionaire because he had almost all of his money in silver—almost one-fifth of the world's visible silver at that time."¹⁴

⁸See any standard European economic history text.

⁹Preston, pp. 37-38.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹²*The New York Times*, 14 September 1967, p. 32.

¹³Federal Reserve Board, *Annual Report* (58th), 1971.

¹⁴Preston, p. 100.

It claims that Baruch sold his stocks and bonds and bought silver. Bernard Baruch, who was not included in the bankers' conspiracy, is apparently a witness in whom one can have confidence. Yet in his autobiography, *The Public Years*, Baruch states that in anticipation of the depression he sold his stocks and *bought* bonds and *a small amount of gold*¹⁵—a very different course of action from that suggested in *The Coming Crash*.

In his book, Mr. Preston claims that the Federal Reserve has "never paid taxes, nor paid any profits to the U. S. Treasury as the law asks."¹⁶ The *Annual Report* of the Federal Reserve for 1971 shows that it has paid \$149,138,300 in taxes; \$2,188,893 in profits; and \$26,460,130,829 in interest on Federal Reserve notes to the Treasury of the United States.¹⁷ Though *The Coming Crash* said that the ratio of paper money to gold was approximately 25 to 1 in 1970,¹⁸ actually, paper currency that year totaled \$50 billion and gold supply was \$10.1 billion—a ratio of 5 to 1.¹⁹

Perhaps one of the most surprising remarks in *The Coming Crash* is that the author has "a friend whose uncle bought a brand new car during the last depression" for 500 pounds of potatoes.²⁰ There is not a price index for automobiles, but one exists for potatoes. From 1929 to 1932 the price of potatoes fell from 32 cents to 17 cents per 10 pounds of potatoes,²¹ suggesting that the friend's uncle paid \$8.50 for a new car. Incredible!

Second, *The Coming Crash* illustrates the author's lack of familiarity with the concepts of demand and supply, the nature and uses of money, and how the Federal Reserve creates money. This leads to serious errors of logic on almost every page that deals with technical economic questions—most notably pages 24-40. For example, he repeatedly insists that because the Federal Reserve pays only \$1.50 for \$1,000 worth of Federal Reserve notes, it necessarily follows that the remaining \$998.50 represents no real value and therefore constitutes

¹⁵Bernard M. Baruch, *Baruch, the Public Years* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 222-223.

¹⁶Preston, p. 25.

¹⁷Federal Reserve Board, *Annual Report* (58th), 1971, pp. 254-255.

¹⁸Preston, pp. 27, 58.

¹⁹*Federal Reserve Bulletin*, March 1972, p. A-16.

²⁰Preston, p. 67.

²¹*Historical Statistics of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 128.

inflation.²² In fact, the full \$1000 represents an obligation of the Federal Reserve to the U. S. Treasury, but neither this nor the \$1.50 (nor the amount of gold backing) determines whether or not inflation will result. The value of money is determined by the same forces that determine the value of any economic good—in this case, the demand and supply of money. If economic output is expanding at an annual rate of 4 percent, the Federal Reserve can, and probably should, increase the money supply at that rate without inflation. Failure to expand the money supply at that rate will result in deflation and probably unemployment in the short run. If the money supply is increased more rapidly than the growth of real output, then inflation does occur.

The Coming Crash mistakenly states that for every dollar increase in government debt there is a dollar increase in the money supply followed by a dollar increase in the price level.²³ In practice, an increase in the national debt is often accompanied by an increase in the money supply in order to provide the federal government with an inexpensive credit market. However, this is seldom a one for one ratio, and in theory there is no necessary connection between the two. Nor does it follow that a dollar increase in the money supply necessarily leads to inflation.

Another major concern found in *The Coming Crash* is the lack of gold backing behind the money supply which mistakenly views gold as the determinant of the value of money.²⁴ Again, the value of money is determined by its supply in relation to its use—which is largely for the purpose of buying the annual output of the American economy, now totaling more than \$1 trillion per year.

The Coming Crash charges that the international bankers created the Great Depression of 1929 for their own advantage. According to this thesis, bankers sold their stocks and bonds and bought gold and silver before the crash—thereby profiting from the depression. There is no documentation provided and I know of no evidence that supports this claim. What is well known is that from 1929 to 1933 there were over 8,500 bank failures in this country, affecting almost one-half of the banks existing in 1929—a strange way to profit from the De-

²²Preston, pp. 26, 34-35.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 26-28, 37, 58.

pression!²⁵ And, judging from the response of bankers to the Roosevelt administration, they were not in firm control of the political scene. It is inconceivable that bankers who supposedly possess virtually world-wide control are, at the same time, unable to eliminate their competitors—the savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks.

Let me state what must be obvious. From the standpoint of both logic and my own study of monetary history, I do not believe in an international bankers' conspiracy which seeks to destroy the United States and wield total world power. On the other hand, I find ample evidence of the desire of bankers to maximize profits and to exert power and influence commensurate with their wealth. I believe that *The Naked Capitalist* and *The Coming Crash* both naively confuse power with conspiracy. Wealth creates power, and many bankers have wealth, hence power. But must we read sinister motives into fairly common human behavior? As human beings we support with our time and money virtually every sort of idea conceivable, and the more wealth one has the more obvious is his support of "strange" causes. The economic history of the 19th century reveals that Jay Gould, Jim Fisk, and others supported both Republican and Democrat candidates within the same state. If there had been a Socialist party with significant political influence, they may well have been found supporting the socialists as well. It is an old practice of "hedging a bet" by making counterbalancing bets.

The belated discovery of a heretofore secret, though world-wide and virtually omnipotent, conspiracy of international bankers impugns the patriotism or the intelligence of every major government official, banker, economist, and newspaper publisher in this and other countries for the past 100 years. The list of government conspirators or dupes includes virtually every public figure in Republican as well as Democratic administrations: Richard Nixon, Dwight Eisenhower, Arthur Burns, Henry Cabot Lodge, John Foster Dulles, Henry Kissinger, etc.²⁶ By the same logic, one must include President Nixon's first Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, whose name is conspicuously absent from lists compiled by Mormon authors.

²⁵Ross M. Robertson, *History of the American Economy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 519.

²⁶Gary Allen, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* (Rossmoor, California: Concord Press, 1971), p. 90.

In the United States today there are almost 14,000 banks with at least that number again in the rest of the world. The either-or task of enlisting their support in the conspiracy or strictly maintaining its secrecy from them staggers the imagination.

TEN STEPS FOR PREPARATION

Let's now turn to the ten steps *The Coming Crash* recommends to prepare for the collapse. The first five steps are noncontroversial and have been suggested by others for a number of years: one should provide for (1) a safe water supply;²⁷ (2) an adequate medical supply;²⁸ (3) an ample food supply—18 pages of the book on this topic are verbatim quotes from the U. S. government, Department of Agriculture's food storage plan;²⁹ (4) training in first aid and civil defense;³⁰ and (5) enough food, water, clothing, etc., to be self-sufficient for two years.³¹

The remaining five steps recommended in *The Coming Crash* are more original and more controversial. It advocates that (6) one should prepare to defend himself by joining a gun club and owning a small rapid-fire 22 calibre rifle;³² (7) those living in cities should sell their homes and move to a rural retreat 200 miles from a large city—seeing no advantage to home ownership, but recommending an older house, a cabin, or a mobile home;³³ (8) one's savings should not be kept in banks or savings and loan institutions;³⁴ (9) people should secretly convert their currency into silver coins and hide them in many places;³⁵ and finally, it recommends that (10) wealth be converted into silver bullion.³⁶ The author will sell non-returnable silver at considerably above the spot price in return for your Federal Reserve notes. Investments to stay away from, according to the author, are life insurance, with the exception of 5-year term policies, all retirement programs, mort-

²⁷Preston, p. 67.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 68-86.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 87.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 90-97.

³²*Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

³³*Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 98.

³⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

³⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

gages, U.S. government bonds, and mutual funds.³⁷ If enough people in the United States followed this advice, the predictions of a severe depression would be self-fulfilling and would not even need any help from a super conspiratorial union of bankers.

Considerable interest and attention have focused on advocating the purchase of silver bullion. One of the most frequently encountered questions is whether or not silver represents a viable hedge against (1) inflation and (2) the type of depression predicted by *The Coming Crash*. The only accurate answer is that nobody—including Mr. Preston and Mr. Wimmer—knows. That answer, or lack of answer if you like, follows from the fact that the question requires a knowledge of the future. What can be known for certain is that the purchase of silver as a hedge is a highly speculative and risky venture, dramatically demonstrated by recent price changes for silver. From 1968 to 1971 the price declined from \$2.14 to \$1.54 per ounce (a 28 percent decline); the price rose precipitously from \$2.97 in December, 1973 to \$6.70 on 26 February 1974 (a rise of 125 percent); as of 16 April 1974, the price had declined to \$4.31 (a fall of 36 percent—sufficient to entirely wipe out the investment of anyone buying on margins).³⁸ In my opinion, the silver market is too volatile for the average, small investor, and it surely is not a market designed to assure an investor against risk and uncertainty. One may insist that the price of silver must continue rising because we are producing only 70 percent of current consumption—the remaining 30 percent coming from depleting stocks. But on the other hand, ponder the impact upon the future value of silver should Eastman Kodak, the world's largest consumer of silver develop a substitute for silver in their photographic process. My point is not that the price of silver must fall or rise, but rather that the future is uncertain and that silver is a highly speculative market which no one should go into uninformed.³⁹ It must be remembered that for every dollar of silver purchased in anticipation of a future in-

³⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 102-104.

³⁸*Statistical Abstract of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 666 and *The Wall Street Journal*, December 1973—April, 1974.

³⁹Anyone contemplating the purchase of silver should read an article on the problems of margin buying in the silver market published in the *Wall Street Journal*, 4 February 1974, pp. 1, 18.

crease in its value, someone must of necessity sell a dollar of silver, and he may be equally convinced that the future price of silver will decline.

The answer to the second question, "Is silver a good hedge against the type of depression described by *The Coming Crash*?" is the same. No one knows. In my opinion, if conditions become as severe as the book predicts, it is possible that silver would be of little value. Preston is not describing a depression similar to that of the 1930s—probably the most severe depression in this country's history—but one of much greater severity and consequence. He is predicting a total economic, social, and political collapse, including large scale famine, civil disorder, and anarchy. If conditions were to become that severe, it seems unlikely that any form of monetary unit would circulate. What trade would exist would most likely be in the form of pure barter—goods for goods with no monetary intermediary. On the other hand, if *The Coming Crash* is wrong about the severity of the depression, then silver may be a reasonable hedge against a moderate depression. That, however, is just as uncertain as the answer in the case of inflation. The value of silver is now determined almost entirely by non-monetary forces of demand and supply, and the future of both is unknown.

The question of what sort of wealth portfolio one should hold is a very complex matter because it should include some hedge against the economic opposites of depression and inflation. The answer varies from family to family and from year to year, and should be worked out cautiously with as much professional help as can be afforded.

I believe that one should first look after his debt, insurance, and cash flow needs. To the extent that he is fortunate enough to have a surplus, I encourage him to seek professional advice and to diversify. Normally the higher the potential return, the greater the risk and therefore the greater the probability of loss also. Included in this category are commodities (such as silver, copper, cocoa, sugar, hogs, cattle, soybeans, etc.), international monies, and the so-called "penny stocks." Lower risk investments generally yield less return, but also less likelihood of loss. These include bluechip corporate stocks and land purchases. The safest investments, and therefore under normal conditions the lowest returns, are savings accounts and government and corporate bonds. Silver, as a com-

modity, falls under the category of high risk and the average family should be very cautious of that type of investment—especially at current prices.⁴⁰

It is my conviction that the predictions and prescriptions contained in *The Coming Crash* are simplistic and of dubious validity. In their more extreme form, they are potentially damaging to true preparedness.

⁴⁰Recently, the *Wall Street Journal* warned that the gold market (a market closely related to the silver market), "as any intelligent gold speculator knows, is highly volatile." And cautioned that that market "has become an even riskier place." *Wall Street Journal*, 1 April 1974, p. 25.

The Keep-A-Pitchinin or the Mormon Pioneer was Human

Ronald W. Walker*

"If there's anybody doleful
Just grab him by the fin
And lead him to the office
Of the keep-a-pitchinin."

Keep-A-Pitchinin, March 1, 1870, p. 3.

Salt Lake's short-lived *Keep-A-Pitchinin* (pronounced "keep a pitchin'in") was more than one of the West's first illustrated journals and humor periodicals. Written by men of talent, including sons of Mormon apostles and even a distinguished apostle incognito, its boisterous wit demonstrated that the nineteenth century Mormon pioneer was something besides a crabbed and humorless yeoman building a commonwealth. It testified to the early settlers' humanity, providing a valuable but over-looked index to those concerns and qualities which shaped Utah society. In 1938 Cecil Alter's *Early Utah Journalism* declared the periodical was "probably one of the longest remembered and least important of all Utah papers." From today's perspective he was wrong on both accounts.¹

The frivolous and irrelevant tone of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* belied its apparent purpose. Its chief editor "Uno Hoo," whose editorial assistants were "Ubet Urlife" and "B.I.Z. Ness," ostensibly explained its origin. "Everything was dull, dark and

*Mr. Walker, a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Utah, teaches at the Salt Lake Institute of Religion adjacent to the University of Utah.

¹J. Cecil Alter, *Early Utah Journalism: A Half Century of Forensic Warfare, Waged by the West's Most Militant Press* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1938), pp. 317-18. Mormon humor has been most effectively treated by folklorists, with historians, more by omission than commission, creating a somber stereotype. This paper was written under a summer research grant by the Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter cited Historical Department).

torpid," he wrote. "The world needed waking up."² But from every indication the proposed "arousing of humanity" proceeded from a specific and serious intent. While the paper had commenced as early as 1867 as primarily an occasional advertising broadside, only in 1870, after the Godbeite protest began to rend Mormon society, did the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* become a regular bi-monthly. Hardly coincidental, the Godbeite "New Movement" became a consistent victim of the paper's satire. Led by such former Mormons as William S. Godbe, E. L. T. Harrison, Amasa Lyman, Henry Lawrence, Edward Tullidge, and T. B. H. Stenhouse, the Godbeites spurned what they considered to be the theological fundamentalism, the cultural and geographical isolationism, and the temporal emphasis of nineteenth century Mormonism. Embracing spiritualism and given to intellectual pretension, the "New Movement" became an irresistible staple for the periodical's humor.

But the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* attraction to Godbeitism involved more than humor seeking its natural affinity. During the schismatic crisis the periodical became an important vehicle and voice for orthodoxy, its humor a perfect foil to the Godbeite challenge. If not tied directly to the Mormon leadership, it certainly possessed semi-official approbation. It was recommended to the Saints by the Church organ, the *Deseret News*, printed upon the Church owned press, and written by men closely associated with the Church leaders.³ Indeed the Mormon leadership may well have provided financial assistance. While the paper floundered financially prior to the Godbeite insurrection and failed upon the "New Movement's" demise, during the confrontation between the Church and its dissenters it enjoyed a stability incompatible with its limited advertising. The source of its fleeting strength may only be surmised.

The identity of "Uno Hoo" and his editorial assistants, however, may be more than presumed. The *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* publisher and editor was George J. Taylor, eldest son and sometime business manager of John Taylor, apostle and subsequently president of the Latter-day Saints. Young Taylor's career illustrated that individuality and diversity are often humor's requisites. Indicative of his close ties to the Mormon

²*Keep-A-Pitchinin*, 15 April 1870, p. 15, most issues available on microfilm at Western Americana Library, University of Utah.

³*Ibid.*, 1 May 1870, p. 19; see also *Deseret News*, 16 March 1870, p. 2 and 26 April 1870, p. 4.

community, he had been baptized by Joseph Smith himself, while Brigham Young had on one occasion saved his life. He served as a missionary (several times), a member of the Salt Lake High Council, a regent and instructor in grammar and geography for the University of Deseret, a Salt Lake City Councilor, a member of the editorial staff of the *Deseret News*, chief clerk of the Utah upper house, and for many years as county coroner. His private concerns were also as numerous. Illustrator, art instructor, music composer, bicycle enthusiast and inventor, debator, Taylor participated in the territory's first nail manufacturing by machine, its first glass works, and its first building association—and somehow found time to manufacture shoes, contract for the Union Pacific Railroad, establish a short-lived mercantile concern, and engage in lumbering and sawing. If his consuming timidity prevented marriage, it could not subdue his humor.⁴

Taylor's *Keep-A-Pitchinin* associates were from the same mold. Their pseudonyms—"Marrowfat," "Resurgam," "Viator," and "Saxey,"—only slightly disguised the participants. Charles Savage and George M. Ottinger, who provided cartoons and even prose, were occasional partners in a photography business. Savage had been converted to Mormonism as an English youth; later he received national attention as Utah's pioneer photographic artist. Ottinger had joined Mormonism after an eventful career on the sea as an adolescent, and although he served Salt Lake as its superintendent of water works and chief of its fire department, his consuming but largely unfilled passion was to succeed as a painter of fine art.⁵ Equally talented were Joseph C. Rich and Heber J. Richards, sons of apostles Charles C. Rich and Willard Richards. During his career Joseph Rich would serve as a surveyor, missionary journalist, telegrapher, merchant, lawyer, judge, and

⁴Papers of George J. Taylor, uncatalogued and unindexed, Historical Department; for his timidity see Taylor's missionary blessing, *ibid.*; for Young saving his life, George J. Taylor to Brigham Young, Salt Lake, 20 May 1874, Brigham Young Papers, Historical Department; other biographical details are found in "Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," 2 February 1868, p. 3, 3 May 1897, p. 8, and 15 December 1914, p. 2, Historical Department.

⁵Andrew Jensen, *Latter-day Saints Biographical Encyclopedia* (Salt Lake City: By the Author, 1920), III, 708-11; Thomas A. Leek, "A Circumspection of Ten Formulators of Early Utah Art History," (M. A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1961), pp. 21-29; "Journal of George M. Ottinger," typed-written copy, Historical Department; M. B. Stern, "A Rocky Mountain Book Store; Savage and Ottinger in Utah," *Brigham Young University Studies*, IX (Winter, 1969), 144-154.

politician; before contributing to the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* he had proven his mettle as an humorist by creating, in his words, that "wonderful first class lie—'The Bear Lake Monster,'" Utah's long-lived transplant from Loch Ness. Richards was one of the territory's first young men to receive medical training in the East, Brigham Young himself supporting his education.⁶ But of all the periodical's contributors, the most eminent and indeed the most anonymous was Orson Pratt. The Godbeites apparently never realized that the scholarly apostle, one of the men they most revered in Mormonism, was a clandestine author of some of the paper's pungent satire.⁷

Collectively the contributors seemed an ideal combination for the enterprise at hand. As Taylor later characterized them, they represented a "brilliant array."⁸ Blood and sentiment bound them to the community's leadership. As young men—with the exception of Pratt, most were in their thirties—they possessed the youthful perspective often necessary for social humor. And as members of Mormonism's second generation, they benefited from Deseret's relative stability and growing prosperity, fundamental requisites to cultural productivity.

The *Keep-A-Pitchinin* enjoyed an immediate response. When it commenced regular publication in March, 1870, with its banner declaring its devotion to "Cents, Scents, Sense and Nonsense," the four page bi-monthly was greeted favorably by its more serious sister journals. Not only did the *Deseret News* laud its advent, but the *Salt Lake Herald* found its fun "pretty good to take." Even the *Tribune*, the organ of the Godbeites, attempted to reply in kind by archly complimenting the "Orthodox party . . . on their 'New Move,'" borrowing the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* own waggish epithet for the Godbeite "New Movement."⁹ In April the humor periodical announced that

⁶Russel R. Rich, *Land of the Sky-Blue Water: A History of the L. D. S. Settlement of the Bear Lake Valley* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1963), p. 180, citing the *News Examiner*, April 17, 1947; Ezra J. Poulsen, *Joseph C. Rich: Versatile Pioneer on the Mormon Frontier* (Salt Lake City: Granite Publishing Company, 1958); Belle A. Gemmell, "Utah Medical History: Some Reminiscences," *California and Western Medicine*, XXXVI (January, 1932) 11-12. Rich does not indicate awareness of the older Indian legend of a Bear Lake monster.

⁷Taylor later identified his collaborators, including Pratt, in a penciled and unpublished autobiographical sketch, Papers of George J. Taylor, uncatalogued and unindexed, Historical Department.

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹*Salt Lake Herald*, 16 July 1870, p. 3; *Mormon Tribune*, 5 March 1870.

three printings of its first regular issue had been exhausted, and when an actor of the Salt Lake Theatre "ad-libbed" a comment concerning the *Keep-A-Pitchinin*, the audience roared with approval. Clearly the newspaper had gained a following.¹⁰

The *Keep-A-Pitchinin* secured its success with the comic conventions of its day. Like much of American nineteenth century humor, especially that of the frontier, the paper's spirit frequently was Gargantuan, its braggadocio and exaggeration tempered by mocking, self-deprecation. "The first number of this paper, which caused such a revolution in the newspaper world, was issued in 1867," the editor declared in 1870 when the paper actually first commenced a regular publishing schedule. "Since then, it has been issued regularly to the minute according to prospectus. There may be isolated individuals among our subscribers who have failed to receive all their numbers. This we attribute to the irregularities of the males [sic] . . ." ¹¹ Many of its short jests were rustic and unsubtle, derived if not borrowed from the American almanac tradition. While some possessed an enduring quality ("Text for sinners—Pretext."¹²), most should be charitably forgiven and forgotten ("A fond wife threw a bottle of hair renewer at her husband's head, at which he exclaimed: 'We must part—the dye is cast.'"¹³) The paper reflected the nineteenth century American delight for spelling and grammatical gaucherie, specializing in misspelled names. Such Godbeites as Harrison, Godbe, Tullidge, Salisbury, and Eli Kelsey were rechristened "Harrasing," "Goodboy," "Gullidge," "Sourberry," and "Ye Lie Kelsey." As Utah's first illustrated journal, its woodcuts bore an obvious debt to the political cartoons of the day, often crude and complicated by modern standards, but believed to be "wonderful" at the time.¹⁴

While the Godbeite challenge provided the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* with impetus and purpose, the religious controversy by no means dominated its pages. Occasionally the paper printed excerpts from the writings of American humorists Mark Twain, Artemus Ward, and Josh Billings. During the Franco-Prussian war, its columns were filled with dispatches from the

¹⁰*Keep-A-Pitchinin*, 15 April 1870, p. 16 and 1 June 1870, p. 28.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 1 March 1870, p. 2.

¹²*Ibid.*, 15 May 1870, p. 24.

¹³*Ibid.*, 15 July 1870, p. 40.

¹⁴*Millennial Star*, XXXII (26 April 1870), 271.

THE KEEPAITCHININ :

A SEMI-OCCASIONAL PAPER,
Devoted to Cents, Scents, Sense and Nonsense.

PRINCIPAL EDITOR,.....UNO HOO.
DEPUTY ASST. EDITOR,....UBET URLIFE.
DEP'Y ASST'S CLERK.....B. I. Z. NESS.

One Copy for a certain period,.....\$10.00
One Copy for an uncertain period... 5.00
Single Number,..... 10
Double Number,..... 5

For sale by all *respectable* Newsdealers everywhere.

SALUTATORY.

We have got our type so large that "a wayfaring man though a fool, need not err therein." You see there are a great many wayfaring men nowadays and some fools.

Our City has grown; the New Move has groan, and hence the necessity that our paper should grow.

Standing as it were in the midst of time, and glancing retrospectively upward through the gloomy centuries of the sombre past, beholding the cimmerian obscurity which has for unnumbered ages pervaded the minds of the benighted denizens of this terraqueous globe—what wonder that, in their incipient stages, our herculean efforts to illuminate the intellectual horizon of frail, erring humanity, should attain but partial success!

What was our position when we assumed the editorial conduct of this paper? What is our position to-day? Judging the future by the past, what may we not anticipate for ourselves and a discriminating world.

Standing on the verge of the mighty abyss of futurity, and glancing our minds eye down through the interminable vista of future generations, when many of our ephemeral, coterminous productions shall have been consigned to a merited oblivion, we behold the teeming millions of earth's unborn children, and their posterity after them, in numbers like the stars of the firmament, and faces radiant with joy, each perusing a damp copy of the *Keepapitchinin*. "Yah, dat iz zo."

FREE.

The Circus bills inform us, in large letters, that the sight of the Balloon will be "free," gratis, for nothing without charging *ascend*. We all feel relieved as many of us feared they would spread a large cloth over the City and prevent us looking at it.

MELANCHOLLY DISAPPOINTMENT.

We did anticipate having quite a time on the 4th, from the magnitude of the preparations, but one of the brethren of the New Move notifies the public through the columns of the *Tycoon* that *if the celebration is held in the New Tabernacle he shall stay at home*. As this is the only building large enough to hold all the celebrators on that day, of course it falls through.

"Twas ever thus, since childhood's hour,
This chilling fate has on me fell;
There always comes a soaking shower,
When I haint got no umberel."

PROCLAMATION!!

IMPERIAL EDICT OFFICE,
JULY 1st. 1871.

WHEREAS, certain young shavers being instigated by the devil, and not having the fear of the late Governor's proclamation before their eyes, have, villainously and maliciously, with malice, pre-pense and aforethought, fired and caused to be fired, various squibs and sundry fire-crackers, sky-rockets *et al*, of divers dimensions, to the imminent disarrangement of the intellectual equilibrium of the editorial corpse of the *Tribulation* Office.

Now, therefore, I, Gomeril Sir Charles Moore, do hereby issue this my proclamation, forbidding; interdicting and prohibiting any or all of said boys or shavers from firing off, or causing to be fired off, any or all of said squibs, fire-crackers, sky-rockets, *et al*, whether instigated by said devil or any other man; or from celebrating or attempting to celebrate, in any manner whatsoever, the said 4th of July.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the Menagerie.

GOMERIL SIR CHARLES MOORE.

FLIZE.

There are various kinds of flies in the world, for instance, there is the horse-fly, gad-fly, shoe-fly and the ordinary domesticated fly; of the latter we have a few specimens in this country. Most of these stand over *six feet* in their stockings, and might grow much larger if people would only take pains to give them regular meals of nutritious food, instead of knocking them about so much. The ancients also speak of "time flies," they used to call them *tempus fugit*. We suppose the name *fugit* originated in the fact that if you grab at them *few* you get. Our ball players sometimes catch the ball "on a fly;" this gives us some idea of their speed. Some flies are very intelligent, when you stick a pin into one he immediately struggles to get off—we suppose because he cannot "see the point." They also co-operate with the bed-bug and mosquito. While the mosquito acts as *pick it guard*, the bed-bug and the fly spell each other, one operates by day and the other by night. In order to keep bald-headed sinners awake in the Tabernacle, the fly is on the alert, and when night comes the fly retires to his virtuous couch, and the bed-bug takes hold where he left off. Herein we see the beauty and harmony of nature, (for the mosquito is quite musical.) Some flies are like our honest miners, very busy and industrious—others, again, are continually loafing around, and trying to make a *spec*. Almost any one with a little instruction can make the *butter fly*. We suppose the horse-fly is so named because of his fondness for short-tailed horses.

"Shoe-fly, don't bodder me."

For myriads of horses and riders!
And acres of music and fun!!
Go visit the Mammoth Pavillion!!!
And see how the tournament's won!

With a sound like the rushing of waters,
The steed of Mazeppa will fly;
While the monster Balloon of the Circus,
Floats grandly aloft to the sky!!!!

OWED TO THE NEW MOVE.

Our '*Peep O'Day*' it petered out,
Our *Magazine* got stuck,
Our "Close O' Day" *Diagonies*
Has also "run a muck."

Our *Tribulation*, weakly still,
With voice so thin and hollow
'Tis said has sunk ten thousand now,
It may expire to-morrow.

We've nothing good to offer you,
Nothing to which to tie;
Except our most unbounded stock
Of *concentrated lye*.

We'll change our platform if you wish,
As we have done before;
We want you all to join with us,
Lest we should run ashore.

Come "Riff-Raff," from Nevada, come,
And help us hate the Church;
As this is all we yet can do,
Don't leave us in the lurch!

"WHO PAYS THE FIFER?"

Thats whats the matter the "*Liberal*" organ wants to know who is to pay the party for its patriotism on the coming fourth. "We want more capitalists—more money—what is done with the taxes and the tithing" and what has Jones done with his money? We want it and wont rest until something is done about it?

What does General Grant do with \$25,000 a-year of the peoples money? A man could be hired to fill that position for a tenth of that sum. Why not hire a chinaman or a digger Indian. We want this matter investigated immediately.

Since the premature demise of the "Peep," the "Magazine" and the "Diagonies," the man in the Sixth Ward who takes the "Tribune" feels discouraged, he wishes us to tell him how he is to recover damages for the losses he has sustained in subscribing for those three litterairy productions which have so co-incidentally gone up. We would say to him, don't abandon the "Tribune," for we have hopes of it surviving a little longer, since it has taken to copying from the "News" and the "Herald."

Dwyer says he "has been bothered and plagued and exercised and irritated and annoyed and disquieted by persons inquiring for the "Keepapitchinin." Some *think* your discontinuance has killed "Diogenes," they say, "as long as you published something original for them to copy they survived, but when you stopped they fizzled out." Why is it you don't continue the 'Pitchinin'?

If you remember the last cut you had, (the Cat) they continued to copy over and over again, until the people got tired of it when "Diogenes" gradually petered out.

Br. Dwyer, we might answer you by quoting one of our Methodist friends, at the Camp Meeting. "It's a free country,—you have no right to *think*," but we shall not do so. We began our paper because we wanted to, and we published a full volume because we agreed to. We pocketed the surplus dollars of the only successful religious paper, west of Chicago, because we had a right to, and we stopped at the end of the volume because we had other matters to attend to. We hope that this paper will enable the editors of "Diogenes" to get out another number of that delectable sheet, so that the subscribers who have paid two or three years in advance will not lose quite all of their investment.

Correspondence.

THE BIG TENT.

"If there's a hole in a' yer coats,
I rede ye tent it,
A chief's among you takin notes,
And faith he'll prent it."

"Mr. EDITOR:

As there has been a good deal said about the disturbances at the late camp meeting and as there is evidently a great misapprehension prevalent on this subject allow me to state, through the columns of your valuable journal, the facts in the case just as they occurred. You see it was like this, Br. Skip had the sinners in Zion by the metaphorical seat of the pants shaking them over the brink of the fiery pit, and crying "only believe and you will be saved." When an unruly member, being doubtless "set on fire of Hell," exclaimed "Then the Devil will be saved for he believes and trembles." This was the first interruption that I recollect, after rebuking the interrupter Br. Skip sank back into his seat and Br. Pool arose exclaiming "Why will ye dye? Mrs. Snodgrass who occupied one of the front seats supposing herself the party addressed said "I don't dye, I wear a wig, and I think you're the most undelicatest and disgustinest young man I ever met," and assuming an expression of supreme contempt she flounced out of the meeting. This was the 2d case of the kind. The 3d and last interruption occurred in this wise, The Deacons had succeeded in getting a man filled with the spirit onto the anxious seat and were busily engaged in hammering the gospel into him at the same time asking him questions, when he interrupted the services by replying as follows:

Br. Skip.—Dost thou believe?

Sinner.—"I dost."

Br. Skip.—"Canst thou drink into the spirit of the meeting?"

Sinner.—"If the spirit of the meeting is extracted from 'Old Rye' I think I canst."

They labored for some time endeavoring to induce another sinner to join them a-lass without success. Then Br. Stiggins, being instigated by the Devil and not having the fear of the synod before him, remarked that it was "the dryest Serkus he ever attended; it reminded him of working an old bass wood pump in a dry well—the more you worked the more it squeaked and the dryer it got." Br. Skip was meek and pious and long suffering but he could'nt stand that, so he gathered Br. Stiggins by the skuff of the neck and the seat of his pants, pitched him out of the Synagogue and wound the thing off with a benediction.

SOL M. KOLLY.

SUCKERS.

Saxey says "The fish in Bear Lake just begin to bite. I landed several five pounders last night and D. P. has improved wonderfully in the art piscatorial, he now carries his angle worms in his mouth and will follow a chub or sucker further than a digger ute would a lizzard." (Our compositors will be pleased to learn that suckers are coming to the surface. As a newly married Bear Laker has promised us several tons on subscription.)

WHERE ARE WE NOW?—If you wish to be startled and astonished—made to wonder whether what you see is a reality or a deception of the senses, examine the extremely low prices marked on that magnificent new stock of DRY GOODS AND GROCERIES, offered by TEASDEL & Co, East Temple Street.

GOOD MANNERS FIVE HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

"Whoso will learn curtayse," (says the writer, whose name is omitted, and who is supposed to be dead, the manuscript being four or five centuries old,) "may find it in this book, whether he be gentleman, yeoman or knave. * * * * *

Pare thy bread in two, the upper crust from the under. Cut the upper portion into four quarters, and set them together, as if whole. Cut the lower crust in three, turn it downe and lay it before thy trencher. Sit upright, do not touch aught, until thy mess of meat be offered thee, lest men say thou art a glutton. Wipe thy mouth ere drinking. Let not thy spoon stand in thy dish, nor lay it on the dish side, but cleanse it. Spit not on the board, nor play with thy dog. Should thy nose run, cleanse it on the tippet of thy skirt, lest, peradventure it drop on thy meat. Don't tell scandalous tales at table, don't stroke the cat. Wipe not thy teeth with the board-cloth, nor dip thumb in thy drink."

The foregoing directions are very clear and explicit, except in regard to cleansing the spoon. We are positively forbidden to "dip thumb in thy drink, or to use the board cloth," hence it would seem advisable to fall back, as in the other case, on the tippet of our skirt. We would like to hear the opinion of Lord Chesterfield on this subject, or perhaps one of our Judges could furnish an opinion.

DOLLAROUS NEWS.

We hear that the Liberals are offering money to induce ladies to join their procession. One establishment on Main Street was offered \$1.00 each for all the young ladies they could turn out on the 4th. This very "liberal" offer, we understand, was refused. We can't imagine what the young ladies are thinking of to refuse to walk all day in the sun and dust, in the "Liberal" ranks, for the magnificent sum of one Dollar! A dollar will buy one-half of a pair of gloves—then you could walk with them hand and glove; ladies hadn't you better reconsider it?

Advertisements.

CALDER BROTHERS.



CALDER BROTHERS.

If you wish to be healthy and happy,
With joy that shall never decay,
Go purchase your bread and confections,
Go lightly, just over the way.

Their crackers they make by the car-load,
Their cakes are made up by the ton,
While their candies, and all their confections

Are sweetest things under the sun.

GOLIGHTLY & HARRAS,
East Temple St.

The managers of the Camp Meeting thought of entering into the mercantile business, in this City, but having examined the extensive stock of new goods in the establishment of Messrs. RIGGS & LECHTENBERG, they became disheartened, and abandoned the idea, because they could not hope to compete in price and quality.

SAVAGE'S AT WORK AGAIN.—We thought that after the great Indian pow-wow, we should have peace; but people cry peace! peace! when there is no peace.

We have just seen the heads of several of our prominent citizens recently executed by SAVAGE & OTTINGER, and the only excuse the Savage has, is, that they are in a proper frame of mind. The police should make a descent on that place at once, and either take the ring-leaders or be taken.

THE UTAH SOUTHERN RAILROAD.—Our friends in the South will be pleased to learn that this great enterprise is progressing. The cars have got as far South as TAYLOR & CUTLER'S Depot, on Main St., where it is proposed to lay in supplies of every description to last them to Provo. That's right, get them by the car load, where they can be got the cheapest. The Best store in town.

"LET US HAVE PEACE," said General Granite, and his head was clear. The General is a man who seldom speaks publicly, but when he does speak, he says something. In the above quotation he had reference to a "piece" of one of those luscious cakes, accompanied by ICE CREAM, and delicious STRAWBERRIES, only to be found at WALLACE'S, near the Salt Lake House.

THE BEAR'S APPEAL.

Ever ready, ever handy,
Climbing, wrestling striving too,
To do something still to please you;
Watch us well what feats we do.
Ring-tail-spider-monkey-grandee
We'll hang every creature handy;
Don't forget the cakes and candy.
Bear it in mind:
Museum and Menagerie.

June 30, 1871.

JNO. W. SNELL, is doing well,
In sales of Grain and Flour;
The highest price, he pays in cash,
For Peaches, every hour.

He also has those sugared Hams,
Of salt, a wondrous tower,
And vinegar in giant tubs
And most exceeding sour.
Idaho Store, 2d South St.

PHIL. MARGETTS has got (H)ale and Stout,
But not on common swill;
Whoever calls at Margetts' shop
Is sure to get his Phil.

His beverage is pleasant, too,
Go ask for what you will;
Who oftens calls at Margett's shop
Need never make his will.

If you want to see Hats by the million,
And Boots by the hundreds of tons,
Don't ramble around on the suburbs:
Go straightway to DUNFORD & SONS.

Their Hats are the pink of perfection,
Their worth you perceive at a glance;
And as for the Boots and the Slippers,
They're certainly par excellence.

University. These pages with those on the cover complete the photographic reproduction of all four pages of the issue.

front. The *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* own correspondent, Lord John Rustle (not to be confused with the Whig statesman, Lord John Russell) filed a typical communique for the 1 September 1870 issue:

I passed a better night, I also passed a regiment of cavalry and had five or six swords run through me accidentally. I shall have them pulled out to-morrow. I was taken for Napoleon. Send \$40,000 to \$50,000 to my family. You ask what position I held in the late conflict.—I held the King's mule.¹⁵

Commonly inveighing against any specie of pretension, the periodical printed the text of "Uno Hoo's" speech following a "serenade given in front of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* office." It provided a skillful parody of the spread-eagle oratory of the day with its bloated and cliché-ridden images:

Twenty-three years ago to day [sic], at six o'clock in the morning this whole Territory was one vast, howling wilderness. (Applause.) The red Indian scoured the plain where now our plain women scour the floors, (laughter,) while the sage brush and greasewood, towering in majesty over it, lent a grateful shade to the blood-thirsty cricket and the carnivorous grasshopper. . . . No Iron Horse snorted aloud its discordant notes on the palpitating air at five o'clock in the morning, just as you were getting your morning nap; but the modest mouse and timid bed bug went forth, hand in hand, peacefully, over this broad land, with none to molest or make them afraid. . . . There is only one thought that mars the festive jocundity of this occasion—it is the evident jealousy, whose sweltering venom rankles and festers in the puny bosoms of our weakly contemporaries. (This was followed by sixteen cheers and a tiger and two cubs for our paper.)¹⁶

Much of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* humor dealt with immediate and local concerns. The 1870 United States Census canvassing prompted the journal to warn that the local citizenry might well be asked whether they belonged to the "Strangites, Rigdonites, Morrisites, Josey-fights, Hit-tights or Git-tights."¹⁷ Reference to the Bear Lake Monster, which Rich had introduced to the territory the year previous via the columns of the *Deseret News*, appeared frequently in the *Keep-A-Pitchinin*, with special focus upon attempts to snare the elusive but celebrated leviathan. Inasmuch as the friendly monster had beg-

¹⁵*Keep-A-Pitchinin*, 1 September 1870, p. 51.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 1 August 1870, p. 42.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 15 August 1870, p. 47.

ged "no 'tobacker," " in sometime, Rich concluded that he was absent, "perhaps prospecting."¹⁸ In mild protest over a Relief Society work project, Rich also reported "Sister Molwitcher has not yet got the Female Relief Society in complete working order, there not being at present any wooden-legged men to knit socks for."¹⁹

The journal's lively and deprecating wit frequently belied Mormonism's serious and straight-faced image. Using one of the favorite metaphors of the Church leaders for their own purpose, the paper had the potter declaring to his clay, "*be ware.*"²⁰ If the question of the Danites received respectful and serious attention by the Gentiles of the territory, the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* attitude was hardly reverential. The paper denied the Danite band simply by satirically confirming its presence.²¹ Nor did it take overly seriously the super-charged question of polygamy. It playfully authored, if only to subsequently deny, the light-hearted charge that men married their grandmothers in their quest of plurality. The periodical reasoned that many refused the "principle" because they could not "bear the courts," a pun that assumed larger meaning during the judicial persecutions a decade later.²² When the Reverend J. P. Newman, pastor of the Metropolitan Church at Washington and Chaplain of the Senate, peremptorily travelled to Salt Lake to challenge a wary and reluctant Brigham Young to debate polygamy, the magazine in turn issued its own call to the Washington minister for forensic combat. Its terms were unique:

The Dr. to try polygamy for six months, in order that he may get a practical knowledge of it, and we to enter into monogamy for the same length of time; at the end of which period, should the Dr. survive, we are to discuss the matter in the presence of our wives, socially, intellectually, physically, spiritually, morally, practically, syllogistically, somatically, materially, theoretically, temporally and eternally; neither to speak more than six hours at a time; and should the Dr. prefer it, we furthermore agree to occupy his pulpit in Washington, and edify his congregation there as much as he possibly could and draw his salary, as close as he dare to, while he takes our place in this city and draws our salary. We also intend to challenge the Pope of Rome and the Arch-

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 15 November 1870, p. 72.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰*Ibid.*, 1 April 1870, p. 10; *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* emphasis.

²¹*Ibid.*, 1 November 1870, p. 67.

²²*Ibid.*, 15 March 1870, p. 7; 1 November 1870, p. 66.

bishop of Canterbury, and, should they fail (as we fully expect) to come to time, we shall publish them to the world as recreant poltroons and cowardly vagabonds.²³

Newman eventually debated—not Brigham Young—but one of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* own contributors, Orson Pratt.

The year 1870 saw several dramatic confrontations between the Mormons and the National Government, but the tone of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* hardly corroborated the high emotionalism often suggested to have accompanied these events. Under a cartoon satirizing the extravagant anti-Mormon charges attending the Congressional debate of the Cullom bill, the paper dismissed the unconfirmed rumors of a Mormon insurrection. There was "Nothing Like It In History," it reported, "Excepting That Affair in France, When"

The king of France, with forty thousand men,
Marched up a hill, and then marched down again.²⁴

During the so-called "wooden-gun rebellion," a struggle between the Mormon community and the territorial government over control of the local militia, Savage and Ottinger were arrested and imprisoned for treason—charged with unauthorized drilling with mock guns. But the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* assessment of the event revealed that the paper had not lost its perspective. With tongue bulging in cheek, it described the event as

one of the most daring and desperate attempts on the peace and safety of a nation ever recorded in the annals of crime. . . . The mind of man faints, staggers and falls back in its vain attempts to grasp the SAVAGE diabolism projected by these fiends in human form. Had they been successful, they would undoubtedly have slain the inhabitants, destroyed the nation and emptied the debris into the Gulf of Mexico.²⁵

A Grand Jury failed to indict either Savage or Ottinger or their fellow miscreants.

While the journal's interests were diverse, its special and continuing attention focused upon the Godbeites and their "New Movement." The paper frequently attacked what seemed to be the "New Move's" pretentious and vaulting nature, a characteristic not unknown to those bearing the tidings of new revelation. But the Godbeites intensified the effect by com-

²³*Ibid.*, 15 August 1870, pp. 46-7.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 15 March 1870, p. 5.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 1 December 1870, p. 76.

binning their religious enthusiasm with both a spirit of reform and a spirit of sophistication. The result naturally invited humor. Under the caption of "New Lights for the City," the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* responded to the dissident's unending claims of further "light and truth." "We learn that the City Fathers design pulling down the recently erected lampposts and substituting a few personages of the New Move. That's as it should be," the paper asserted. "The people require light, and while there is so much of it in the Movement, why not utilize it? This new gas does not equal the old in brilliancy, but this is made up in quantity."²⁶

Repeatedly the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* satirized the Godbeite over-weening vocabulary, which at times seemed more suited to specialized treatises than common persuasion. Edward Tullidge's praise to the announced revelations of Harrison and Godbe was an irresistible object of assault, with the magazine borrowing Tullidge's tone and even an occasional phrase from the Godbeite revelations:

The idiosincrasies [sic] of peculiar individualities, indicate the very incarnation of those inherent intellectual qualities, so natural to those of spiritual organic quality; giving to the whole being an impressible, inspirational tone which constitutes the divine essence of those lofty aspirations which permeate the circumambient atmosphere and lead to etherial constituents. Such susceptible embodiments of the sublimest conceptions venture into an infinitude of glorious periphery of thought; leaving the mundane circumstances of the terrestrial world they inhabit far beneath them, in their lofty flight in search of those heavenly gems of truth which were exemplified in the life of "the good Queen Bess." *Triumphant! Triumphant!*

In a postscript, "Uno Hoo" promised a key to the above would be provided "in the ensuing number of the *Tribune*."²⁷

The Godbeite penchant for the lofty and sublime was heightened with the advent of Amasa Lyman, the silver-tongued former Mormon Apostle. Joining the "New Movement" in May, 1870, Lyman became its public champion and eventually its titular leader. Again the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* filled the measure of its creation. In an anonymous letter which sounds a lot like Orson Pratt, the paper contrasted this modern Amasa with his Biblical namesake. The latter was a warrior

²⁶*Ibid.*, 15 April 1870, p. 14.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 15 March 1870, p. 6.

and dealt in blows, while the son of Roswell found strength "in pretty words." The letter concluded by mocking Lyman's style and even quoting from his vocabulary. The latter-day Amasa

"planted his childish footsteps in the incipient stages of his upward journey;" he "in the artless innocence of uneducated youth, was cast upon the world's broad ocean of ever-varying conditions and circumstances, and in his fragile bark he pursued his way over the seething waves of life's storm-tossed ocean, to find in the prosecution of his imposed labor all of life's opportunities for the culture of the soul and the development of its own constituent divinity."

"This he did," the letter suggested, "by reading novels whenever he could."²⁸ The charge of novel reading in nineteenth century Utah society was not meant to be complimentary.

Nor could the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* resist repeated comments on the "New Movement's" attraction to spiritualism. "Encouraging" the growing number of alienated Godbeites (many former adherents had become distressed with the movement's increasingly apparent spiritualistic tendency), the paper promised a spiritual column probably to be written by Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and "a few choice spirits who seem to have nothing better to do. . . ." Not much came of the promised feature, although "Wilkins Micawber" did write from "Hot Springs, Purgettory" on "June 41th, 1870," to affirm the presence of "His Sul-furious Majesty." The affirmation was in direct contradiction to the Godbeite denial of Satan. When the spiritualists apparently claimed, in addition to their usual visitations, an actual "spirit photograph," the paper confirmed the event by suggesting "the spirit was in everybody's mouth." It employed the same play on words after the Walker Brothers dispossessed the "New Movement" from meeting in their old store in favor of the establishment of Howard's Liquors. The irony did not escape the periodical, the change being viewed as merely the trading of one kind of spirits for another.²⁹

The *Keep-A-Pitchinin* frequently dueled with the Godbeite magazines and newspapers. But its weapon was sarcasm and never substance, refusing to accord the "New Movement" the

²⁸*Ibid.*, 1 August 1870, p. 44. Not only was the letter suggestive of Pratt's satire and filled with his relish for vocabulary and scriptural imagery, but it also promised a sequel which never materialized, possibly because of the apostle's sudden involvement with Newman.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 15 June 1870, p. 30; 15 July 1870, p. 39; 1 July 1870, p. 36; 1 May 1870, p. 18

dignity of debate. Referring to the *Utah Magazine*, a weekly journal which Godbe later transformed into the *Salt Lake Tribune*, the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* expressed what at first seemed to be a compliment. "We have seen some good things in that magazine," it observed. "We once got a pound of sausages rolled up in it." "Uno Hoo" and his associates employed a similar observation to explain the *Utah Magazine's* transformation. Its earlier format had been invaluable for butchers and fishmongers for the wrapping of butter, lard and bacon. "Feeling encouraged by this liberal support and realizing from past experience what it [*the Utah Magazine*] was most useful for, and being desirous to extend its usefulness, the proprietors immediately enlarged it to a size better adapted to the wants of the community, in papering trunks, and enclosing packages of dry goods. . . ."³⁰ When the *Tribune* condescendingly noted the receipt of a copy of the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* via its "hired hand," the humor magazine immediately secured a "hired girl" to critique its rival, a choice no doubt influenced by the *Tribune's* embrace of the "woman's movement."³¹

Feeling somewhat disadvantaged in the contest, those with Godbeite sympathies produced the *Diogenes*, a journal dedicated to fighting humor with humor. The *Tribune* disavowed any connection with the new periodical. However, Daniel Camomile, its editor, as well as many of his associates in the venture, had earlier warmly embraced the Godbeite dissent.³² If their orientation had changed, the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* did not discern the evidence. To its vantage both the *Diogenes's* sympathies and format seemed to confirm a common parentage with the *Tribune*. The orthodox paper at first rechristened its opponent the "*Di-agonies*" and subsequently, when rumors spread suggesting its suspension, the *Die-agonus*.³³ Commencing about the first of January, 1871, it was projected as a weekly—the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* misspelling its prospectus, "a weakly." The pun proved prophetic. After less than two months the *Diogenes* suspended publication, and none of her issues seem to have survived to the present.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 15 January 1871, p. 86 and 15 July 1870, p. 38.

³¹*Ibid.*, 7 March 1870, p. 7.

³²*Salt Lake Tribune*, 3 December 1870, p. 1; Daniel Camomile to Brigham Young, Salt Lake City, 9 November 1869, Brigham Young Papers, Historical Department. Earlier Camomile had been the general canvassing agent for the *Tribune*.

³³*Keep-A-Pitchinin*, 1 January 1871, p. 82; 15 January 1871, p. 86; 15 February 1871, p. 94.

The death of the *Diogenes* was a sign. What had commenced so optimistically a year earlier as a revolution of Mormonism and the world had failed in its promise. Although the Godbeite movement persisted in altered and faltering form throughout the 1870s, it lingered primarily as a cherished hope by its most faithful. By early 1871 indications of its decline were apparent. The boastful *Keep-A-Pitchinin* exuded mocking triumph. "Yes, we are happy to be able to say that it [the New Movement] is about exhausted, and that the *Keep-A-Pitchinin* has exhausted it. . . . We shall not charge anything for the obituary notice; as we stated in the beginning, we will publish the marriage or death of any of our friends or contemporaries with pleasure."³⁴ Six weeks later the newspaper proceeded with the figurative burial of its opposition. Unable to restrain a final taunt over the Godbeite inability to secure the leader of its choice—the dissidents apparently had hoped to secure Joseph Smith III, the son of Mormonism's founder—the journal advertised for a stone-cutter:

One who can cut a nice inspiration in granite to be placed over the sepulchre of the "New Move." No *Head* stone required but a simple inexpensive footboard with the following inscription. 1871. Sacred to the memory of the "New Move," aged 1 year and six months. *Requic "scal" in pace.*³⁵

But the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* jubilation was premature. The decline and demise of its opposition denied the journal its own sustaining purpose. On 15 February 1871, after only a year of regular printing, it too suspended publication. Although Taylor produced a special July 4th edition later in 1871 and for several years steadfastly claimed that the paper would again be published, its enterprise was virtually at an end.

As often is the case, the *Keep-A-Pitchinin's* historical bequest differed from its aspirations. Of course its role was hardly more than contributive to the Godbeite collapse, and while its humor was at times clever, more often than not, it was a wit that failed to transcend its own time. But more importantly its brief career testified to a warmer and more human society than is often accorded pioneer Utah.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 1 January 1871, p. 82.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 15 February 1871, p. 94.

On Doing Theology

M. Gerald Bradford*

Any paper dealing with the nature of theology and particularly with theological method, within the context of the restored gospel, must acknowledge at the outset the somewhat enigmatic character of the role of theology and of the theologian in the Church. On the one hand, every member of the Church is admonished to be a theologian—that is, every member is urged to study the scriptures and teachings of the Prophets; to attempt to understand the scope and depth of the gospel and to apply it in his life, all under the inspiration of the Spirit. Consequently, no individuals in the Church are singled out as official theologians; no one is called and set apart as a theologian to the Church. On the other hand, it is obvious that there have always been certain individuals who for a variety of reasons—either because of their concentrated study of the gospel, their position in the Church, or more importantly, because of the books and articles which they write, wield tremendous influence in interpreting and teaching the meaning of the gospel to others.

These individuals have full claim to the title “theologian” and as such are the topic of this paper. My objective is to reflect upon what I take to be the role of such theologians in the Church. Initially I intend to say something about how I view the nature of theology by considering two issues: (1) from the perspective of the theologian as theologian, how does his view of the nature of reality influence what he says and does as a theologian; and (2) what kind of a relationship ought to exist between any theologian and the subject-matter of his

*Mr. Bradford, a doctoral candidate in religious studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara, is an instructor in philosophy at Brigham Young University.

study. In other words, I will attempt to clarify what ought to be accepted as "given" by any theologian before inquiry can even begin.

In addition I will inquire into the ways of doing theology employed by some theologians in the Church and suggest certain norms which, if followed, ought to enable such thinkers to present their ideas in a logical and understandable manner. Finally, on the basis of these considerations I will be in a better position to determine the nature of the role of the theologian in coming to know the things of God, especially when viewed within the tradition of the restored gospel.¹

There is no question but that some theologians occupy a special position of influence in the Church. And yet on the basis of some recent examples of theological reflection it occurs that it might be helpful to attempt to delineate the role of the theologian the better to distinguish his position from that of the prophet's. I contend this needs to be done precisely because it is a fact that certain theologians in the Church at times say things which not only run into conceptual and argumentive difficulties, but more importantly, are of such a speculative nature as to portray the theologian as inadvertently and presumptuously arrogating to himself some of the prerogatives of the prophet.

THE THEOLOGIAN QUA THEOLOGIAN

Theology is often defined as an exposition of religious beliefs in language which is both systematic and temporally relevant. James E. Talmage claims that "theology is the science that deals with God and religion; it presents the facts of observed and revealed truths in orderly array, and indicates the means of

¹It should be obvious that my intention in this paper is to talk *about* doing theology in the Church rather than to actually *do* theology. However, I am well aware that some will interpret my observations and suggestions as, in one respect, committing the very thing I am suggesting the theologian ought to avoid. That is, when I conclude that the theologian ought to see his function in the Church as helping us to understand what the Prophets have taught rather than seeing his role as an alternative for the prophetic function in coming to know the things of God, some may interpret my presuming to describe and mark off the proper bounds of theological reflection as, in effect, placing myself in the role of the prophet. Let me assure the reader that this is not my intention. The suggestions and conclusions which I arrive at represent merely one personal view and the motives behind the investigation ought to be viewed for what they are—one person's attempt to better understand the scholarly demands and responsibilities attendant to this type of activity in the Church. I wish to thank my students and colleagues for their comments and criticisms, especially Professor Louis Midgley, my mentor.

their application in the duties of life.”² And Professor Sterling McMurrin sees the primary task of theology to be the reconciliation of “revelation to culture, to make what is taken on faith as the word of God meaningful in the light of accepted science and philosophy.”³

No doubt one who undertakes to do theology ought to see his job primarily as one of exposition or description of what is taken to be the revealed word of God. His objective ought to be to portray, with as much clarity and accuracy as possible, the coherent teachings of the gospel, thereby helping himself and others to understand what they believe. And in so doing it is presumed that in some measure the teachings of the gospel will be made more meaningful and correspondingly more relevant.⁴ But before going into this in more detail, I want to consider the perspective of the theologian as theologian, thereby saying something about the nature of theology itself.

A theologian clearly is not an objective, unbiased observer of the religious scene. I mean by this that he cannot approach

²James E. Talmage, *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, 1924), p. 5.

³Sterling McMurrin, *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion* (Salt Lake City, 1965), p. 47.

⁴An assumption in these definitions, one somewhat tangent to our considerations, ought to be pointed out. The trouble lies in the suggestion that the relevance, the meaning and presumably even the truth of theology is judged according to contemporary cultural standards, that theology ought to be evaluated in “light of accepted science and philosophy.” But is this necessarily the case? Why must relevance be understood in this sense? If all that was implied here was the requirement that whatever the theologian says must be meaningful according to some acceptable standard, then it is hard to see how anyone could take exception to this. But a larger claim is being made. Theology is to be judged according to prevailing criteria of culture. This understanding has become almost axiomatic among Christian theologians and has even had a profound influence upon the nature of theological reflection within the Church. Nevertheless, I consider it highly suspect. My guess is that the theologian comes closer to the mark by simply writing what he deems to be correct, paying strict attention to the control imposed upon his ideas not by prevailing cultural norms but by those teachings taken to be the revealed word of God. In fact, it seems that the teachings of the gospel do not require men to take sides in the various cultural shifts. The gospel message stands rather as a constant critic of all cultural manifestations in the sense that it continually requires of us to ask what we can make of this culture. The message protests now, as it always has in other ages, whenever men say how things are in such a way that the picture is closed, the future settled, the factors of risk and uncertainty removed. This is not to suggest that prevailing scientific theories, philosophical positions and the like need not be compared and contrasted to revealed teachings. On the contrary, there is a constant need for this within the Church. But what is being questioned here is the idea that the latter be finally evaluated on the basis of the former.

The claim I am making obviously influences how I view the nature of theology. I believe that when theology is viewed from the perspective of the gospel some such conclusion must necessarily follow.

his subject matter as would, say, the historian of ideas, or the philosopher. Theology in the Church is an activity of men who believe the teachings of the gospel. To make the point more forcefully, theology is an activity of men committed to Christ, men who, ideally at least, look to the teachings of the Savior for direction, orientation, and meaning in life. And therefore, a Latter-day Saint theologian will not leave open the question of why the gospel is decisive for him; that would include within the task of theology itself the question of whether there ought to be theology at all.

Yet given this personal commitment on the part of the theologian, it does not follow that his stance is wholly subjective, in the pejorative sense of that word; it does not follow that what he says is necessarily unjustified or unjustifiable. The nature of reality, how things really are, is in measure a matter of how we segment or divide up our experiences of the world. And that which determines how we will carve up and thereby give meaning to such experiences depends upon a number of factors—not the least of which is what we want to achieve in life. Yet the very fact that the world is viewed from many perspectives is proof of man's various and often conflicting interests and values and proof also that there is no standard way of "carving up the world." Consequently, it is difficult to know what it would mean to expect that a theologian in the Church defend his particular view of reality *as a theologian*.

To demand such a defense implies not only that a universal criterion exists by which all competing world views can be evaluated, but also suggests that everyone recognizes and accepts the authority of such a universal norm—a position which is clearly untenable. Mormonism itself proposes yet another way of viewing the world, of speaking about reality, and the starting point for a theologian in the Church is the recognition and acceptance of the gospel. He can analyze the gospel, explore its contents, trace its implications and consequences, but the fact that such teachings are read and accepted as they are he cannot account for *as a theologian*. If you ask a Latter-day Saint theologian his view, for instance, on the nature of man, you will probably discover that he has derived his ideas in large measure from the scriptures and the teachings of the Prophets. If you ask why this view of man is to be taken seriously, or why this view instead of another,

he will probably say, "Because this is how things are." And why? "Because such a view is true." True in the crucial way that such matters are true, true because such ideas give a leading and grounding in life which those who follow them find to be right in an important and comprehensive way.

If this point is granted, it follows that it ought to become a chief concern of every theologian in the Church to clarify the way in which he views the world, to determine how his views differ from other perspectives, and to determine the bounds of sense bordering what he says about the world, speaking as a theologian. To this he must add consideration of what is clearly central to the whole issue, namely, the relationship which ought to exist between himself and the object of his study.

The subject-matter which any theologian tries to explain will have its own kind of objectivity, but what is singled out for attention and the significance paid to what is selected will necessarily bear the stamp of the investigator, of one biography, of one particular world view. Such a position can represent an authentic comprehension of the world. It need not be seen as an example of mere intellectual imposition or sheer emotional projection, as I have just tried to point out. But it does represent an angle of vision, which is not at all neutral, but which enables one to make publicly valid observations while at the same time reflecting the experiences, values, and commitments of a personal life.^{4a}

The goal here is not to rid oneself of such presuppositions but to attempt to see them for what they are; to try to understand how they influence not only what one sees but what one wants to see. A theologian can achieve a level of objectivity toward his subject-matter by fully respecting its independent nature and by realizing the implications of his own legitimate but nevertheless existential perspective on what he studies. The crucial issue here is not that the theologian fails to identify properly the object of his study or that he mistakes theological inquiry for out and out speculation, but that he needs to become sensitive to how much his own outlook influences what he is studying and trying to understand.⁵

^{4a}I have discussed this idea with Professor Thomas O'Dea. See his, "Transformations of Thought in America," *Thought*, 47 (Autumn, 1971): 325-345.

⁵No doubt the best way to illustrate what I mean here is to point out an actual example of theological reflection which has, in one or more ways, failed

Up to this point, I have centered on what could be called the outer limits of theological reflection itself. I have tried to determine what must be attempted by every theologian before such inquiry can even begin. I should like now to go into some detail as to the ways of doing theology employed by some individuals in the Church.

ON DOING THEOLOGY

Some theologians, in attempting to reconcile their view of Deity with other suggested ideas about God or man, as, for example, the attempt to relate the idea that God knows all things with the view that he is still progressing in knowledge, or the attempt to resolve how if God has foreknowledge of things man could still have free agency, inevitably hit upon the use of difficult and ambiguous concepts such as "glory,"

to conform to these norms. From 1848 to 1854 Orson Pratt was in the Eastern states and in Great Britain as mission president. During this time he became concerned with the philosophical implications of certain Mormon doctrines, especially the concept of God. In 1853, Pratt suggested, "All these Gods are equal in power, in glory, in dominion, and in the possession of all things; each possesses a fulness of truth, of knowledge, of wisdom, of light, of intelligence. . . . The fulness of all these attributes is what constitutes God. Each person is called God, not because of his substance, neither because of the space and size of the substance, but because of the qualities which dwell in the substance. Persons are only tabernacles or temples, and TRUTH is the God, that dwells in them. When we worship the Father, we do not merely worship His person, but we worship that truth which dwells in His person. It is truth, light, and love that we worship and adore. . . . Whenever you find a fulness of wisdom, knowledge, truth, . . . there you find God in all His glory, power, and majesty, therefore, if you worship those adorable perfections you worship God." (*The Seer*, Vol. I, No. 1 (January, 1853), p. 24.) What Pratt says here is clear enough. And there is no question but that what he says is logically consistent. But it is also clear that Pratt is strongly influenced by certain Platonic philosophical views. What is not certain is whether or not he was aware of such influences on his theological investigations. In 1860 the *Deseret News* published a list of specific ideas advanced by Pratt including the above quotation, along with a statement by Brigham Young and other presiding authorities to the effect that such views were *not* to be considered acceptable as doctrine. While the brethren did not spell out their reasons for calling such teachings into question, one might be safe in concluding that in this situation the brethren were, at the very least, drawing attention to the fact that when the notion of God as a person is de-emphasized—when God is understood as subject to immutable attributes—then the divine personality is relegated to something less than the highest order of reality. The important point being that according to the Mormon concept of God, we do not worship truth, goodness, and beauty, as some kind of abstract form or idea, in the manner of Plato, but we do worship God who is said to have such attributes predicated of him.

This is a classic instance of a theologian uncritically letting a particular world-view influence his reasoning. We do not know if the brethren specifically took exception to Pratt's platonism; we do know that what he said about God was considered false doctrine. And it does appear that a source of his error was unduely letting certain presuppositions influence his reading of the scriptures and his interpretations of the teachings of the prophets.

"intelligence," "truth," etc. The trouble is they often use these words in an uncritical and consequently misleading way—supposedly assuming there is general agreement as to the meaning of such words (when there is not), that is, assuming there is only one possible meaning regardless of the way the words are used or the context in which they are found.⁶

The first question any theologian should ask is not whether a particular theological claim is true or false but rather what counts as a meaningful claim and whether that claim does indeed make any sense. And this is not an easy thing to do. People often use words in an unfamiliar manner and in ways which lead to confusion. Therefore, one whose task it is to understand what the Scriptures and the teachings of others mean must be doubly on guard that he uncover the intentions of any given writer he is studying and not, in turn, use words carelessly. And it would be especially helpful if he evidenced an awareness of other possible interpretations to which his views lent themselves, eliminating those he considers incorrect. B. H. Roberts must have had something like this in mind when, speaking of what is required of theologians in the Church, he cautioned:

It is often the case that misconceptions arise through careless use of words, and through using words interchangeably. . . . Hence, . . . a lack of careful or precise choice of words, a large dependence upon the general tenor of what is written to convey the truth, a wide range in using words interchangeably that are not always exact equivalents, are characteristic. . . . Hereafter, let the student be on his guard in relation to the words 'intelligence,' 'spirit,' 'soul,' 'mind,' etc.; and he will find his way out of many a difficulty.⁷

Consider, for example, the familiar suggestion that while the Lord is not progressing in knowledge, power, etc., he never-

⁶Consider, for example, the possible meanings of the word "truth" as used in the D.&C. 93: 24. B. H. Roberts, referring to this passage, suggests "truth" can be interpreted as relative truth, absolute truth, or truth unfolding or becoming. This last interpretation implies that a statement said to be true of things at the present may not be true of things as they are to come because objects in the real world are in a constant state of change and alternation and because new relationships are continually being realized as one's perspective with regard to reality changes. (*Joseph Smith: The Prophet Teacher* (Salt Lake City, 1945), pp. 29ff.) The point is anyone either interpreting or using such a word ought to evidence an awareness of its potential different meanings, identify which meaning he intends, and indicate how his particular meaning of the term can influence our understanding of the point he is trying to develop. Cf. James R. Harris, "Eternal Progression and the Foreknowledge of God," *BYU Studies* 8 (Autumn 1967), pp. 37-46.

⁷Roberts, *Joseph Smith*, p. 38.

theless is progressing in the sense that his creations increase, his dominions expand, his spirit offspring multiply, etc. The first step in understanding this idea is to determine what it means. Take the point that the Lord continually has spirit offspring and yet is said not to be progressing in knowledge. Surely the creation of a new spirit child would be a unique experience for God, one which would in turn result in a genuine increase in knowledge for him. To suggest otherwise is to use the words "experience" and "knowledge" in a very unfamiliar way. Some may admit that this is precisely the point; that words mean something totally different when they speak of God than when they speak of man. But then are we ever sure that we understand what is being said about God?

In any event, some theologians, using key words and phrases in one particular manner and suggesting one possible interpretation, feel the need, on occasion, to postulate or deduce what appears to be new truths, for example, about the nature of God, whether or not what they conclude has any scriptural precedence. Presumably this happens because the logic of their position dictates such a deductive move, or it may simply result from their haste to present what appears to be a doctrinal reconciliation. But the inevitable result is that the intended solution is not forthcoming, and that uncertainty reigns as to just what is being claimed, and more questions are raised than settled.

One alternative to this way of doing theology can be stated quite simply. What it amounts to is lowering one's sights, i.e., taking a more modest view of what the theologian can successfully accomplish—keeping in mind his objectives of helping us understand what we believe and his need to take seriously what the prophets and others say thereby avoiding the inclination on his own to introduce new ideas to "fill in the blanks." If one desires to answer the question, "Can God know all things and still progress in knowledge?" why not begin by analyzing the assumptions underlying the question itself? Why not prepare a careful comparative study of important scriptural and prophetic words and phrases to enable us to better understand this mode of expression as a criterion for determining correct usage and to achieve conceptual clarification in these areas? Why not present a more detailed study of the relationship between such ideas and other revealed truths? What is required, in other words, is not speculation as to what the Prophet

Joseph Smith (and others) meant, but more detailed study of the actual statements made by them in different contexts and at different times when they discussed theological matters. Furthermore, it is required that the theologian present his ideas in a clear and coherent manner. His reflections must be carried out in a consistent and systematic fashion. His arguments must be valid according to the rules of logic, theology being as dependent on logic as any other scholarly discipline. The emphasis would be on theological clarification not theological system-building or speculation. This would require more work of the theologian, and results would be harder to come by, take much longer, and usually be on a smaller scale; but I suggest, they would be more firmly grounded and hopefully more in accord with revealed teachings of the Church.

THE THEOLOGIAN AND THE PROPHET

The inclination on the part of some theologians in the Church to deduce religious truths solely on the basis of their own interpretation of scriptures and according to the logic of their particular perspective brings us to a central issue in theology—a question of authority and epistemology. To what extent is the theologian able to establish new theological truths on his own, especially for the Church at large? This is a traditional problem in the history of Western religious thought—sometimes referred to as the problem of reason vs. revelation. It might be profitable to discuss this problem briefly to better appreciate how the issue is resolved from the perspective of Mormon thought.

At times the theologian has been looked to as the source of insight concerning the things of God. The scholastic tradition (both Catholic and Protestant), for example, provided a total world-view by virtue of which everything from God to the lowliest of his creatures could be thought of as one great chain of being. The same clear and consistent ideas or categories of thought could be applied to all. Reason seemed to move in harmony with revelation. Thus using Aristotelian categories and on the basis of deductive logic it was thought possible to “prove” or establish not only the existence of God and something of his nature, but also the authenticity of scriptures. That is, it was held that there are demonstrable truths available to anyone solely on the basis of the use of human intellect unaided by revelation.

This type of harmony between reason and revelation did not last long, however. Followers of Luther and Calvin came to minimize the value of reason—of natural theology, questioning the authoritative teachings of the Church (the traditions of the Fathers) and stressing the revealed word of God found in the Bible, referring all questions of doctrine to the “private judgment” of individuals. And by the time of the Enlightenment, the pendulum had swung the other way. The value of revealed theology was minimized to where it was felt that the “rational” man had no need of revelation at all, since revelation was seen as nothing more than the “republishing of the religion of nature.”

Moreover, beginning in the modern period and continuing down to the present, the complexion of the problem has so changed that it is now no longer a question of whether reason or revelation, or reason in accord with revelation is the source of religious knowledge, but for many individuals the concern is over what could possibly count for such knowledge. For one thing, the prevailing view of revelation has changed. In large measure, the more established view that theology deals with revealed truths, with propositions about the nature of reality, has been rejected in favor of the view that revelation is exclusively an event, the creation of an I-Thou encounter between God and man. According to this view no information is conveyed from God to man, no knowledge is sought or gained.

This radical change can be traced to a number of profound challenges to theology beginning in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially those of science and the scientific method. Science appeared, as it still does, to offer a uniquely reliable way of gaining information about reality. And it became increasingly apparent to some that none of the topics on which theology believed it could inform had the kind of evidence and authority that science could refer to. In other words, because of threats from science, from biblical criticism, and the like, the very authority of theology has come to be questioned. Those who continue to speak about the revelation of God simply locate this vision somewhere other than in inspired propositions vulnerable to scientific criticism, and, consequently, theology today is often viewed as based upon moral and religious experience—upon a divine human encounter, that which is presumed beyond the bounds of science.

There are at least two explanations for why a similar ques-

tion as to the authority of theology has not arisen within the Church. Both have to do with avoiding the inclination to view the theologian as a source of new religious truths.

First of all, consider the acceptance and understanding of the well-established role of the prophet in coming to know the things of God. This understanding rests, in turn, on the distinctive view of revelation, and the relationship between reason and revelation articulated within Mormon thought.

I agree with one description.

There is among the Mormons a pronounced intellectualism in matters pertaining to religion and a strong commitment to the capacities of human reason. It is assumed that the world is intelligible and though there are limitations to human knowledge in relation to the objects of religion, those limitations do not justify the acceptance of paradox or an official doctrine of mysteries. In principle everything is knowable and the ways of God are reasonable.⁸

However, "both the existence and nature of God are known by revelation only. In this way the primacy of revelation is protected."⁹ In other words, while revelation is considered the exclusive means of coming to know the things of God, reason is not correspondingly denigrated. Reason does play a role in the process. In revelation truth is conveyed to man, the ways of God are made known to man, and that which is revealed is understandable, is "reasonable." In an important if only introductory study of the relationship between reason and revelation in Mormon theology, Professor Truman Madsen contends that according to Joseph Smith, the things of God are not "above" the laws of thought. Consequently there are no grounds for disparagement of reason. There is no celebration of the irrational. "Paradox and contradiction were clues to error, not to 'divine truth.'"¹⁰ But at the same time, while

reason may help to order and relate our knowledge of God, it cannot of itself apprehend Him, nor in any genuine way 'infer' Him except as He manifests himself. . . . In sum, Joseph Smith neither disparaged nor deified reason. Rationality and consistency are prerequisites to truth, but not final guarantors. Reason, if necessary, is not sufficient. . . .¹¹

⁸McMurrin. *Theological Foundations*, p. 47.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 48.

¹⁰Truman Madsen, "Joseph Smith and the Ways of Knowing," in *Seminar on the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 1961 (Provo, Utah, 1964), p. 38.

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 39-41.

Madsen concludes:

Before and after the high moments of revelation there must be genuine human initiative and effort. Perhaps rarely in religion have two opposite views been so firmly entrenched: man dependent upon God's continual revelation, and man dependent upon his own continual 'working out,' utilizing the totality of his experiences¹² in relation to his needs and problems—with almost complete responsibility.¹³

And for the Church, there is only one man who holds the "keys." The "prophet, seer, and revelator" alone may come to know the things of God for the whole Church.¹⁴ Thus it is difficult to see how any Mormon theologian could mistake his role for that of the prophet. And it is doubly unfortunate if what a theologian says falls outside of what could count as meaningful discourse because not only does this render understanding difficult, if not impossible, but it also suggests that one may assume the ways of God are not reasonable. And revelation from God has always been viewed as reasonable.

Secondly, consider an even more important reason. Mormonism, despite the well-meaning intentions of a few "rationalistic" theologians in the Church, is first and foremost a revealed religion. The message and influence of the gospel must ultimately be accepted on the basis of individual initiative under the influence of the Holy Spirit. I contend there is simply no place for the alternative view that as a result of systematic or creative theology the gospel can be said to be made "rational" in such a way that it would be accurate to speak of a person genuinely embracing it solely upon the dictates of reason alone.

¹²"In Mormon thought there has never been a commitment to rationalism, empiricism or intuition as a primary method of knowledge. On the contrary there has been instead a tacit and uncritical respect for all three ways of knowing. The Mormon view can perhaps best be summarized as commitment to the methods of science, which effect a conjunction of reason and sensory experience, and to revelation." Sterling McMurrin, *The Philosophical Foundations of Mormon Theology* (Salt Lake City, 1959), p. 9.

¹³Madsen, "Joseph Smith," p. 43. Compare the views of the Prophet Joseph Smith, "The things of God are of deep import. And time, and experience and careful and ponderous and solemn thoughts can only find them out. Thy mind, O man, if thou wilt lead a soul to salvation must stretch as high as the utmost heaven and search into and contemplate the darkest abyss and the broad expanse of eternities. Thou must commune with God." Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City, 1938), p. 137.

¹⁴For a fuller statement on rationalizing in the gospel setting see Pres. J. Reuben Clark, Jr.'s April 1952 conference address recorded in the *Conference Report*, pp. 95-96. In this talk he said ". . . there is only one in this Church and in this world, who has the right to rationalize, and that is . . . our prophet, seer and revelator. . . ." (p. 95)

CONCLUSION

An understanding of the nature of theology reveals that it would be nonsense to inquire of the theologian whether there ought to be theology at all. As I have stated, the starting point for Mormon theology is the recognition and acceptance of the teachings of the gospel. And the theologian cannot give a justification of this point of departure.

But in regard to that which the theologian can justifiably do, I have suggested that he ought to conform to a number of methodological norms. Despite the fact that such norms are quite obvious (and possibly for that very reason) they need, on occasion, to be reviewed. Thus we can require that the theologian articulate his view of reality and evidence some awareness of how his view influences what he is studying and trying to understand. And we can require of him that he maintain the proper relationship between himself and his subject-matter. I have tried to get clear about the nature of this relationship and suggest what the theologian can do to help maintain it. My suggestions boil down to the following point: If the object or subject-matter of theology (at least in the proximate sense) is the revealed teachings of the gospel, then the theologian must be faithful to what these teachings actually say. Theology, after all is said and done, is chiefly a descriptive-interpretative enterprise. On this view, the theologian is saved from at least one kind of subjectivism. It means the theologian ought not to advance his own personal ideas or beliefs *as if they constituted revealed truths*. This is not to deny that the theologian's own personal stance obviously plays a legitimate part in what he does. But I stress the point that the teachings of the gospel—the corpus of what is taken as revealed truths—address the theologian in precisely the same way they address others. The theologian must strive to achieve that degree of objectivity which allows his subject-matter to be what it is and ultimately to determine his approach to it. Anything short of this allows the theologian to substitute his deductions and speculations for that which can only come through the prophetic gift.

If a Latter-day Saint theologian fully understands his task and its limitations, if he correctly sees his role in proper relationship to that of the prophet's, then he will strive for logical rigor, coherence, and conceptual clarity in what he says and will see his task not as one of uncontrolled speculation, but as one

of helping himself and others to better understand what they have come to believe, so far as this is possible.

In the scriptures and in the writings of the prophets, relatively little importance is attached to theorizing about the nature of God. What seems to be the primary concern of the prophets is to testify that God is, to seek for themselves and to admonish others to constantly attempt to discern God's will, and to learn to stand in the Lord's presence as one fully dependent upon him. And what the theologian does, if it is done correctly, can be of immeasurable help to the prophet in achieving these important objectives.

THE WORDS OF SAINT PETER
FROM HIS THRONE IN THE
VATICAN

Carma de Jong Anderson*



Seat me on a plank of wood
That bends and creaks with muscled weight—
Not palace marble, cold, immovable,
For I would *move*
The feet of Galileans
And all the world of Gentiles
To a holier ground!
Give me the roughened wood
From licking waters
And the stains of storms
That roil the fishes and color my nets
With every hue of Israel.
My metal is not bronze
In polished greens,
But iron for the strength of ships,
The ferrous blacks and oranges
Of fiery souls!
My keys and crowns are neither
Bronze nor iron of this earth,
But gifted me of God.

*Mrs. Richard L. Anderson is a wife, mother, painter, and dramatist in Provo.

THE PLAN

Ronald F. Malan*

He told us: Go preach the kingdom at hand.
Take nought: no shoes, nor purse, nor script, nor stave.
Leave Samaritans and Gentiles, stay in Israel's land.
Heal and cleanse. You have freely received; freely save.
But I, Judas, a beggar? Cringe like the poor?
Snivel for alms, like those without the gates?
Before my next mission, I'll lay in a store—
Borrow from the bag, receive usurer's rates.
But the bag never holds much; I need larger sums.
I need a great miracle, like He'd perform.
(I'd have sold Mary's oil, but they shouted me dumb)—
A great miracle? By Him? A rich plan is born:
I'll go to the Priests, they'll give me their store;
Then He'll pass through their midst, as He's done before!

*Mr. Malan, supervisor of home study course development at Brigham Young University, is a doctoral candidate in instructional psychology there.

Uintah Dream:

The Ute Treaty — Spanish Fork, 1865

Gustive O. Larson*

Mormon invasion of the Great Basin in 1847 was followed by two decades of anomalous Indian-white relations. Notwithstanding petitions to Congress from the Territorial Legislative Assembly, native title to the domain was not extinguished, and the government delayed establishment of a land office in Utah until 1869. In the meantime, the Saints occupied every Indian homeland on the eastern border of the basin.¹ In the absence of congressional action, Brigham Young, as Indian superintendent from 1850 to 1857, together with Garland Hurt, established a number of "Indian Farms," or little reservations, designed to introduce the natives to agriculture. The most important of these was located at Spanish Fork in Utah Valley.

The Utah expedition of the United States Army to install new Territorial officers in 1857 brought an end to Young's promising Indian farms. The Indians, losing confidence in the government, were becoming restless, resorting to theft and threatening the safety of the white communities. Under these conditions, Supt. Benjamin Davies recommended to the Indian Commissioner in Washington on 30 June 1861, "For the Utes, Pah-Utes, Pah-Vants and others who congregate at the Spanish Fork Farm, I recommend the establishment of a reserve including the whole of Winter [Uintah] Valley. . . ."²

*Mr. Larson, associate professor emeritus of history and religion at Brigham Young University, is a widely respected western historian. In recognition of his several books and many articles in professional journals, he was given an honorary doctorate by Southern Utah State College in Cedar City, Utah, in 1974.

¹The occupation was done with a minimum of friction due to a Mormon religious concept of the Indians as a fallen race for whose regeneration they were responsible under divine assignment. Brigham Young's policy was, "It is better to feed them than to fight them."

²Supt. Benjamin Davies' annual report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, William P. Dole, in *Annual Report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Utah Supt'cy, 1861*; the Commissioner's Annual Report is hereafter cited as *Commissioner's Report*.

His recommendation was relayed in a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, Caleb B. Smith, to President Abraham Lincoln on 3 October.

Sir, I have the honor to submit for your consideration the recommendation of the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, that the Uintah Valley in the Territory of Utah, be set apart and reserved for the use and occupancy of Indian tribes.³

The president, occupied with matters of the Southern Rebellion, responded the same day by simply noting, "Let the reservation be established as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. A. Lincoln."⁴

Three years later, on 23 February 1864, Congress provided for extinguishing the Indian title to Utah lands by treaty, and on 5 May, legislated further for dissolution of the Indian farms and confirmed the Executive Proclamation of 1861 by designating Uintah Valley as a permanent reservation for the Indians.⁵

The south slopes of the Uintah Mountains pour several snow-fed streams into the valley below, where they are carried by the Duchesne and Uintah rivers across a broad valley to enter the Green River. Although visited by the Mountain Men in their heyday, the valley was still largely unknown in 1864. The reservation which was declared to be "extensive and fertile" included more than two million acres and embraced the entire region drained by the Uintah and its tributaries.⁶

Colonel O. H. Irish, who had been appointed Indian Superintendent for Utah on 2 February 1864, waited in vain in Nebraska City for Indian goods which had been ordered for his superintendency. He arrived in Salt Lake City on 25 August to find the local Indians restless and demanding. They were soon to leave for their winter hunting grounds and wanted their promised supplies before departure. "Those Indians," he wrote Commissioner William P. Dole on 26 September,

³*Executive Orders*, Vols. 1-2. p. 169—Indian Reservation, 3 October 1861.

⁴*Ibid.*

⁵Developments in the establishment of the Uintah Reservation appear in the Utah Superintendency reports contained in the *Commissioner's Report* for 1863, 1864, and 1865.

⁶Report of Agent A. Humphrey in *Report of the Sec. of the Interior*, 30 September 1861, p. 750. See Eli F. Taylor, "Register U. S. Land Office," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 4 (January 1931), 29, for acreage.

inhabiting that portion of the Territory south of Great Salt Lake City, are all anxious to know whether the government proposes to enter into treaties with them. They are anxious to understand their rights. . . . I would recommend that steps be taken to make treaties with the following tribes or bands of Indians, viz., Utahs, ParVants, and Pie-Edes, as soon as they can be congregated in the spring.⁷

At last, on 23 February 1865, Congress passed "an act to extinguish the Indian title to the lands in the Territory of Utah suitable for agriculture and mineral purposes," and on 28 March, Commissioner Dole communicated welcome instructions to Superintendent Irish to proceed with treaty making with the Indian tribes in Utah:

I deem it very desirable that you should avail yourself of the information in possession of Governor Doty, ex-Governor Young, and other officers of the Territory. . . . To enable you to carry into effect the object of the law, the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars, appropriated by the third section, will be placed at your disposal, and subject to your drafts.⁸

Authorized now to proceed with treaty negotiations, Irish moved rapidly to avoid losing any of the Utah bands to current hostile movements, both within and outside the Territory.⁹ He had scarcely finished reading the Commissioner's instructions when news arrived of the outbreak of the so-called Black Hawk War in southern Utah. Soon reports came of men killed, homes destroyed and livestock driven into the mountains.¹⁰

The Superintendent consulted Governor Doty and Brigham

⁷*Commissioner's Report*, 1864, Utah Superintendency Report 60, p. 169.

⁸William P. Dole to O. H. Irish, 28 March 1865 in Utah Superintendency Report No. 29, pp. 148-49.

⁹In his Annual Report for 1865 he wrote, "notwithstanding the Indians of this superintendency are peaceful now, in view of the fact that Indian wars are raging on our immediate boundaries in Nevada, Idaho, Colorado, and Arizona, how long they will remain so it is impossible to tell, unless those Indians who are in arms against the government are speedily and thoroughly subdued. . . . Yet witnessing the success of the hostile Indians in depredating upon the government and its citizens, our peaceful tribes are anxious and excited. The argument used with them is, that the Indians now in arms are contending for their homes; that if they are conquered and submit, they will be exterminated; that our Indians should join them in this last struggle; as the existence of all Indian tribes depends on their success." *Commissioner's Report* 1865, Utah Supt'cy, Report No. 28.

¹⁰The fighting began when a young chief, reported as the son of the late Chief Arapeen, was dragged from his horse and thrashed by a white man. Although not involved in the initial revolt, Chief Black Hawk soon assumed leadership in three years of depredations which became known as the Black Hawk War (Utah).

Young, both of whom advised immediate action.

I therefore called the several bands of the Utah Indians to meet me at the Spanish Fork Indian Farm on the 6th of June. . . . Governor Doty acted cordially with me in making the preliminary arrangements, but was taken suddenly ill in the evening before I started for the Indian Farm. . . .

Brigham Young accepted my invitation. . . . He has pursued so kind and conciliatory a policy with the Indians that it has given him great influence over them. It was my duty and policy, under your instructions to make use of his influence for the accomplishment of the purposes of the Government.¹¹

Interpreters serving the convention were D. B. Huntington and George W. Bean. The Superintendent and associates met with the invited chiefs on 6 June for preliminary talks and reading of the treaty.¹² Its preamble stated:

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT AND CONVENTION
made and concluded at Spanish Fork Indian Farm, in the Territory of Utah, this eighth day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-five by O. H. Irish, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for Said Territory Comm., on the part of the U.S. and the undersigned chiefs, . . . on behalf of said Indians and duly authorized by them.

These included the following listed at the end of the proceedings:

For the Yampah Utes: Sow-e-tt, Tabby and To-quo-ne
For the Pa-Vants: Kanosh, An-kar-an-keg, Pean-up, Eah-Sand
and Narient
For the San-Pitch: Sow-ok-soo-bet
For the Timpa-nogs: An-kar-tew-its and Naup-peads
For the Utes: Pam-sook, Quo-O-Gand and San Pitch
For the Spanish Fork Utes: Kibits
For the Cum-um-bahs: Am-oosh

Among these the venerable Sow-e-ett was acknowledged leader although feeble with age. Next to him the white-haired Kanosh was given deference as was also Tabby, brother of Sow-e-ett. These together with the late, notorious Chief Wal-kara, became spokesmen for the natives.

¹¹Irish to Dole, 29 June 1865, in unratified treaties file, Spanish Fork Treaty, 1965, National Archives.

¹²The following report of the treaty and the proceedings are extracted from the original minutes preserved in the unratified treaties file, Spanish Fork Treaty, 1865, National Archives. Unless otherwise noted all the quotations listed are from this document.

The chiefs, seated on the ground in a circle, listened closely as the interpreter did his best to convey the meaning of the written words to these men who must decide whether they would accept or reject them. The reading over, the meeting was brought to a close with an admonition that the chiefs consider the provisions of the treaty carefully before tomorrow's gathering when they would be called upon to make their decision. The Superintendent and Brigham Young would be pleased to counsel with any of them in the meantime. The essence of the treaty is contained in a synopsis presented in the Superintendent's report as follows:

Sec. 1. The Indians relinquish their right of possession to all of the lands within Utah Territory occupied by them.

Sec. 2. With the exception of the Uintah Valley, which is to be reserved for their exclusive use and occupation, the President may place upon said reservation other bands of friendly Indians of Utah Territory.

Sec. 3. The said tribes agree to remove upon said reservation within one year after ratification of the treaty. . . .

Sec. 4. The Indians to be allowed to take fish at their accustomed places; also to gather roots and berries on unclaimed lands.

Sec. 5. In consideration thereof, the United States agree - -

First. To protect the said Indians and their said reservation during good behavior.

Second. To pay or expend for their benefit \$25,000 annually for ten years, . . . \$20,000 annually for 20 years thereafter, and \$15,000 annually for 30 years thereafter [on a basis of 5,000 population]. . . .

Third. For making improvements on reservation and procuring cattle for stock-raising, the United States agree to expend \$30,000, as is already provided for by Act of Congress, May 5, 1864. . . .

Fourth. To establish and maintain for 10 years, at an expense not to exceed \$10,000 annually, a manual labor school, the Indians stipulating to keep all children between the ages of 7 and 18 years, at school nine months in the year. . . .

Fifth, the United States agree to furnish a mill for grinding grain and sawing lumber, one or more mechanic shops and tools, houses for interpreter, miller, and farmers. . . .¹³

Article 7 stipulated further that the government would build a house on five fenced acres and add \$100 a year for

¹³*Commissioner's Report*, 1865, Utah, Supt'cy, Report No. 30.

each chief. The remaining sections dealt with roads, cessation of depredation, war limited to self-defense, and liquor prohibited on the reservation.

When the conference was called to order on 7 June, blankets were awarded to certain deserving chiefs, after which the council proceedings show that the Superintendent turned to the business of the day. (Huntington interpreter:)

. . . The great Father at Washington has directed me to call his Indian children together and talk to them of matters that concern their future welfare.

You are the chiefs, the leaders, the head-men of your people. . . . The great Spirit in Heaven, who controls you and me and the great Father in Washington, wishes this ground upon which we stand. . . . He has put it into the hearts of white men to come here and open farms and build houses. . . . The same great Spirit that led them here, has put it into the heart of the Great Father, to extend the same privilege to you; and therefore we are here today, and propose to make a treaty that you shall agree that so much of the land which you have heretofore occupied, shall be occupied by the whites and belong to the government. . . . And that other land shall be occupied by you and your children. . . . I now say to you that if you sign this treaty you shall have farms, houses, and goods, and this is why I wish you, the leaders of your people standing today where you are, to decide for their future welfare. . . .

This treaty, after being signed, is to be submitted to the Great Father's counselors at Washington, for them to agree upon it also. I have done for the present.

Following momentary silence Chief Kanosh spoke: (Bean interpreting)

We have agreed that four chiefs shall do this talking. . . . I do not see what use it would be to trade the land where there are so few of us. Whatever we would trade for would be all gone soon, whether blankets, or hats, or shirts, or money. The money would soon go in the stores and the other things would soon be gone. . . .

Although a man of reputed wisdom Kanosh, as he continued, reflected the limitations of the native mind to grasp the full meaning of the treaty provisions.

If the Americans buy the land where would the Mormons who live here go? Will the Lord take them up to his country? I think this is the Mormons' land, the Bishops' land; with the Utahs let them all live here together. I do not want to cut the land in two. Let it all remain as it is.

The chief broke his train of thought abruptly to disapprove of the Indian uprising in Sanpete County and disclaim any participation in it, and then continued:

It is all right to let us stay where we are. Let me stay at Corn Creek and visit back and forth. . . . Suppose Brigham, our eldest brother, was to die, where would the Indians all run to? When we know he is at Salt Lake City, it is all right. Brigham is the great captain of all, for he does not get mad when he hears of his brothers and friends being killed, as the California captains do. The best thing is for the Superintendent to give us our blankets and shirts, and not talk about trading the land, but let us live and be friendly together. Give all of us blankets and shirts, squaws and all, and do not make us feel poor, but clothe us up.

Then San-Pitch rose to speak (Bean interpreting):

I do not question the paper, but I do not want to trade the land nor the title to the land. It used to be Lord's land, but now it is the Mormons' land and ours. The maker of the land is probably dead and buried now. But this is good heavy land, lots of water and rocks; and I want it to stay here and us to stay here with it. . . . The whites make farms, get wood and live here on the land and we never traded the land. . . . let them live here and us live here too.

While speaking, the chief became increasingly excited and closed angrily with:

If the talk is for us to trade the land in order to get the presents, I do not want any blankets or any clothing. I would rather go without than to give up my title to the land I occupy.

Prompted by this unexpected resistance from the speakers, the Superintendent turned towards the man whom he knew had the confidence of the chiefs. In response to his inquiring glance, Brigham Young rose to speak. (Huntington interpreter):

San-Pitch, Sow-e-ett, Tabby, and all of you, I want you to understand what I say to you. I am looking for your welfare. If you do not sell your land to the Government, they will take it, whether you are willing to sell it or not. This is the way they have done in California and Oregon. . . . If you go to Uintah, they will build you houses, make you a farm, give you cows, oxen, clothing, blankets and many other things you will want. And then, the treaty that Colonel Irish has here, gives you the privilege of coming back here on a visit; you can fish, hunt, pick berries, dig roots and we

can visit together. . . . The land does not belong to you, nor to me, nor to the Government; it belongs to the Lord. But our Father at Washington is disposed to make you liberal presents to let the Mormons live here. . . . If you will go over there and have your houses built, and get your property and money, we are perfectly willing you should visit with us. Do you understand that, Kan-osh?

Kan-osh (and others): We do.

Young: We feel to do you good; and I know that this treaty is just as liberal and does everything for you and for your people that can be done. . . . Now, if you can understand this, you can see at once that we do not want anything to wrong any of you.

Indians: It is enough.

Tabby: (Bean interpreter) The hearts of the Indians are full; they want to think, wait until tomorrow; let us go back to our lodges and talk and smoke over what has been said today. The Indians are not ready now to give up the land; they never thought of such a thing.

A show of resistance appeared on the faces around the circle and chief San-Pitch jumped to his feet. But as he turned to leave, someone shouted, "Sow-e-ett wants to speak." All eyes turned to the venerable person seated next to the Superintendent and upon a gesture from him every delegate except San-Pitch relaxed to listen respectfully to his words. The contumacious chief remained standing but listened from outside the circle.

Sow-e-ett: (Bean interpreter) I am the father of you all. I have always been a friend of the Americans. (Mr. Young: He has.) I have never thrown away my friendship for the Americans. . . . (Superintendent Irish: That is what everybody says of you) After awhile Brigham and the Mormons came here. I saw him and he was my son, my friend. When I met President Young we talked and understood each other, me and my children the Utahs, and Brigham and his children. When some of my children stole horses and acted bad, did I break my friendship? No, never. . . . I do not want to see it, I am old; my heart is very weak now, but it is good.

Uncertainty held the chiefs in silence for a few moments and then according to the record, "The meeting separated and the Indians returned to their lodges very much excited, unwilling to talk any more about giving up their land." Nevertheless, during the afternoon and evening, Colonel Irish, accompanied by interpreters, visited informally with some of the chiefs to discuss the treaty and answer questions.

The council reassembled on Thursday, 8 June, at 10:00 a.m. All were present except San-Pitch. Superintendent Irish: (Huntington enterpreter)

I wish to ask the Utah chiefs this morning, if they have eyes that they can see? If they have ears that can hear? . . . Are you prepared to give me your answer, that I may tell the great Father your decision. Shall I tell the great Father, that when he stretches out his hands to you full of gifts and benefits, you reject them? . . . We have come here today to settle this question. . . . Decide for yourselves. Say now what you will do.

Sow-e-ett: It is good. We will sign.

With a deep sense of relief, and confident of Federal support in the high purpose of his efforts, the Superintendent exclaimed "Sow-e-ett, you are an old man, but if you live a year, you will live long enough to be glad of having signed this treaty."

The record simply reads, "The chiefs then attached their marks to the treaty." This consisted of an X opposite each of their names. Article IX of the hand-written document, signed and witnessed, appeared as follows:

Article IX. This treaty shall be obligatory on the contracting parties as soon as the same shall be ratified by the President and the Senate of the United States.

In testimony whereof, the said O. H. Irish, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for Utah Territory, and the undersigned chiefs, headmen and delegates of the aforesaid tribes and bands of Indians have hereunto set their hands and seals at the place and on the day and year herein before written.

O. H. Irish
Superintendent of Indian Affairs
and Commissioner

Sow-e-ett (Nearly Starved)	His X Mark
Kan-osh (Man of white hair)	" " "
Tabby (The Sun)	" " "
To-Quo-ni (Black Mountain Lion)	" " "
Sow-ok-soo-bet (Arrow Feather)	" " "
Au-Kaw-Tew-ets (Red Boy)	" " "
San-Pitch (Bull Rush)	" " "
Kibets (Mountains)	" " "
Am-oosh	" " "
An-kar-aw-keg (Red Rifle)	" " "
Namp-peades (Foot Mother)	" " "
Pan-sook (Otter)	" " "

Pean-up (Big Foot)	"	"	"
Eah-gand (Shot to Pieces)	"	"	"
Nar-i-ent (Powerful)	"	"	"
Que-o-gand (Bear)	"	"	"

The agreement was executed in the presence of Brigham Young, the interpreters, and others.¹⁴

To what extent the X marks represented understanding of the articles of the document is uncertain, but concluding remarks by the Superintendent and Brigham Young assured the chiefs that the Great Father in Washington would keep his side of the bargain if only the Utes would live up to the treaty.

Superintendent Irish: (Huntington interpreter)

If you live up to this treaty, if you keep it, you commence today a career of prosperity for yourselves and your children and the time will not be far distant when you will be living in houses of your own, when you will have little farms of your own, when you will be gathering into your barns the produce of your farms, and by the side of your own fires you will be surrounded with your children in comfort.

In concluding comments, Young reminded the natives that Colonel Irish, who was their friend, would not always be with them; but he promised to look after their welfare. Chief Tabby, being asked to express his views said, ". . . I love all of you and do not want to see blood shed on the land. I want you to send a good father to Uintah; one that won't quarrel with us. . . . I will go there. I love that country." Kanosh, growing impatient, voiced an unspoken wish of the natives, "Now we are ready for the presents; fetch them out and deal them out. We don't want the father to hide anything up. Fetch all out." In response the Superintendent announced: "Go and get your women and children and bring them here to receive your presents, they shall all have something. . . ." In the afternoon, the presents were distributed among the Indians, all receiving a share according to their rank, age, or needs.

Friday morning, 9 June, the chiefs assembled to have "talk" with Superintendent Irish upon various matters pertaining to the treaty, their removal, etc.

¹⁴San-Pitch was not present at the signing and only after a stormy session between him and Colonel Irish the next day did he later appear in Salt Lake City to make his mark. The Superintendent suspected the rebellious chief of being involved in the Sanpete uprising which proved to be the case as he subsequently took direct part in what became known as the Black Hawk War.

Superintendent Irish: (Huntington interpreter)

I have brought you here, this morning, to talk with you about going to Uintah. . . . There are no houses out in Uintah and no road out there yet. . . .

That is Tabby's country there, and I think he wants to go and those with him. We want to make little farms for them all. We do not want to make a great big farm and have the government work it, but to make little farms and have you work them and that the produce and everything on them will be yours, and you will have it. We wish to arrange it so that every man will have his little patch of ground, and take his family, his woman and boys and work it and live upon it. . . .

Strange it was that this white man's portrayal of private ownership of land and "living on a little patch of ground" should have appealed to the red man to whom the concept of individual land ownership was foreign. However, it was so that when the Colonel said, "I would like to know what you think about it," Kanosh apparently spoke for the group when he replied, "I like it well."

However, "the year after ratification of the treaty" when the Utah tribes were all to be gathered on the Uintah reservation to receive their reward in return for signing away their homelands never arrived because the treaty was never ratified. The "paper" signed at Spanish Fork traveled a long way before it was finally acted upon by the United States Senate. On the way up it gathered the signatures of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior and the President. On 6 March 1866, it was submitted to the United States Senate for action which was delayed three years, until March 1869.¹⁵

Colonel Irish resigned as Superintendent shortly after the treaty signing and was succeeded by Franklin H. Head on 23 March 1866. The population of the Uintah Agency began to swell as increasing numbers of Indians were persuaded to join the reservation with its promise of a new life. "Many small bands," read the Commissioner's 1869 report, "seeing the advantages of the location, have gone wholly, or in part, upon the reservation." Among them "some of the principal chiefs, including Black Hawk, for many years engaged in

¹⁵Indian Office, 13 December 1865 - 29 September 1866, Report Book, No. 15; Department of Interior, Record of L. S., Indian Affairs, No. 6, p. 140; Executive Journal 14, U.S. Senate 1866, Part II, p. 586.

active hostilities, are among the most industrious Indians upon the reservation."¹⁶ The population as of that year was estimated at 1500.¹⁷

Meanwhile modest beginnings were made in implementing the agricultural program designed for the reservation. Agent Pardon Dodds reported to Superintendent Head on 8 September 1868, "I found there a force of five laborers, an interpreter, and a cook. The laborers were busily employed with the teams belonging to the agency, in hauling supplies of provisions, seed, grain, presents, etc., until about the middle of November."¹⁸ When snows blocked the mountain passes, the hands turned to plowing for a month in preparation for spring planting. Caring for the cattle, cutting timber, and repairing tools occupied them until spring weather permitted planting wheat, oats, corn, potatoes, and vegetables. But when the grain was in head "an army of grasshoppers came and within a week the ground was bare in three fourths of the crops." The same thing happened to several thousand young peach trees just putting out leaves—"the grasshoppers ate them—even the bark and killed all but two or three hundred."¹⁹

Nevertheless the agent judged the effort and expense justified

as thereby the Indians have made no inconsiderable progress in their education to habits of industry. . . . The Indians appreciate the cause of the crops failure, and will work upon the land for the coming season.²⁰

The natives helped dig a large irrigation ditch which was nearly a mile long. They learned to irrigate, to drive oxen and to hold the plow. The prospect of an extensive orchard was especially pleasing to them. But, he hastened to add, all this was dependent on sufficient operating funds. The appropriation of \$15,000 for the year ending 30 June 1868, was not sufficient for carrying on the business of the agency, and yet it was cut to \$5,000 for the 1869 year! He pleaded with his

¹⁶Superintendent Head in his 1867 report related how he had arranged to meet Black Hawk and some of his followers on the reservation, on which occasion the chief committed himself to a course of peace. This promise he apparently kept. Head to N. G. Taylor, 22 August 1867.

¹⁷Quotes from Utah Superintendency Report No. 42 (1 August 1869) included in *Commissioner's Report*, 1868-69.

¹⁸Supt. Report 1869.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

superiors for adequate appropriations to enable him to carry on *until the treaty should be ratified*.²¹

Such a beginning, with its successes and failures, presented a challenge coupled with a promise of reward for industry. There was good reason to believe that a new life lay ahead for the natives when the "Great Father" in Washington should fulfill his treaty promises. Neither the local agent nor the commissioner in Washington failed to remind their superiors in every report that success of the program waited upon ratification and implementation of the treaty. Wrote Superintendent Head on 22 August 1867:

The treaty has never been confirmed, nor has any action been had regarding it. Although it has been repeatedly explained to the Indians that the treaty was not binding until ratified by the Senate, they do not seem to comprehend the matter, and are much dissatisfied that it is not in effective operation.²²

Again on 16 September, he wrote:

I have heretofore repeatedly urged that some action be had relative to this treaty. It is impossible to make the Indians fully comprehend the reason why, when they have observed their part of the treaty, it is not fulfilled on the part of the government.²³

Nevertheless, the Superintendent was optimistic as indicated in his report of 1 August 1869:

The progress upon this reservation is a most satisfactory illustration of what can be accomplished with proper management in training Indians to habits of industry. . . .

I feel confident that \$10,000 per year, judiciously expended at this reservation, one-half thereof annually for cattle and the balance for tools, presents, and the labor of a few whites to aid and instruct the Indians, would in five or six years collect all the Utah Utes upon the reservation, and make them permanently self-supporting.²⁴

The flame of hope for solution of the Indian problem in Utah Territory which had burned brightly in 1865 flickered

²¹Agent Pardon Dodds to F. H. Head in *Commissioner's Report*, 1868, Utah Superintendency No. 42.

²²Head to Commissioner N. G. Taylor, 22 August 1867, in *Report of the Secretary of the Interior*, 1867, Utah Supt'cy, No. 42.

²³Head to Commissioner Taylor as of 16 September 1868 in *Report to Secretary of the Interior*, 1867, Utah Supt'cy, No. 28.

²⁴Head to Commissioner E. S. Parker, in *Commissioner's Report*, 1869, Utah Supt'cy No. 42, p. 226-27. The Superintendent's estimate was based on Agent Dodd's enthusiastic report of 1 August in which he said: 'The grass-

bravely through the next four years only to be snuffed out in 1869-70. The Spanish Fork Treaty with its promise of mutual benefits to both the red man and the white had reached the Senate on 6 March 1866, where it was referred to the committee on Indian Affairs. Three years later, in February 1869, Senator James Harlan, chairman of that committee, submitted several worn treaties, including that with the Utes, to O. H. Browning, Secretary of the Interior, with an inquiry as to whether he would recommend their ratification. The Secretary referred Harlan's inquiry to Commissioner of Indian Affairs A. G. Taylor, who replied in part on 18 February 1869:

The ratification of the treaty with the Utah Tribes has been repeatedly urged by this office, as under its provisions, measures could be adopted for the concentration of the Indians of the Territory upon the ample reservation set apart for their use and occupancy, and the necessary means afforded for their support and improvement. It is possible that a better treaty can be made under present circumstances and relations of these Indians and I suggest that it would be as well, perhaps, that the Senate, do not advise the ratification of the pending treaty—in which event, I would recommend that early steps be taken to negotiate a new one.²⁵

With the Indian Bureau's acquiescence in the death of the treaty, there remained only to carry out its formal execution and burial. On 11 March, Senator Harlan reported four treaties (including that with the Utah Utes) to the Senate with negative recommendations. The result was the adoption of a resolution "that the Senate does not advise and consent to the ratification of said treaties."²⁶ The resolution was forwarded to the President. The hand-written articles, formulated and hopefully subscribed to by Superintendent O. H. Irish and sixteen trusting Indian chiefs with their X marks, on 8 June 1865, were returned to the Commissioner's office and

hoppers have not at all troubled us the present season, and the crops of every kind are excellent." The one hundred and ten acres under cultivation were substantially as follows:

<i>Crops</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Bushels</i>	<i>Value at Agency</i>
Wheat	50	1,750	\$10,500
Corn	20	1,200	6,000
Potatoes	6	1,500	6,000
Turnips	20	3,000	6,000
Oats	6	240	480
Vegetables, etc.	8	- - -	1,000
Total	110	- - -	\$29,980

²⁵Record Group 48—Letters received, Secretary of Interior. File January to April, 1869—Box 23, National Archives.

duly buried in the unratified treaty files now located in the National Archives.

The rejection of the Ute treaty, together with others, was symptomatic of a changing national concept of Indian administration. The belief that the Indian could best work out his salvation separate and apart from the white race was giving way to ideas of "assimilation, Allotment and Citizenship."²⁷ It was also in harmony with a developing resistance of the House of Representatives to the Senate's exclusive control over Indian affairs.²⁸ The Indian treaty system was on its way out.²⁹ The practice came to an end in a clause attached to an appropriation act in favor of the Yankton Indians which read

provided that hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the Territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe or power with whom the United States may contract a treaty.³⁰

In keeping with President U.S. Grant's policy of placing Indian administration under military control, Brevet Colonel J. E. Tourtellotte replaced F. H. Head in the Utah superintendency, with Lieutenant George W. Graffam as agent in Uintah. Upon learning that the Ute treaty had already been scrapped, Tourtellotte faced the disappointing realities optimistically:

Whenever such abundant supplies are raised upon the reservation that the Indians can then be bountifully subsisted, the Ute Indians of the Territory will, of their own desire, move thereon. . . . I think in three years time most of the Utes of this superintendency will move upon the reservation without expense to the government. If that can be done I see no reason why those Indians cannot become self-supporting.³¹

²⁶*Executive Journal*, Vol. 17, 1869-71, p. 7.

²⁷Felix S. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945), p. 66.

²⁸The House objected to the Senate's making treaties with the Indians involving financial appropriations in which it had no voice.

²⁹*Commissioner's Report*, 1869, and the first *Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners* submitted that same year, recommended abolition of the treaty system of dealing with the tribes. *Commissioner's Report* 1869, pp. 6 and 50-1.

³⁰Cohen, *Federal Indian Law*, pp. 66-68. Since the government still recognized the original Indian title, it continued to deal with its redskin wards on a basis of mutual consent, however, through *agreements* instead of *treaties*. The difference between them was largely in the process by which the latter was ratified by both houses of Congress.

³¹*Commissioner's Report* 1870, Utah Superintendency, No. 41, pp. 607-8.

However, the military superintendent found little support from Lt. Graffam in leading the Uintah natives across the ruins of a shattered dream. The local agent had failed to win the Utes' confidence and, ill at ease among them, he wrote that "Troops must either be stationed in the Valley: the Indians delt [sic] with more liberally, or the Agency abandoned."³² Finding it more to his liking, he spent so much of his time at Fort Bridger that the natives complained to Col. Tourtellotte. "He did not care for them," they said, and asked that he be replaced by a good chief. Tourtellotte reported to the Commissioner in Washington on 25 July 1870, "I am much interested in the Uintah Valley Reservation, but fear it will not prosper under the management of Lt. Graffam."³³ The agent was replaced on 21 October, but his successor, John J. Critchlow, did not arrive at the Uintah Agency until the following February.

At this low ebb in the fortunes of the Utah Indians, they felt the protecting hand of the "Great Father" in Washington still further withdrawn. Congress enacted legislation prohibiting army officers from holding civil positions, and with the removal of Col. Tourtellotte, the Utah superintendency was abolished altogether in 1870. From that time Utah's single agent at Uintah reported directly to the Commissioner of Indian affairs in Washington.³⁴ Certain drawbacks to settlement in the valley which had formerly been hopefully tolerated, now loomed large without the treaty promise of sufficient finances to overcome them. Notwithstanding adequate area with natural resources sufficient to sustain all of the Indians in Utah, its isolation, which had been originally regarded with favor, now no longer recommended it. Both the agency and the

³²Lt. George W. Graffam, Annual Report to Col. G. E. Tourtellotte, 3 May 1870, in the Office of Indian Affairs. L. R. Utah Supt'cy, 1849-1880, in the National Archives.

³³Letter from Col. Tourtellotte to Commissioner Parker, 19 May 1870, Ibid.

³⁴Letter from Commissioner Parker to Col. Tourtellotte 5 November 1870. "The President under the 5th Section of the Act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, making appropriations for the Indian Department, has discontinued several Indian Superintendencies, among the number that for Utah Territory, and directed that the agency for the Indians therein be attached to the New Mexico Superintendency. . . . The Agent for the Tribes in Utah will be instructed to report hereafter to Superintendent Pope." This letter was followed by another on 11 November, closing with "I now inform you that the arrangement is changed, so far as to require that the records etc. of your office be forwarded direct to this office, and that the agent report here and not to Superintendent Pope." Reports and correspondence continued to be filed in Washington under the heading of Utah Superintendency until 1880. Letters cited are found therein under dates given. National Archives.

natives found it to their disadvantage. The objective to concentrate the red men in Uintah failed as the reservation population dwindled to approximately seven hundred.

So when John J. Critchlow arrived at the Uintah Agency in February of 1871, he found it very much down to earth. He faced a situation to test the courage and capacity of a dedicated Indian agent. Gone was the vision of a "Great Father" in Washington, who, in return for title to their homelands, would generously establish an Indian community in Uintah Valley; and gone was the Ute confidence in "Washington's" promises together with incentive to work for their fulfillment. Critchlow began his difficult task by holding a council meeting with Chief Tabby and several important Indians. He said:

I laid before them the benevolent plans and purposes of the government in relation to their care and support, telling them . . . that I desired to do as the Great Father told me; that I did not want to promise them much, as they knew promises were not always kept.

Upon this frank introduction, he said, the natives were "disposed to give me a fair trial."³⁵

By September he could report new land under cultivation and added, "from present appearances of the various crops I am much encouraged and believe . . . that the capabilities of this valley for agricultural purposes are equal to any in the territory."³⁶ From his practical outlook he challenged: "make this agency a home for the red men of this territory . . . and most if not all of the Indians will be found, in a few years at most, on this reservation."³⁷ To this end Critchlow labored for twelve years as Indian agent in Uintah Valley. But the attraction of treaty provisions which had started a gathering movement toward the reservation in 1865 was no longer operative and the agent was severely handicapped by inadequate appropriations.

Before Critchlow retired in 1883, changes both in the reservation and its population had already set in to mock the high expectations of the chiefs who signed the treaty of 1865. In 1880, following the Meeker massacre, the Government transferred the insurgent Whiteriver Utes from Colorado to Uintah, and two years later the Uncompaghre Utes were removed to a

³⁵J. J. Critchlow, to Acting Commissioner H. R. Clum, 22 September 1891 included in *Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1870-71*, Vol. I, Utah Supt'cy No. 100, p. 961.

separate reserve adjoining the Uintah on the east. The two reservations were consolidated in 1886 and the Uncompahgre reserve was restored to public domain. The combined agency was located at Fort Duchesne with Ouray, at the confluence of the Uintah and the Green rivers, becoming a sub-agency. The dream of a general gathering of Utah's Indians in the spacious valley faded until, in 1901, the three small bands totaling less than 1500,³⁸ remained its only Indian occupants.

Already at the end of the century, land-hungry white settlers were challenging the right of the Government to withhold from public entry more land than the natives could use. The Dawes General Allotment Act of 1887, which was applied to the Uintah-Ouray Reservation in 1902, provided for acreage allotments to the Utes in severalty. A committee was appointed to persuade the reluctant natives to accept this move towards individual land ownership. The program, including a provision for citizenship³⁹ which contemplated the welfare of the Indians, was also intended to speed up assimilation through break up of tribal solidarity and thereby hasten the day when federal relations with the Indians could be terminated.

The federal committee, disregarding native protests against the move, completed its task in Utah by 18 July 1895, when 1390 allotments had been made, including 103,205 acres of irrigable land. On 3 March of that year the President had been authorized to set aside for the "Uintah Forest Reserve such portions of the Indian lands as he thought necessary to protect the [water] supply for the Indians or for general agricultural development. . . ."⁴⁰ Under this authority, 1,010,000 acres were shifted from the Indian reservation into the Uintah Forest Reserve. Congress on 3 March 1905, set aside another 250,000 acres of non-irrigable Indian lands in the valley as grazing reserve to be used by the natives in common. Finally, in that disruptive year in the history of the reservation, the President proclaimed that the unreserved and unallotted lands of the valley, totaling 1,004,285 acres, would be opened to settlement on 28 August 1905. Receipts from sale of the lands at \$1.25

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., p. 964.

³⁸E. E. Dale, *The Indians of the Southwest* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949), pp. 138 and 250. These included 708 Uintahs, 523 Uncompahgre and 241 Whiteriver Indians.

³⁹This provision was superseded by the Snyder Act of 1924 granting citizenship to all the Indians.

⁴⁰See H. M. Tidwell, "Uintah and Ouray Indian Agency," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 4 (January 1931), 32.

per acre would accrue to the tribal fund for use of the natives.⁴¹

To facilitate white settlement on the restored public domain, offices were established in Price, Provo, and Vernal in Utah, and Grand Junction in Colorado for registration for homestead drawings. Heavy demand for the released acreage was evidenced when 5467 land hungry whites registered the first day and the total registration over a twelve day period was 37,657. The demand exceeded the number of available quarter sections by nearly seven to one. As a pitiable reaction to this irresistible encroachment upon their domain, several hundred defiant Whiteriver Utes left the reservation with hopes of joining the Sioux tribes in South Dakota in some form of resistance. The thousand mile hegira came to an unsuccessful end when the Sioux failed to extend a welcome and the disappointed fugitives returned in 1908 to accept the inevitable.⁴²

The Meriam Indian Study appearing in 1928-29 and the Senate-sponsored investigation from 1928 to 1933 of conditions among the Indians of the United States reached into the Uintah-Ouray reservation to disclose a partially acculturated native population of 1206 possessed of 261,000 acres of grazing land, 1046 allotments totaling 84,000 acres, plus school and agency reserves of 20,183 acres. Twenty-one thousand, three hundred and nineteen acres were leased to white settlers. One hundred and fifty families lived in permanent homes with another hundred in temporary houses or tepees. There was one boarding school with a capacity of 110, a day school accommodating 25 and a poorly equipped hospital.⁴³

The nation-wide surveys resulted in corrective Indian legislation during the 1930's in which graft and incompetence on agency levels, the "pauperizing" effect of the ration system and the demoralizing features of the allotment plan received due consideration. The most far-reaching measures resulting from the fact-finding surveys were included in the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, generally known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. In a significant reversal of policy, this legislation brought

⁴¹President's Proclamation on Opening up Uintah's Reservation in Utah, *Dept. of Interior Annual Report*, 1905, I: 472-77.

⁴²Floyd A. O'Neil, "An Anguished Odyssey—The Flight of the Utes, 1906-1908," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 36 (Fall 1968), 315-27.

⁴³Survey of Conditions of the Indians of the United States Report in the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs—Hearings: Uintah-Ouray Reservation, pp. 14, 733-41.

to an end and sought to overcome the harmful effects of the allotment system, and recognized, at long last, an Indian culture and the values of Indian communal life. Upon this recognition, provision was made for tribal assumption of social and economic responsibility, including improvement in the educational system and freedom of religion. Ultimate termination of Federal controls continued as a desired objective, but to be achieved gradually through exercise of their new freedoms and responsibilities.⁴⁴

The benefits of new legislation were introduced on the Uintah-Ouray reservation with Ute acquisition of a corporate voice through an official organization vested with specified legal powers. Taking advantage of the granting clause, they adopted a "Constitution and By laws of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah-Ouray Reservation" in 1937 with the following preamble:

We the Indians of the Uintah, Uncompaghre and White-river bands hereafter to be known as the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in order to establish a more responsible tribal organization, promote the general welfare, encourage educational progress, conserve and develop our land and resources, and to secure to ourselves and our posterity the power to exercise certain rights of home rule, not inconsistent with the Federal, State and local laws, do ordain and establish this constitution for the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation.⁴⁵

The constitution, which was approved by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes on 19 January, stipulated that jurisdiction of the Ute Indian tribe "shall extend to the territory within the original confines of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation."⁴⁶ Membership of the tribe should consist of "all persons of Indian blood whose names appear on the official census roll of the Ute Indian Tribe. . . as of July 1, 1935."⁴⁷ The governing body "shall be a business committee known as the Uintah and Ouray Tribal Business Committee"⁴⁸ to consist of six members, two elected from each of the three bands.⁴⁸ The duties and powers of this committee as enumerated in Article VI extend into practically every phase of the social, eco-

⁴⁴In 1961, under the Ute Partition Act (Public Law 671), 490 mixed blood Indians were "terminated" with some unhappy results due to their lack of preparedness to compete in the white man's world.

⁴⁵U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, 1937, p. 1.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, Article I.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, Article II.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, Article III.

nomic and political life of the tribe.

On 6 July 1938, with the approval of the Interior Department, the tribal unit was given corporate existence. Its charter was duly ratified by vote of the adult Indians and certified to by the Chairman of the Tribal Business Committee and the Superintendent of the Uintah-Ouray Agency.

The 1940s brought some improvement in housing, schools and hospital services to the reservation. An annual per capita income of \$187 in 1939 rose substantially in the 40s through receipts from oil and gas bonuses, leases and rentals. In 1946 the Ute bands were farming 4000 acres of land and owned 5000 cattle and 7000 sheep. Also, to climax their material progress, there waited in the offing a "judgment fund" won from the Federal Government of which their portion would amount to \$17,000,000 as compensation for loss of tribal lands when treaties with their fathers failed. An award of such proportions carried with it not only a challenge to the native's readiness to manage wealth for beneficial use, but prompted a question as to the measure of compensation the judgment fund represented in the Ute loss of their inheritance in Uintah Valley. Their position at mid-century as a reduced minority group surrounded by a white community was hardly the fulfillment of treaty expectations of 1865, which envisioned a self supporting Indian community spread across the hills and valleys of the original Uintah reservation.

Perhaps the ideal presented to the chiefs who signed the treaty document at the Spanish Fork farm was beyond realization. But had the document been ratified and its provisions kept by the authority in Washington, it might have gone far towards fulfillment under dedicated agents such as John J. Critchlow, whose vision was to make his agency "a home for the red men of the territory."⁴⁹ His was a program which foreshadowed the spirit and provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1934. Had the Indian administration safe-guarded the boundaries of the reduced area for which the chiefs signed away the balance of their tribal lands in 1865, and through the years, devoted the millions spent on rations and annuities to training the natives to assume increasing responsibility in the development of the rich resources of the Valley, the Uintah Dream might possibly have unfolded with broader and more promising horizons.

⁴⁹Critchlow to Clum cited in fn. 35.

The Historians Corner

Edited by James B. Allen

This issue of the Historians Corner contains three miscellaneous, but most interesting documents. The first is an important commentary on one of the most far-reaching modern programs of the Church: the Welfare program. Paul C. Child was a counselor to President Harold B. Lee in the Pioneer Stake when the famous early experiments in welfare work were instituted in the 1930s. On 12 June 1971 he wrote a letter to President Spencer W. Kimball outlining some of their experiences as they used the Church organization to help the members of their stake achieve economic security. One result of these activities was Harold B. Lee's call to help establish a Church-wide welfare program. In light of the impressive growth of welfare work, and its importance in the Church today, this letter becomes a significant document. With the permission of Brother Child, the major portion of his letter is published here as a reminiscence.

The next two items relate to the Nauvoo period in Church history. The first is an interesting note by Kenneth W. Godfrey relating to the literary interests of Joseph Smith and other citizens of Nauvoo and raises some interesting questions for further historical study. The second is an unpublished letter by a non-Mormon who was a contemporary observer of the troubled times leading to the death of Joseph Smith. He was not particularly friendly toward the Mormons, but his letter provides some important insight into the spirit and feelings of the times. Jan Shipps has done Mormon historiography a distinct service by discovering and editing the letter.

PHYSICAL BEGINNING OF THE CHURCH WELFARE PROGRAM

Paul C. Child*

People sometimes speak of the "pilot project" in Pioneer Stake. The Stake Presidency was reorganized in December of 1930, if my recollection is correct. The new presidency, consisting of President Harold B. Lee, Charles S. Hyde and Paul C. Child found themselves confronted with very distressing conditions and problems and set about to find solutions to them. If my recollections are correct, more than half of our brethren in the Stake were unemployed and of course most of these families required assistance. One of the first problems therefore was to endeavor to find employment for them. President Lee assigned the responsibilities of the welfare work to me. During my tenure as Bishop of the Poplar Grove Ward I had found considerable success in securing employment for my people through Ward members who held positions of foremen, department heads, etc., at Kennecott and other institutions, so one of our first efforts was to broaden the scope of this activity and set up an employment program in each of our wards and units. As we counseled on this matter we were led into the creating of Ward Work Directors for men and later for women.

We were unable to find employment for all our people and found ourselves with many who needed something to do; hence as we counseled we arrived at the creating of work projects for both men and women where they could work for the assistance they needed. We soon found that we could not place a monetary value on labor as we did not have the money to pay for it; hence we decided (and properly so) that it should be done on a basis "of need."

Some wards were of course in more dire circumstances than others, and we decided to request the Presiding Bishop to permit us to retain all funds coming to us from tithes and fast offerings and create a Stake Welfare fund or account on which the Bishops could draw for their cash needs. We were given permission to do so and functioned for a time in this manner. However, conditions steadily worsened. As weather improved we organized our men under ward work directors and their

*Bro. Child is retired and lives in Salt Lake City.

assistants and sent them to assist the farmers and orchardists in their work which they of course could not afford to pay cash for. As the crops developed and matured we continued this type of activity. The farmers could sell only their prime produce, which left them a considerable quantity of produce for which there was no market. This they gave to us in compensation for our assistance to them and thus we were able to supply our families with produce from the fields and fruit from the orchards.

To supplement all this, after counseling with our high council, we decided to operate a farm for ourselves on which we could grow a "Cash Crop." We applied for and were given permission to use some vacant land west of 2nd West and between 11th and 13th South Streets. The city agreed to give us free use of water from the fire hydrants. We decided that the best cash crop would be sugar beets, and so President Lee had samples of the soil sent to either the Agriculture College at Logan or field representatives of the sugar company for analysis. While this was being done President Grant held a meeting of the Priesthood in the Assembly Hall in which he made an urgent appeal to those assembled to plant sugar beets to keep the factories in operation and provide a strengthening influence on the economy. Shortly after the meeting we received the report back from the soil experts that our land was not suitable for the production of sugar beets. As we talked about this development in our council meeting President Lee turned to me and asked, "Now what shall we do?" My reply was, "President Grant wants sugar beets, so let us go ahead with our plans to plant them." President Lee then laid our decision and plans before our High Council and they approved. We had had the city dump leaves, etc., on our property and we ploughed them under. President Lee then asked the Council after our meeting in the temple where we held a prayer circle each Sunday, that we all assemble at the farm site. This we did and stood in a group. After a few remarks from President Lee we prayed unto the Lord that He would bless our efforts and bless the soil that it would yield abundantly. Following this we set about to further prepare the soil for seeding, etc. We cared for our crops as well as we knew how and when harvest time came, imagine our joy as we harvested these beautiful beets, many weighing from 20 to 25 pounds!

As you can well imagine, despite all our efforts we still lacked the necessary means to adequately provide for our people. In desperation and after much prayer and counsel President Lee decided we should appeal to the First Presidency and accordingly he arranged for a meeting of the First Presidency and the presidency of the Pioneer Stake. President Lee laid our problems before the First Presidency and told them what we had done and were doing to solve them. The First Presidency, by President Grant, said to us, "You will go back, you will take care of your people, and the First Presidency will stand behind you."

Prior to this meeting we had decided to establish a storehouse and canning factory. The scriptures, which we constantly used as our guide, seemed to require it. Into this storehouse on Pierpont Street (donated to us by its owner) we brought the products of our labors and commodities which we had to purchase, from which we administered relief to our families. We also established a coal yard as we had trackage there and bought coal by the carload. We practiced every possible economy.

Much of the commodities coming to us consisted of onions. Through our senior High Councilman, Theodore T. Burton, we secured free use of 3 or 4 empty warehouses and in these we stored our onions, constantly sorting them to prevent spoilage. We learned that in Southern California there were no onions, so we had our mechanics repair such trucks as our people possessed, loaded them with onions and sent them to California to exchange for citrus fruit for which there was no market. We soon found that we could sell our onions for cash which we needed badly and also purchase the citrus fruit, and thus money began to come into our program. If my recollection is correct, we never had to make request on the First Presidency for money.

We found that ladies' knit suits were available at the woolen mills in Logan, etc., at ridiculously low prices. We contacted the mills and they were glad to make deals with us. We brought the garments to our Stake Center and made them available for our Relief Society sisters who remodeled them, etc., and thus many of our women became elegantly clothed with "garments of their own make." We purchased yardage and had the sisters make layettes, etc., for the lovely babies that the Lord was sending to us. Each ward had its supply.

From yardage purchased the sisters also made dresses for themselves and children, and shirts for the brethren. Thus from the Lord's Storehouse and by His blessings the crises were met and solved.

It seems that President Grant had received "word" that he was to "immediately begin to state and restate those fundamental principles regarding the care of the poor which had been in the gospel from the beginning"; and as President Lee laid before the First Presidency what he had done and what we were doing, that President Grant and his counselors recognized in it an answer to their prayers and quandries as to how they should initiate the instruction which had come to him.

A NOTE ON THE NAUVOO LIBRARY AND LITERARY INSTITUTE

Kenneth W. Godfrey*

Sometime in early January of 1844, at least seventy-four of Nauvoo's leading citizens met together for the expressed purpose of organizing a library and literary institute. A constitution, consisting of four articles and twenty-four by-laws, was unanimously adopted by those assembled. On 25 January 1844, Benjamin Winchester, Mormon² publisher and pamphleteer, was chosen chairman of the institute and Charles A. Foster elected secretary.¹ Following this action seven trustees were elected and seven prominent Mormons selected to deliver lectures before the institute, including Sidney Rigdon, Orson Pratt, Orson Hyde, Orson Spencer and Benjamin Winchester, himself. We learn from subsequent minutes kept by Secretary Foster that Orson Hyde, Sidney Rigdon and Winchester did, on different occasions, deliver their lectures.

According to the by-laws, one method of obtaining stock in the institute was to donate books to the library. The secretary would then dutifully list under the name of each person the books contributed. Probably due to the lack of "hard cash"

*Dr. Godfrey is director of the Institute of Religion adjacent to Weber State College in Ogden, Utah.

¹David J. Whittaker in his unpublished paper titled "To Further The Cause of Righteousness: The Life and Contributions of Benjamin Winchester, Early Mormon Missionary," referred to the minutes of The Nauvoo Library and Literary Institute in footnote 145, and first drew my attention to them.

Lardner's Universal History	1.00
Women of England	62½
Blank Book	2.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 13.00

Joseph Smith

Review of Edwards on the Will	+	62½
Life of Tecumseh	+	37½
Whelply's Compend	+	1.00
Scott's Poetical Works in 5 vols 40¢ per vol		2.00
Edmonson's Lectures	+	50
Merrill's Harmony	+	50
Epicureo		25
Humonach's Works	+	62½
Catholic Piety	+	25
Home Physician	+	1.00
Apocryphal Testament	+	2.00
Brown's Travels	+	12½
Red & White Travels	+	50
Brown's Appeal. gram	+	75
Brown's English Synthescope	+	75
Studies in Poetry & Prose		75
Pinned Over		
	<hr/>	0. \$ 12.00

Amount of Stock Rec'd in the Library		
Joseph Smith brot Over		\$ 12.00
Old World & the New. Vol 1 st	+	25
Voyages & Travels of Pres Perry & others		4.00
Bennett's Book Keeping 2 Copies at 1.25 ^{per} vol		2.50
Incidents of Travel in Yucatan by Stephens 2 nd		5.00
Stephens Travels in Central America 2 nd 25¢	+	5.00
Mosheim's Church History 1 st vol		1.50
Imms & Seasons 12 x 3 vol abo 60¢ 112¢ 54¢	+	8.00
Victor's Philosophy		2.00
Millennium & other Poems	+	37½
Beaumont's Experiments	-	50
Dictionary of the Holy Bible	+	1.00
Parker's Lectures on Universalism	+	50
Gander's Discourse	+	25
Metropolitan	+	1.50
Goodrich's History of the United States		3½
Wadsworth's Sermons	+	25
Catholic Manual	+	50
Whelply's Compend	+	1.00
Whelply's Meditations		75
Historie de Charles		25
Rollin 2 Vol 3.00 per vol		6.00
Book of Mormon	+	1.00
	<hr/>	54 5

The Joseph Smith donation list by courtesy of the Church Librarian.

in Nauvoo most of those who belonged to the institute procured shares of stock by such donations. Thus, from a perusal of the minutes we know the titles of over four hundred books held by the Nauvoo library. These titles provide the historian with an excellent source of studying and evaluating, to some extent at least, the intellectual climate of Nauvoo.

Of perhaps even greater importance is the fact that the Prophet Joseph Smith was a member of the institute, and the minutes provide for us a list of the books he contributed to the library. As far as this writer has been able to determine no historian or scholar has made a study of these books and the influence they may have had upon the Prophet's mind.

On 31 January 1844, the Prophet Joseph Smith contributed the following books to the Nauvoo Library and Literary Institute:² *Review of Edwards On The Will; Life of Tecumseh; Whepleys Compend; Scotts Poetical Works*, in 5 vols; *Gillmores Lectures; Merrills Harmony; Epicureo; Krumanachers Works; Catholic Piety; Home Physician; Apochryphal Testament; Bruns' Travels; Reld & other Travels; Browns' Appeal*, gram; *Browns English Syntascope; Studies in Poetry & Prose; Old World & the New*, vol 1st; *Voyages & Travels of Ross Perry & others; Bennetts Book Keeping*, 2 copies; *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan*, by Stephens 2 Vo; *Stephens Travels in Central America*, 2 Vo; *Mosheims Church History*, 1 Vol; *Times & Seasons* 1 2 3 Vol also Vol 1 & 2; *Dicks Philosophy; Millenium & other Poems; Beaumonts Experiments, Dictionary of the Holy Bible; Parkers Lectures on Universalism; Landers Discourse; Metropolitan; Goodrich's History of the United States; Doddriges Sermons; Catholic Manual; Whelpleys Compend; Herveys Meditations; Historie de Charles; Rollin*, 2 Vol; *Book of Mormon*.

Several questions could be asked regarding these and the other books donated to the library. For example, does the above list only represent the books Joseph Smith did not like to read and therefore gave them to the library? Are these books the source of some of the Prophet's intellectual ideas? If so which ones? Who was John Gray (the man who donated the largest number of books)? Who read such works as *Lectures on Witchcraft; Thomas Spencer's Memoirs; History*

²Authors, Book Titles, and the order in which the books appear are exactly as they are given in the minutes of the Nauvoo Library and Literary Institute.

of France; John Locke, *On Understanding*; and the *Life of William Eaton*? Why were there so many grammar and foreign language books donated? Why were Sidney Rigdon and Joseph Smith the only leading ecclesiastical leaders who were members of the institute? What influence did this institute have on the cultural life of Nauvoo? How long did it last? (The last minutes are dated in March of 1844). These questions represent only a few of the queries raised by studying the minutes of the institute.

Thus this small but very important document found in the LDS Church Archives deserves the attention of Mormon scholars and hopefully this brief article will prove to be the catalyst which will motivate writers to devote some time to the Nauvoo Library and Literary Institute.

A LITTLE KNOWN ACCOUNT OF THE MURDERS OF JOSEPH AND HYRUM SMITH

Jan Shipps*

A little known contemporary account of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of Joseph and Hyrum Smith is contained in the following letter which was written by Mr. H. H. Bliss, a resident of La Harpe, Illinois, on the day following the murders at Carthage Jail. Bliss, whose name was included in an 1859 La Harpe business directory with the word "furniture" after it, was the town's postmaster from 1856 to 1865.¹ The letter was written to reassure his family back East that the situation in Hancock County was not as dangerous as published accounts might indicate. It was addressed to Mr. Franklin Bliss, Springfield, Massachusetts, and was mailed from La Harpe on 8 July 1844.

The letter was written in ink on both sides of a single sheet of inexpensive paper. It was folded as a quarto sheet would be, with one face used for the address. The letter is transcribed here exactly as it was written.

*Dr. Shipps is assistant professor of history and religious studies at Indiana University—Purdue University at Indianapolis, Ind., and was recently elected vice-president of the Mormon History Association.

¹Edwin C. Warren, "La Harpe Township," Chapter 32 in *History of Hancock County, Illinois*, Sesquicentennial Ed. (published by Board of Supervisors of Hancock County, 1968), pp. 354-355.

The original is in the Ellison Manuscripts Collection in the Lilly Library at Indiana University. It was a gift from Mrs. Robert Spurrier Ellison of Colorado Springs, Colorado, in 1946. Dr. Elfrieda Lang, Curator of Manuscripts at the Library, helped with the preparation of this transcription, and her assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

La Harpe Jun 1844

Dear Brother

We received the package from home by Mr. Wilcox a short time since he arrived here safe. Yesterday was the first time that I have seen him since his return. We wer gratified to learn that you wer all well I am sorry that he could not stop a little longer but it is well that he did not as things are a going here. We are at this time in the midst of a great excitement and have been for ten days past Caused by the *Murder* of Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet and his brother Hiram Smith. You will probably see an account of the whole proceedings in print be fore you get this but thinking you would be anxious to hear from us I will try to give you an account of the whole affair Early this Spring there was a new party arose among the Mormons they profsed to believe as they had before except in one point and that was that Smith was a fallen prophet they soon commenced publishing to the world Smiths conduct which caused a great inmyty to exist between the two parties. As soon as I heard the division among them I told our Mormon neighbors that Nauvoo would be to hot for them both but they would not believe it. The two parties continued to be more bitter against each other until at last the new party established a press in Nauvoo and printed a paper called the *Expositor* this was more than the Prophet could bear. to have a paper exposing his conduct to the world establishe in the midst of his own city was to cutting. the consequence was that Smith under the shadow of Law caused the Press to be distroid in open day. An now commenced the War. The new party wer determined to make him suffer for this act of violance on their rights and Property. they tride to bring him to justice but the Municipal Court where he was discharged but the new party was determined to make him suffer the penalty of the Law it is possible they knew that the Court of the City had no right to discharge him. Smith on the other hand was determined not leave Nauvoo to be tride

at last the new party established a press in Nauvoo and printed a paper called the Expositor. This was more than the Prophet could bear, to have a paper opposing his conduct to the world was established in the midst of his own city was to ailing. The consequence was that Smith under the shadow of Law caused the Men to be disarmed in open day. On noon commenced the "war". The new party was determined to make him suffer for this act of violence on their rights and Property. They tried to bring him to justice but the Municipal Court where he was discharged but the new party was determined to make him suffer the penalty of the Law if possible. They knew that the Court of the City had no right to discharge him. Smith on the other hand was determined not leave Nauvoo to be tried at Carthage where the writ was issued. By this time matters were coming to a serious point - and that was whether the Law should have its course on Smith or not - every man in the county except Mormons were determined that Smith should be taken by the Constable and brought to justice there was a Community sent to inform the Governor the situation of things before he arrived at Carthage all the Mormons with the exception of a few had ^{left} where and other places for Nauvoo at the command of Smith this was what never expected to see to see our old neighbors.

shouldering their guns to go in defense of Smith they showing a disposition to kill any or all of us if Smith gave them orders. By this time Smith had collected his followers at Nauvoo to the amount of some thousands ready or some of them said "to make in blood keep the town stronger in defense of their Prophet". The Governor established his Head Quarters at Carthage. Smith put the City of Nauvoo under Martial Law. At this time the Constable here had formed ourselves in to a Military Company for the protection of our place this is the first time that I have trained since I left the Brandon-Baker and I can assure you it was with altogether different feelings. The Governor collected a large force at Carthage and took every measure to prevent Smith from getting away which resulted in Smith giving himself up for trial with 18 others. They were all found guilty and put under \$500.00 bonds. They were all released but the two brothers Joseph & Eliram they were put in the Carthage Jail to ~~remain~~ ^{remain} ~~there~~ to the charge of Treason. The trial was to have come on yesterday at 12 o'clock in the mean time the Governor went to Nauvoo with a body of men to get some U.S. arms leaving a guard at the jail to protect Smith but it was not sufficient for them, a body of men from toward Warsaw rushed up on the guard and broke in the jail and shot both of the Smiths. They are buried to day at Nauvoo. How this

at Carthage wher the writ was issued. by this time matters were a coming to a serious point and that was wether the *Law* should have its carse on Smith or not every man in the County except Mormons wer determined to that Smith should be taken by the Constable and brought to justice there was a Commity sent to informe the Governour the situation of things befor he arived at Carthage all the mormons with the excepsion of a few had left here and other places for Nauvoo at the command of Smith this was what we never expected to see. To see our old neighbours shouldering their Guns to go in defense of Smith therby showing a disposition to kill any or all of us if Smith gave them orders. By this time Smith had collected his followers at Nauvoo to the amount of some thousands ready as some of them said '*to wade in blood up to their shoulder*' in defense of their Prophet. The Governour established his Head Quarters at Carthage. Smith put the City of Nauvoo under *Marshall law*. by this time we Gentiles here had formed ourselves into a Milertary Company fo th protection of ou place this is the first time that I have traind since I left the Hamden Guards and I can assure you it was with altogeather diferent feelings. The Governor collected a large force at Carthage and took every means to prevent Smith from es geting away. which resulted in Smith giving himself up for trial with 18 others they were all foud guilty and put under \$500.00 bonds they wer all released but the two Smiths Joseph & Hiram they wer put in the Carthage Jail to await anothe answer to the charge of Treason the trial was to have come on yesterday at 12⁰⁰ in the mean time the Governour went to Nauvoo to with a body of men to get some U.S. armes leaving a gard at the jail to protect Smith but it was not sufficent for there was a body of men from toward Warsaw rushed upon the Gard and broke in the jail and shot both of the Smiths. they are buried to day at Nauvoo. How this matter will terminate no one can tell but that being "who rules in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." The Governor is at Carthage I have not learnd what his course will be. We are all well as yet and the generale opinion is that the excitement will soon be over you must write as soon as convenient tell Mother not to be troubled about us Howard and Eliza think a heap of the Books that Cornelius sent I hope that we shall see each other again Remember us to all friends

H. H. Bliss

Book Reviews

Berrett, LaMar C. *Discovering the World of the Bible*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1973. 699 pp. \$14.95 hardbound; \$10.95 paper.

(Reviewed by Gilbert W. Scharffs, Associate Director of the Institute of Religion adjacent to the University of Utah. Dr. Scharffs is author of *Mormonism in Germany* and several articles in LDS periodicals and has conducted numerous BYU travel Study tours to Israel and to U.S. Church History sites.)

Dr. Berrett's book is an invaluable tool to any traveler in the Middle East. It includes most of the identifiable biblical sites and many non-biblical points of interest, plus dozens of maps, charts, diagrams, and color and black-and-white photographs. Latter-day Saints will find references to LDS scriptures which pertain to the various locations.

Dr. Berrett in his preface correctly states: "... local guides do not always know what the individual visitor wishes to see." Often LDS tourists are disappointed because they are unable to receive the Mormon point of view of the places they visit. A good example of where Dr. Berrett has included interesting LDS insights to a particular location is his material on the Qumran Community and the Dead Sea Scrolls (pp. 312-314). Non-Mormons, however, should find this travel guide equally helpful because only a small fraction of the total content makes reference to LDS scriptures and writings, and these are usually at the end of the biblical material.

The book gives a comprehensive coverage of ten countries—Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey and with the emphasis of course on Israel. The latter comprises almost one third of the book.

Although arranged by country, further subdivision by area, town, and specific sites are made. There is a brief thumbnail history given of each location, both ancient and modern and all the scriptures which pertain to that particular spot. All sites

are listed in a logical sequence of travel to avoid backtracking. However, if the traveler's itinerary does not coincide with Dr. Berrett's, the comprehensive index enables one to readily find whatever river, monument, tomb, mountain, city, lake, ruin, or museum one happens to be interested in.

The maps and charts are very complete and well done including maps of what is in some of the tombs and a floor plan of certain museums. Also helpful are numbers in the text that correspond to the same sites on the maps.

Guiding a group of students to the temple wall in the old city of Jerusalem, I lost my way last summer in the maze of narrow, winding streets. However, with Dr. Berrett's book in hand, I soon had our group headed in the right direction without anyone suspecting that I didn't know where I was.

The uniformity of style throughout the book makes it easy to use, instead of having to get used to the peculiarities of different maps, brochures, guide books for every area visited. For example, biblical names always appear first in one type face; modern names next in another style of type; variants, definitions of names, translation, and other explanatory matters are next in italics.

It is difficult to criticize this work, it is so well done. A few words about the time it takes to go from one location to another would be helpful, since those used to thinking in terms of mileage on U.S. roads or freeways will find themselves running late as they navigate the ancient roads throughout the Near East. Modern road numbers might also be included, plus some general information on accommodations. However, Dr. Berrett probably intentionally avoided getting into this area because economic growth, especially in Israel, would make any treatment of this nature out of date within a short time.

The book still includes the sites of occupied areas of Israel under their original country. For example, information on the Sinai Peninsula is still listed under Egypt. Should that nation regain the territory lost in the six-day war of 1967 the book will again be correct. However, with the Israel development in this area, they apparently don't intend this to happen.

One of the finest features is the excellent overview of history of each country from Ancient times to the present, both in outline and summary. This makes *Discovering the World of the Bible* a valuable book; not only a travel guide, but an

excellent reference book for any serious students of the Bible and history.

Barrus, David F. *The Way to the Sun*. Bountiful, Utah: Horizon Publishers, 1972. 104 pp. \$3.50

(Reviewed by J. Lewis Taylor, instructor at the Institute of Religion adjacent to the University of Utah.)

No single topic demands greater attention of Latter-day Saints than the quest for celestial exaltation. This concern is the subject of a short, ten-chapter book entitled *The Way to the Sun* by a young LDS author. This "brief outline" of the plan of salvation, which might have been more appropriately titled *The Way to The Son*, is expressly written for Latter-day Saints "who haven't yet reached perfection," but who are struggling to live the basic principles of the gospel, seeking fellowship with the Savior and desiring to partake wholeheartedly of the love of God. Specifically, the author's purposes are: To help the readers find the greatest happiness—the love of God; To bring them to Jesus Christ, their personal guide; and to help them live celestial lives on earth, that they might be exalted in the hereafter.

To fulfill his purposes Barrus deals very briefly with these basic themes: celestial happiness or the love of God; Jesus Christ as the spiritual light of our lives; faith as the foundation of all things; prayer; becoming disciples of Christ; love; suffering as a part of the plan of life; Lucifer's way; the value of scripture study; and mortality as a time of testing. Barrus' discussion is written mainly in hortatory style ("we must") and draws upon statements primarily from the scriptures for support and clarification.

The Way to the Sun fulfills only in part the stated purposes of the author. The book deals with *some* basic elements and principles of the plan of salvation, but omits a number of others crucial to the author's purpose of illumining the way to exaltation. For instance, little or no mention is made of the role of gospel ordinances in our lives or the place of the temple, nor is *specific* treatment given of such vital exaltation principles as sacrifice or consecration. This criticism is meant only to suggest the need for a more precise statement of the book's coverage. Moreover, it would seem that in an attempt

to outline the gospel plan, reference should be made to the most complete scriptural definition of the gospel itself, that found in 3 Nephi 27:13-22 given by the Savior; yet the passage is not cited. Some other less important weaknesses are evident. The book lacks continuity in topical movement from some chapters to others, and has some organizational deficiencies. For example, the discussion on becoming a disciple of Jesus Christ (Chapter 5) might well have followed immediately, or even have been incorporated into, the chapter (number 2) on the Savior as the light in our lives. Also, more care might have been shown in distinguishing between entering the celestial kingdom and obtaining exaltation. The distinction, though probably obvious to most Latter-day Saints, would add accuracy to some of Barrus' statements.

These weaknesses do not seriously obscure the message of *The Way to the Sun*. What is said is stated succinctly and simply, amply supported by well-selected scriptural passages. The book is written in a sincere and concerned tone, and evidences in the author both a high sense of commitment to the Lord and conspicuous spiritual insight. Focusing on the basic and eternal verities of the gospel, and upon the necessity of consistent application of these principles in daily living, Barrus gives special emphasis to the Savior as the light and heart of our lives, and to the importance of following Him in order to be renewed spiritually and become partakers of the divine nature. In all, Barrus has made a highly commendable effort to summarize some of the basic gospel requirements comprising the way to the Son.

Tanner, Annie Clark. *A Mormon Mother: An Autobiography*, rev. ed. Foreword by Obert C. Tanner. Salt Lake City: Tanner Trust Fund, University of Utah Library, 1973. 346 pp. \$10.00.

(Reviewed by John B. Harris, associate professor of English at Brigham Young University.)

It is just possible that an autobiography has a natural advantage over a third-person narrative. In its immediacy and directness, its personal point of view, its emotional commitment, and in its often semi-polished prose, it can give the reader a sense of reality and participation that a more ob-

jective work might miss. Certainly such an account avoids the pedantry that often mars scholarly biographies. At any rate, it struck this reviewer that *A Mormon Mother* (volume one of a new series, UTAH, THE MORMONS AND THE WEST) made far more captivating reading than did such highly-touted recent works as Elizabeth Longford's massive study of the Duke of Wellington, Jane Aiken Hodges' epistle-based biography of Jane Austen, and Ralph Martin's immensely popular two-volume portrait of Jenny, the mother of Winston Churchill. The only really damaging characteristic of the book is the author's inclusion of so many letters to and from her children that they clutter the work with irrelevancies and mar the flow of an otherwise straight-forward and vigorously-told story.

At the urging of her children, who considered the work a highly personal memoir, Mrs. Tanner wrote her autobiography in 1941, the last year of her life, and for years very few copies were to be found outside the family circle. Fortunately, Mr. Dale Morgan recognized *A Mormon Mother* as far more important than a private narrative and urged this general publication, and one easily recognizes that although the narrative is, indeed, personal, it is also an excellent microcosmic picture of Mormon life in transition, as it moved from pioneer settlement to modern metropolis, from a tight, self-contained and all embracing community to a disunifying cosmopolitan world, from childlike faith to disturbing intellectual inquiry.

Annie Clark was born in 1864 in Farmington, Utah, the second child of her father's second wife, and the sense of being second seemed to plague her all her life. Hence, her chief ambition appears to have been to make her children front runners. Her father, Ezra T. Clark, was a pioneer who had known the Prophet Joseph personally, who was intimately acquainted with contemporary Church leaders, and who stood for immovable faith and loyalty in his Church/community positions. He served several missions for the Church, and it was on one such mission to England in 1856 that he met Susan, the girl who was to become his second wife and Annie's mother. Ezra lived with his first wife, "Aunt Mary," but Susan and her children were reasonably well cared for and properly respected, living in a pleasant, adequate house across the street from Ezra and Mary's larger home.

It is obvious that Annie looked upon her father not only with respect, but with awe. She loved him and acknowledged that he demonstrated his love for her, but their relationship was always somewhat distant, more a discipleship on Annie's part than tenderness. But with her mother, Annie had a very close union. As the oldest daughter in her mother's family, Annie worked closely with her mother and became a kind of partner with her, acting as assistant household manager and often as adjutant mother to the younger children. It was out of these experiences that Annie, in retrospect, saw her mother as having been less than fairly treated, not simply by her father, but more correctly, according to her view, by the system in which they lived. Susan had come from a refined home in England, and Annie thought it unfair that the duties of a new-settlement farm wife had been thrust upon her. She also resented her father's acknowledgement of a pecking-order in the family and her mother's consequent secondary and semi-neglected position. These adverse feelings, however, seem the reflections of a mature woman lamenting her own life more than the sympathy of a young girl for her mother. As a child and young woman Annie apparently accepted their lifestyle as normal and satisfactory.

Naturally eager for knowledge, Annie was allowed to go to Brigham Young Academy in 1882-3 to study religion. There a visiting professor, Joseph Marion Tanner—against the wishes of Karl G. Maeser—soon began to show her special attention. It is evident that Annie was not particularly attracted to him romantically, but she deemed it almost a sin to refuse an opportunity to marry in polygamy, especially just then when the Edmunds-Tucker Act had recently been passed and many Mormons took a defiant pride in adhering to "the Principle." Obtaining a *reluctant*, semi-approval from her father she married "Mr. Tanner," as she stiffly refers to him in her autobiography, in the Endowment House in 1883. Even taking into account that the law forbade Joseph Tanner from openly acknowledging Annie as his wife, there seems to have been a curious and unusual coolness between them from the start. Mr. Tanner made appointments and promises to visit his new wife and, without troubling to cancel or change them, simply neglected to show up. But, frankly, they seemed to have little in common even when they were together. Expressions of Annie's resentment are visible early in the account of their mar-

riage, but so, it must be pointed out, are Mr. Tanner's. He apparently felt that she was too self-centeredly demanding and not understanding and appreciative enough of his problems and projects—of which he seems always to have had a superabundance.

As the children were born, they created an even sharper point of contention between the couple. Annie, ever hungry for education, wanted her children to be well-schooled. Strangely enough, Professor Tanner, the popular, professional teacher, didn't share her sentiments. He thought it more important that the children help the family financially than that they go to school.

With such diversity of attitudes and temperaments, it was almost inevitable that the marriage should collapse. There was no divorce, only Mr. Tanner's announcement that she could no longer look to him for support. Their separation did not mean the dissolution of all family ties; the children were often with their father on the Canadian farm, and even Annie seems not to have gotten over her admiring fondness for an obviously unusual and intelligent man. Some of Annie's tenderest expressions of sympathy toward her husband came after their separation. For example, she was genuinely offended by the chilly attitude shown her husband by Church leaders whom he had served so loyally when Joseph Tanner persisted in obeying "the Principle," practicing polygamy, after the Church had forbidden the practice. She frequently evidenced a great pride in his educational accomplishments and in his influential connections, and—although the chapter entitled "Mr. Tanner's Death" is a short one—it is clear that Annie Clark Tanner retained some fondness for her estranged husband to the end. She was very grieved to learn that he had died all alone in Canada, but when she learned that he had died peacefully, her first thought was, "Surely the Lord loved him."

A Mormon Mother is the story of a brave and courageous woman whose energy, determination and goals helped her to raise a remarkable family, a family with many front-runners. It is the story of a woman forced to struggle against the hardships of poverty, against the legal witch hunts which plagued Mormon wives who lived on the "underground," against a husband who didn't share her ambitions for her children,

against sickness, death, and separation. But mostly it is the story of a woman struggling against herself. It is a glimpse into one woman's journey from what she herself regarded as a naively simplistic faith, to what most readers will detect as an almost equally naive doubt, and finally to what appears to have been a peaceful and happy resolution at the end. Her big battle was with polygamy, and her primary adversary was her husband. Her triumphs over both seem just and overdue, and the reader is inclined to view Annie Clark Tanner as her obviously devoted son Obert does, as a tragic heroine who managed to capture a bit of poetic justice in her life before it ended. But a suspicion keeps lurking in the back of the reader's mind: can we depend upon all of her evaluations? Probably not. Cold objectivity would be simply too much to ask. It is true that "history is always written by the survivors," but it would be interesting to hear Mr. Tanner's version of the story.

As heretofore, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY STUDIES is to be a voice for the community of Latter-day Saint Scholars. Contributions dealing with LDS thought, history, theology, and related subjects will receive first priority.

BYU STUDIES is a serious venture into the study of the correlation of revealed and discovered truth. Dedicated to the conviction that the spiritual and the intellectual are complementary avenues of knowledge, BYU STUDIES welcomes articles from all fields of learning. They should be written for the informed nonspecialist rather than the specialized reader in the technical language of the field. Creative work—poetry, short fiction, drama—are also welcomed.

Except for unusual cases, *contributions should not exceed 4,000 words* (approximately 15 double-spaced, typewritten pages). Manuscripts should conform to the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style*, and footnotes should be placed on a separate page at the end of the article.

Each author will receive 20 off-prints and three copies of the number in which his contribution appears.

Send manuscripts to Brigham Young University, Dr. Charles D. Tate, Jr., Editor, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY STUDIES, 283 JKBA, Provo, Utah 84601.

SUBSCRIBER NOTICE

Subscription is \$7.00 for four numbers; \$12.00 for eight numbers; and \$16.00 for twelve numbers. Single numbers are \$2.00. The rate to bona fide students and missionaries is \$5.60 for four numbers. All subscriptions begin with the current issue unless subscriber requests otherwise. Send subscriptions to Brigham Young University Press, Marketing Division, 205 UPB, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602.

If you're moving, PLEASE let us know four weeks before changing your address. A Change-of-Address Postcard available at all Post Offices, sent in advance, will aid us in getting your magazine to you promptly. Your courteous compliance with this request will help us to solve a serious and costly problem.

Brigham Young University Studies is being listed in *Current Contents: Behavioral, Social and Management Sciences*



THE GRAND UNTERRIFIED "LIBERAL" REMNANT OF THE "NEW MOVE," AS IT APPEARS WHEN IT "WALKS DAT BROADWAY DOWN." HISTORICO-LITTER-AIRY MOTTOES, CONSPICUOUS IN THE PROCESSION, EMBLEMATIC OF THE SUCCESS OF THE PARTY!

GRAND PRELIMINARY MEETING OF THE UNTERRIFIED "LIBERAL" REMNANTS OF THE NEW MOVE!

TERRIBLE THINGS IN THE LAND OF HAM AND WONDERFUL THINGS BY THE RED SEA!

INCREDIBLE PREPARATION FOR THE FORTH COMING FORTH!!

The New Move building not being (like the New Move itself) finished, the Rev. *Planchette Harrassing* moved that this meeting be held in the "Dobie Yard," all in favor of this move, say *aye*. As the dust was blowing boisterously, the eyes had it.

Argentiferous Joseph, of literary notoriety, then arose and wished to know why the wealthy members of the Move had not turned out on this suspicious occasion.

Br. Sourberry moved that parties making irrelevant remarks be themselves turned out.

Deacon Paris rose to a point of order, he didn't like to see a bad spirit prevail. He had come on business. There were several there owing on subscription to the *Tribune*; two bits a weak. If the meeting had been opened by prayer, this wouldn't have happened—it was never too late to mend. He would take the liberty of calling upon *Br. Sourberry* to invoke a blessing on the proceedings.

Br. Sourberry remarked that he'd see *Br. Paris* and the assembled multitude d——d first, and then he wouldn't, and he continued to speak in a very spirited manner for some time.

Br. Goodboy said it was eminently desirable that peace should prevail, he sincerely trusted that no blasphemous language would be allowed to profane the ground on which they stood, for it was holy. *Br. Sourberry* remarked that it was rather *holy* where the *adobies* were taken out.

Br. Harrassing stated that he had just been consulting spirits of the departed who reside in the circumambient atmospheric air through the medium of the *Planchette*, and that that distinguished old patriot *Benedict Arnold* had declared that he greatly feared the patriotic spirit of "'76" was dying out; the New Move disciples of *Planchette* and *Tom Paine* should put their heads and purses together and celebrate the forth coming forth regardless of expense.

Br. Silcery said the foregoing suggestion of our departed brother, suited his feelings, he motioned that 2 bits worth of fire-crackers be purchased at his store, to be used exclusively for the Celebration of the Fourth.

Br. Stiggins moved that each individual pay for what crackers he used excepting the butter crackers, which the committee on Finance were expected to furnish, together with a sufficiency of *Vinegar's Walking Bitters*, to wash them down.

Br. Kamp said if the aforesaid 2 bits worth of fire-crackers were purchased, he wanted to know who was going to pay for them. It required funds to make purchases and he in behalf of the Liberal party objected to squandering these large sums so recklessly. Why not buy 20cts. worth of striped candy red, white and blue. It would be very emblematic and eminently suitable not to mention the fact that he could furnish it at his candy stand.

One of the brethren here threw out an insinuation that *Br. Kamp* was in the habit of sucking his candy sticks in order to make them bright and saleable.

(Just at this juncture *Br. Kamp* requested the privilege of a few moments private conversation with the last speaker, which was granted. After a few rapid passes with their mauleys they folded each other in a loving embrace and rolled over into a vacant frog pond convenient to the stand.)

Br. A. moved that *Brs. Stricknine* and *Flaxwell* be appointed a committee of 2 to wait on *Prest. Grant* so soon as he arrives and use their influence with him to have the expenses of the *Liberal Party* liquidated out of the secret service fund. (*Cheers and cries of that's the ticket! you bet yer life!*)

Brother Goodboy then moved to erase the word fire-crackers in the bill of expenses, and insert (his) *Rocky Mountain Bitters*.

He also moved that the expense incurred by the Liberal party in hiring a *Sawyer* to remodel their platform be included under the head of sundries.

Br. Harrassing did not wish the word "head" to appear in the minutes, and suggested that our friends the Chinese and the Digger Indians be cordially invited to participate in the festivities of the occasion.

Br. Sourberry objected—"there were enough *Chinamen* in the outfit already."

Br. Wms. wished to know whether the New Move Militia and Sunday Schools would turn out in the procession?

Br. Sourberry thought they would—in a horn.

They then unanimously voted for the following committees, without a dissenting voice:

Committee on Organization and Procession:—*Gen. Charles Moore*.

Committee on Printing:—*Eds. of "Peep O'Day" and "Diogenes."*

Committee on Finance:—*Br. Skeesicks and Br. Helrose*.

The Committee on Procession ordered that the company should be led off,

1st.—By "the piper that played before Moses," closely followed by *Elias* with the subscription books of the "Peep O'Day."

2d.—A large *Planchette*, the emblem of the Spiritists.

3.—The last No. of *Diogenes* before he deceased.

4th.—The *Minors*.

5th.—*Tom Paine* on a bust.

6th.—The Methodist minister with a large bottle of *Paine-Killer*.

Just at this juncture, the proprietor of the yard made his appearance on the scene of action, and with a few well directed bricks adjourned the meeting, *sign ye die*.

In-Swears to Correspondents.

What is the title of the doctrine taught by the apostles of the New Move? And who was the editor of "Diagonies"?

We believe it is termed "the belief of the unbelievers."

The son of the *Bond* woman.

DICK TATOR inquires why the leaders of the New Move object to their little flock reading the "*Keepapitchinin*?"

It is simply a piece of bigotry and religious intolerance.

BR. DWYER says he sells a great many *Keepapitchinin* papers to the New Movers, why is it?

The reason is that it is really a New Move paper; we intended it more particularly for the New Move.

A. T. POT says, "I have been very much exercised in regard to religion since I visited camp meeting, and wish to know how I can receive a spirit communication?"

The way our spirit friends receive them is in a horn.