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The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.

(D&C 130:22)
The Textual Development of D&C 130:22 and the Embodiment of the Holy Ghost

Ronald E. Bartholomew

The Christian debate over the nature of Christ’s body began in the first century A.D. Although the focus of this debate was the issue of monotheism versus polytheism, it also included the corporeal versus incorporeal nature of God. An example that epitomizes this portion of the debate can be found in the statement of Cerinthus, a man trained in Egypt who propounded that the man Jesus and the divine Christ were two separate entities. He taught that the Christ, or the divine spirit, descended upon Jesus in “bodily shape” (Luke 3:22) after he was baptized. The spirit of the divine Christ thus gave the mortal Jesus the power of God to perform miracles and to declare the will of the Father. In regard to the sufferings of the Atonement, Cerinthus taught that the Christ left the mortal Jesus before the Passion. Therefore, it was the mortal Jesus who suffered and died. Meanwhile, the Christ remained untouched by the mortal suffering recorded in the Gospels.

Another school of thought was that of the Docetists. They believed that physical matter was inherently evil and that Christ was a divine being; therefore, Jesus only “appeared” to have a mortal body, for it was an illusion. As historian Craig Ostler has noted, “These explanations were not made by apostles but by theologians who used the philosophies of Greece, mingled with apostolic teachings.”1 To resolve the dispute over the nature of the Godhead, Constantine was instrumental in

Several years ago, while poring over *The Words of Joseph Smith* by Ehat and Cook, I discovered discrepancies between the text of what eventually became D&C 130:22, as recorded by William Clayton and transmitted by Willard Richards, and the canonized text in the Doctrine and Covenants. Since this pertained to something as foundational to our doctrine as the way the nature of one member of the Godhead was understood, I couldn’t help but wonder how the transformation had occurred. After I asked members of the Joseph Smith Papers Project who were working on these texts about these changes, I still had questions about the processes involved in these revisions, and so I presented my inquiry to one of the editors of *Words of Joseph Smith*, Andrew F. Ehat. He assured me that he knew from a personal communication between himself and Elder Bruce R. McConkie that members of the Scripture Committee responsible for the 1981 edition of the scriptures were aware of these discrepancies, but there had been a decision to leave the text as it had been canonized in the D&C (obviously). While I accepted these various responses to my inquiries, my mind still raced to understand the complexities of the transformation of the text from its original recording to its present state. In response to a call for papers for the 2011 Mormon Scholars in the Humanities Conference regarding “embodiment,” I decided to research and write a paper on the LDS conception of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost as it related to the original and revised text of D&C 130:22. The result was the forerunner to this paper. When Professor John W. Welch heard my paper, he invited me to submit it for publication to *BYU Studies Quarterly*. The project involved two years of trips to the archives in the LDS Church History Library, much research, and multiple revisions. I hope the reader will enjoy traveling along this path of discovery with me.
calling the Council of Nicaea, the first of the great ecumenical councils, in AD 325. The creeds that emerged from this and subsequent councils resulted in the ecumenical doctrine of the Trinity. These creeds attempted to establish monotheism and the incorporeal nature of the Godhead as standardized Christian doctrine, which they have been from the fourth century to present. Most interestingly, despite the many differences between various Christian denominations, the doctrine of the Trinity is the point upon which many of them agree.

In contrast, one of the most distinguishing characteristics of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been its rejection of this ideology of Christianity. In fact, on June 16, 1844, just eleven days before his martyrdom, Joseph Smith pointedly declared, “I have always and in all congregations when I have preached it has been the plurality of Gods. It has been preached for 15 years. I have always declared God to be a distinct personage, Jesus Christ a separate and distinct personage from God the Father, and the Holy Ghost was a distinct personage and a Spirit: and these three constitute three distinct personages and three Gods.”

Despite the fact the Joseph Smith boldly asserted that this concept of the Godhead was what he had “always and in all congregations . . . preached for 15 years,” the debate among LDS scholars regarding when and how this doctrine was known and accepted by early Latter-day Saints has gone on for decades. Rather than continue that debate, this paper will

---

2. Joseph Smith, Address, June 16, 1844, Thomas Bullock report, in The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo Discourses of the Prophet Joseph, comp. and ed. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980; Orem, Utah: Grandin Book, 1991), 378, spelling and punctuation corrected; citations refer to the Grandin edition. The uncorrected text reads, “I have allways—& in all congregats. when I have preached it has been the plurality of Gods it has been preached 15 years—I have always decld. God to be a distinct personage—J.C. a sep. & distinct pers from God the Far. the H.G. was a distinct personage & or Sp & these 3 constit. 3 distinct personages & 3 Gods.”

focus primarily on the historical development of the actual canonization of these doctrines as found in Doctrine and Covenants section 130, verse 22—with particular regard to the embodiment of the Holy Ghost. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of recorded teachings regarding the embodiment of the Holy Ghost prior to the Nauvoo era, excepting the single Book of Mormon inference in 1 Nephi 11:11, denoting the anthropomorphic nature of the spirit body of the Holy Ghost.4

While Joseph’s teachings regarding the embodiment of the Father and the Son have drawn criticism from Christians who base their perceptions of the embodiment of the Godhead on the creeds, the idea that the Father and the Son have tangible bodies of flesh and bone is still less enigmatic than the description of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost. The text of D&C 130 is relatively congruent regarding the embodiment of the Father and the Son when considering verse 3, which explicitly states that “the idea that the Father and the Son dwell in a man’s heart is an old sectarian notion, and is false,” thus emphasizing the idea in verse 22 that they have tangible bodies of flesh and bone, and therefore would not be able to dwell in a man’s heart. However, verse 22 goes on to state that the Holy Ghost is also “a personage,” but “of Spirit,” and his not having a tangible body of flesh and bones like the Father and the Son enables him to dwell “in us.” This notion of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost is further complicated when we consider Joseph’s later teachings


4. It is important to note that there is not universal agreement on the interpretation of 1 Nephi 11:11. For example, James E. Talmage interprets the “Spirit of the Lord” as the Holy Ghost in Articles of Faith (Salt Lake City: LDS Church, 1952), 159–60. Of this, Sidney B. Sperry noted that while there is not agreement on whether or not the phrase “Spirit of the Lord” refers to the premortal Christ or the Holy Ghost, he indicated that he not only agreed with Elder Talmage but wished he could convince others to as well, explaining his position and giving an explanation for the opposing sentiment in Sidney B. Sperry, Book of Mormon Compendium (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1968), 117–18.
that “there is no such thing as immaterial matter. All spirit is matter, but it is more fine or pure, and can only be discerned by purer eyes” (D&C 131:7), suggesting that while the Holy Ghost’s body is not comprised of flesh and bones, it is still composed of tangible matter. Therefore, it is not surprising that since the 1850s, this enigmatic phraseology has led to general disagreement among LDS Church leaders and scholars regarding the exact meaning of the final sentence of D&C 130:22, “Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” What makes this even more interesting is the fact that the portion of the canonized text in D&C 130:22 describing the embodiment of the Holy Ghost has undergone multiple revisions from its inception, which are depicted in the chart below.

In this paper, I will examine the historical development of these textual modifications and will argue that each stage of the formulation of the final text brought it into more complete conformity with other scriptural passages in the LDS canon. Furthermore, despite the general disagreement among LDS Church leaders and scholars regarding the literal or figurative interpretation of that last sentence, the revised text still retains Joseph Smith’s original teachings to Orson Hyde on April 2, 1843, regarding the nature of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost.

**Textual Development of D&C 130:22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date text was recorded or published</th>
<th>Persons responsible for text or modifications to text</th>
<th>Text (modifications in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2, 1843</strong></td>
<td>Text: Joseph Smith Clerk: William Clayton</td>
<td>“The Holy Ghost is a personage, and a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometime between April 2, 1843, and February 4, 1846</strong></td>
<td>Clerk: Willard Richards</td>
<td>“the Father has a body of flesh &amp; bones as tangible as mans the Son also, but the Holy Ghost is a personage of spirit, —and a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 27, 1854</strong></td>
<td>Text: George A. Smith Clerk: Thomas Bullock Approved: Brigham Young and Jedediah M. Grant</td>
<td>“The Father has a body of flesh &amp; bones as tangible as man’s; The Son also; but The Holy Ghost is a personage of Spirit, &amp; a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 1854</td>
<td>Clerk: Leo Hawkins</td>
<td>“The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; The Son also; but the Holy Ghost is a personage of Spirit;” (the rest of what he wrote on July 31 was erased on August 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August 3, 1854     | Text: Brigham Young, Jedediah M. Grant, and George A. Smith  
                   | Clerk: Leo Hawkins                                                       | “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones but is a personage of Spirit; were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” |
| July 9, 1856       | Deseret News Copy Editor        | “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit; were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” |
| November 13, 1858  | Millennial Star Copy Editor     | “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” |
| 1876 and 1879      | Orson Pratt                     | “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” (No modifications) |
| 1921 and later      | Heber J. Grant and a committee of six members of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles | “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” |
Early converts’ understandings of the embodiment of the Godhead varied from the canonized text of D&C 130:22, primarily because their paradigm of the nature of the Godhead was likely the result of their Protestant roots, which were typically connected to creedal pronouncements. This provided ample teaching opportunities for the Prophet Joseph Smith. It was in one such setting that the revelation now known as Doctrine and Covenants 130:22 was originally given. The historical development of this text can be more easily understood if the processes involved in those changes are examined chronologically.

1. April 2, 1843. Joseph Smith was in Ramus, Illinois, presiding at a stake conference. He was accompanied by his scribe, William Clayton, and Apostle Orson Hyde. During his morning address, Elder Hyde taught that “it is our privilege to have the Father and Son dwelling in our hearts.” In between conference sessions Joseph said, “Elder Hyde I am going to offer some corrections to you,” to which Elder Hyde replied, “They shall be thankfully received.” William Clayton was present to hear Joseph’s corrections of Elder Hyde’s scriptural commentary and recorded them in his journal: “In correcting two points in Er Hydes discourse [Joseph] observed as follows, . . . ‘When the savior appears we shall see that he is a man like unto ourselves. . . . Also the appearing of the father and the son in John c 14 v 23 is a personal appearing and the idea that they will dwell in a mans heart is a sectarian doctrine and is false.’” Clayton also noted that Joseph said the following in reference to the third member of the Godhead: “The Holy Ghost is a personage, and a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.”

8. Two different transcriptions of William Clayton’s diary entry for April 2, 1843, one by James B. Allen and the other by Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook, agree precisely: “The Holy Ghost is a personage, and a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.” Although Allen sometimes rephrased Clayton’s diary entries in his own words, in this instance it is apparent that he did not, in that both of these transcriptions are exactly the same and both are in quotation marks. See James B. Allen, Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 122; and
2. Sometime between April 2, 1843, and February 4, 1846. Willard Richards, who was not present, later recorded the following text (fig. 1) into the diary he was keeping for Joseph Smith, apparently utilizing William Clayton’s diary as source material: “the Father has a body of flesh & bones as tangible as mans the Son also, but the Holy Ghost is a personage of spirit,—and a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.” The first phrase is not in any of the three transcript copies of William Clayton’s diary and was added either by Richards, possibly


9. Joseph began dictating this history to his scribes on June 11, 1839. By the time of his death, a draft of his history was completed up to August 5, 1838, and by the time Willard Richards and his clerk Thomas Bullock packaged the historical documents in their possession on February 4, 1846, in preparation to leave Nauvoo, the draft manuscript was 1,485 pages in length and included the Prophet’s history up to March 1, 1843, just one month short of the D&C 130 material under consideration, which was dated April 2, 1843. For an accurate and thorough review of the chronology of these events, see Howard C. Searle, “Authorship of the History of Joseph Smith,” BYU Studies 21, no. 1 (1981): 114–17.

10. Joseph Smith, Address, April 2, 1843, Joseph Smith Diary kept by Willard Richards, in Ehat and Cook, Words of Joseph Smith, 173. This is not the only instance of Joseph Smith’s words, as originally recorded in diaries or manuscript books, being revised later. For example, the revelations now published as Doctrine and Covenants sections 24–27, 68, 83, and 107 all underwent major textual revisions between the time of original recording and later publication in the Book of Commandments or subsequent editions of the Doctrine and Covenants. For details regarding these textual changes see Lyndon W. Cook, The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985); Kurt Eliason, Historical Context of the Doctrine and Covenants and Other Modern Scriptures, Volume 1 (Dallas: Kurt Eliason, 2011); or Stephen E. Robinson and H. Dean Garrett, A Commentary on the Doctrine and Covenants, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005). All of these changes were directed by Joseph Smith. However, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not Joseph directed the addition of the line “the Father has a body of flesh & bones as tangible as mans the Son also, but” afterward when Willard Richards was transferring the contents of William Clayton’s diary to the journal he was keeping for Joseph Smith. 11. See note 8.
in collaboration with Clayton,\textsuperscript{12} or under the direction of Joseph Smith, or was missed when Clayton was copying from his notes into his diary. Importantly, neither the William Clayton Diary nor the Joseph Smith Diary kept by Willard Richard implies the current phrasing of D&C

\textsuperscript{12} I am indebted to Andrew F. Ehat, who discovered that William Clayton may have shared Joseph's corrections of Elder Hyde's address with Willard Richards on April 5, 1843. Ehat has formulated the hypothesis that Clayton and Richards may have even collaborated on the construction of the additional statement “the Father has a body of flesh & bones as tangible as mans the Son also,” based on William Clayton's recollections of Joseph Smith's teachings, while he was sharing the April 2, 1843, diary entries with Richards. This supposition is based on an entry in the William Clayton Diary, dated April 5, 1843 (Wednesday), which states, “At the office near the temple also at prest. Josephs office, looking at a lot for Adam Lightner and giving Dr Richards history.” Ehat's unpublished notes in possession of author.
130:22: “Were it not so [that the Holy Ghost is a spirit], the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.”

3. **July 27, 1854.** By this date, more than a decade later, Willard Richards had passed on, the Saints had relocated to the Salt Lake Valley, and George A. Smith had been called to replace Richards as the Church Historian, with the charge to continue assembling, editing, and eventually publishing *The History of Joseph Smith.* Subsequently, the remainder of Joseph Smith’s history of the Church was completed under the direction of George A. Smith with the help of several clerks, as well as Wilford Woodruff, who was called as Assistant Church Historian in 1856. The Church Historian’s Office Journal indicates that on July 27, 1854, the portion of the draft that included the text that would eventually become D&C 130:22 was recorded by Thomas Bullock as dictated by George A. Smith and was later heard and read by Brigham Young the same day. The text that emerged (fig. 2), with slight variations, reflects the union of the text from the Clayton and Richards diaries:

---


14. Initially, George A. Smith, with the help of his clerks, collected various documents from which the history would be drawn; these were assembled into scrapbook form. See Church Historian’s Office Journal, vol. 17, CR 1001, pp. 17, 22, 62, and insert 1-8, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as Church Historian’s Office Journal). Thomas Bullock kept this journal, however, and at the request of the senior Brethren, he was absent from the Church Historian’s Office May 4–June 2, 1854, while attending them on an excursion to “the south” part of the territory. His responsibilities on this trip were keeping the camp journal and detailed odometer readings. As a result, he took the Church Historian’s Office Journal with him, and it actually includes these details of the trip instead of the occurrences in the Church Historian’s Office during this time period (see Church Historian’s Office Journal, vol. 17, 22–57). In his absence, one of the other clerks kept records of the happenings in the Church Historian’s Office, and these eight pages were inserted in the Church Historian’s Office Journal between pages 24 and 25 of volume 17. According to the composite journal kept by Thomas Bullock and the inserted pages, work on the scrapbook, which was commissioned by George A. Smith on April 28, 1854, was conducted on the following dates: May 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16–20, 22–31, and June 1, 2, and 6, 1854.


16. Church Historian’s Office Journal, 112. This is an extremely important page in the Church Historian’s Office Journal, because it is the only entry indicating that they worked on the “history for April [18]43,” as well as recording that “President Young calls at noon and hears and read history.”
“The Father has a body of flesh & bones as tangible as man’s; The Son also; but The Holy Ghost is a personage of Spirit, & a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.” Importantly, the source of this document appears to be the Clayton diary, in that the words “The Father has a body of flesh & bones as tangible as man’s; The Son also; but”—which, as has been shown, find their origin in Joseph Smith’s diary kept by Willard Richards—were inserted above the wording contained in the Clayton diary, “The Holy Ghost is a personage of Spirit, & a person cannot have the personage of the H. G. in his heart.”

4. **July 31, 1854.** On July 1, 1854, Leo Hawkins began copying draft manuscript pages 1486 through 1547, as they were approved by members of the First Presidency, into Manuscript Book D-1. Although he was able to do the actual copying in twelve working days, he did not finish it until August 21, 1854—fifty-two calendar days after he began. Hawkins’s typical working hours were from about 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and he copied on average five pages per day. At this rate, the D&C 130:22 text was likely recorded on working day six, which would have been July 31, 1854, four days after it was approved by the First Presidency. On this day, Hawkins apparently copied the text directly from the draft manuscript, making only one change—replacing an ampersand (which looks more like a simple “+” sign in the draft manuscript) with “and.”

17. History of the Church, Draft Manuscript, Church History Library.
5. **August 3, 1854.** Three days later, on August 3, the Church Historian’s Office Journal indicates, “Thomas Bullock and Leo Hawkins examining Manuscript D history. George A. Smith hearing it. Jedediah M. Grant in office in forenoon hearing history read for publication. George A. Smith revising. President Young in office from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. hearing history read and felt satisfied with our labors.”19 It is likely that this is the day this portion of Manuscript Book D-1 was read, heard, and revised with two members of the First Presidency, because it is the only day Leo Hawkins, whose handwriting reflects the changes, was also present when members of the First Presidency were in the office for that purpose.20 The revised text as it appears in its final form in Manuscript Book D-1 (fig. 3) is markedly different from the William Clayton Diary, the Joseph Smith Diary kept by Willard Richards, and the previously approved draft manuscript.21 It reads, “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; The Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones but is a personage of Spirit; were it not so the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” It is apparent, from close examination of this page of Manuscript Book D-1, that Leo Hawkins originally recorded the text in accordance with the approved draft and then inserted the words “has not a body of flesh and bones, but” in between the words “Holy Ghost” and “is a personage of Spirit.” He then erased the words “a person

---

20. The only other day on which portions of Manuscript Book D-1 might have been read to Presidents Young and Grant was August 13, 1854; however, the journal does not specifically indicate that those portions read were from Manuscript Book D-1 (although it is likely). Importantly, the journal does specifically indicate that Leo Hawkins was sick at home with a toothache that day, and since the D&C 130:22 portion of Manuscript D-1, as well as the corrections that were made to it, are in the handwriting of Leo Hawkins, the possibility of the changes being on this day are effectively eliminated. See Church Historian’s Office Journal, 130.
21. The author was not able to obtain images of the William Clayton journal but has images of the Willard Richards journal in his possession. Copies of these images have been provided for examination.
cannot have the personage of the Holy Ghost in his heart,” replacing
them with “were it not so the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” The
erasure is confirmed by the visible smudges and the fact that the blue
lines he was writing on are no longer there.22

6. July 9, 1856. The revised text first appeared in print form, with only slight
variations, on page 1 of the July 9, 1856, edition of the Deseret News under
the title of “History of Joseph Smith. April 1843.” It reads, “The Father
has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also: but the
Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit:
were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.” The only variations
in this text from Manuscript Book D-1 are the lowercase t in “the Son,”
a comma added after “bones,” and the colons that replace the last two
semicolons after the words “Son also” and “personage of Spirit.”

7. November 13, 1858. This text next appeared in print form in the
November 13, 1858, edition of the Millennial Star, also under the title
“History of Joseph Smith,” this time with a significant variation in
punctuation. It reads, “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as
 tangible as man’s; the Son also: but the Holy Ghost has not a body of
flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy
Ghost could not dwell in us.” This text retains the colon that replaced
the semicolon after the words “the Son also,” as in the Deseret News
version; however, it replaces the colon that appeared in the Deseret
News version after the words “personage of Spirit” with a period, mak-
ing the phrase “Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us” a
separate sentence. The 1876 and 1879 editions of the Doctrine and
Covenants retained this exact wording, spelling, and punctuation.

8. 1921 Edition of the Doctrine and Covenants. While this version
retained the same wording and spelling, the colon after the words “Son
also” was replaced by a semicolon, as it was in Manuscript Book D-1;
however, this text retained other changes made later in the Millennial
Star and the 1876 and 1879 editions of the Doctrine and Covenants.

Historical Context of Textual Modifications

While it is difficult to ascertain exactly why the changes noted above
were made, it is important to place these textual variants, which likely

22. History of the Church, August 3, 1854, Manuscript Book D-1, 1511,
Church History Library.
occurred between July 31 and August 3, 1854, in an accurate historical context. What possible insights into this question might be gleaned from attempting to ascertain the understanding of Church leaders, particularly members of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, regarding the nature of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost during the decade of the 1850s when these changes were directed? The following is a summary of some of their key published teachings, in an effort to reconstruct, if possible, their individual and collective understandings.

On January 16, 1853, eighteen months prior to directing the changes in the text of what would eventually become D&C 130:22, Brigham Young is reported to have given an address in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, indicating his understanding and thinking regarding the embodiment and “indwelling” of the Holy Ghost:

We are the temples of God, but when we are overcome of evil by yielding to temptation, we deprive ourselves of the privilege of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, taking up their abode and dwelling with us. . . . Let me ask, what is there to prevent any person in this congregation from being so blessed, and becoming a holy temple fit for the in-dwelling of the Holy Ghost? . . . I would to God that every soul who professes to be a Latter-day Saint was of that character, a holy temple for the in-dwelling of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but it is not so.23

While it is impossible to know exactly what Brigham Young meant by this statement, it is somewhat reflective of Orson Hyde’s sermon that Joseph Smith corrected on April 2, 1843. What is known, however, is that Brigham Young was not in Ramus on April 2, 1843, when Joseph gave those corrections to Orson Hyde’s sermon, and therefore we can conjecture that the only way he could have known about Joseph’s corrections to Orson Hyde’s sermon (according to the chart and timeline above) is if Orson Hyde or someone else present that day had shared Joseph’s corrections to that sermon with Brigham prior to this address in the Salt Lake Tabernacle in 1853. If Brigham Young was aware of Joseph’s corrections to Orson Hyde’s sermon, his teachings quoted above are figurative. If he had not yet been made aware of Joseph’s corrections to this notion, his teachings may have been based on his understanding as of that date.

Interestingly, on February 18, 1855, just six months after Brigham Young directed the changes in the text of what has now become D&C 130:22 and seventeen months prior to the revised text being published in

the *Deseret News*, another interesting discourse on the embodiment and indwelling of the Holy Ghost was given by one of the Twelve. Speaking in the open air on the Temple Block in Salt Lake City, Orson Pratt taught that he was not aware of any revelation stating whether or not the Holy Ghost was a personal being. He stated:

I am inclined to think, from some things in the revelations, that there is such a being as a personal Holy Ghost, but it is not set forth as a positive fact, and the Lord has never given me any revelation upon the subject, and consequently I cannot fully make up my mind one way or the other. . . . Consequently we are left to our own conjecture respecting there being a personal Holy Spirit; but one thing is certain, whether there is personal Holy Spirit or not, there is an inexhaustible quantity of that Spirit that is not a person. This is revealed; this is a fact. And it is just as probable to my mind, that there should be a portion of it organized into a person, as that it should exist universally diffused among all the materials in space.\(^{24}\)

In the same sermon he also asserted that the persons of Heavenly Father and Jesus could not be in more than one place at a time because of their embodiment, but in regards to the Holy Ghost, he said that the “Holy Spirit ‘is in all things, and round about all things,’ holding all things together in every place and part of the earth, and in all the vast creations of the Almighty,”\(^{25}\) and that is how God could be omnipresent. It is clear from his remarks that (a) he was unsure whether or not the Holy Ghost was a personage of Spirit—a personal being, and (b) this allowed him to see the Holy Ghost, as a member of the Godhead, as a fluid spiritual substance dwelling in all things:

But I will not say that the Holy Ghost is a personage, the same as the Father and Son. When I speak of the Holy Spirit, I speak of it as being a substance that is precisely the same in its attributes as those of the Father and Son; I speak of it as a substance that is diffused throughout space, the same as oxygen is in pure water or air, and as being cognizant of every day’s events. And wherever this Holy Spirit is, it possesses the same attributes and the same kind of qualities that the personages of the Father and the Son are possessed of; consequently, the oneness that is here spoken of, must be applied to the attributes, and not to the persons themselves.\(^{26}\)

---

During the next nineteen months, from August 1856 (one month after the text in question was published for the first time in the Deseret News) through March 1857, Orson Pratt published eight pamphlets on the first principles of the gospel while he was serving as president of the European Mission. One of them, titled “The Holy Spirit,” continued on the theme of the previous discourse given at the Temple Block in 1855, complete with detailed descriptions of the fluid nature of the Holy Ghost’s body, which allowed for his literal indwelling in the Saints. However, by this time he had come into contact with the revised text of what would become D&C 130:22, since it had been published in the Deseret News, and he made reference to it, without changing his assertions regarding the fluid nature of the embodiment and literal indwelling of the Holy Ghost:

It has been supposed by some, that the Holy Spirit exists only as a personage in the likeness and form of the personal spirits of the Father and Son, or in the image of the spirits of men which resemble the human tabernacle in shape and magnitude. That such a personal Holy Spirit exists, there can be but little doubt; but to suppose that such person is alone called the Holy Spirit, or that there is not a widely-diffused substance, also called the Holy Spirit, is evidently erroneous, and contrary to what is revealed in the divine oracles.

One personage of the Holy Spirit could not be in two or more places at the same instant; for such a condition is absolutely impossible, for any one person, being, or particle. Therefore, one personage, called the Holy Ghost, could not dwell at the same instant in two or more Saints. If He were in one, He would most certainly be absent from all others. To be in millions of Saints, would require millions of personages of the Holy Ghost, provided that He only exists in the personal form.

But there are many expressions in Scripture which plainly show that the Holy Ghost exists, not only as a person, but as a diffused fluid substance. John the Baptist, in speaking of Jesus, says, “God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.” (John iii. 34.) If the Holy Spirit, which Jesus is represented as not receiving by measure, were a personage, His presence in Jesus could not be considered a greater measure, than His presence in the Saints; but being a fluid substance, a greater quantity or fulness of it was given to Jesus than what was measured out to his disciples. Let it be remembered that the Holy Ghost and Holy Spirit represent the same Holy Substance or Fluid, being two different names for the same thing. . . .

But does not that portion of the substance of the Holy Spirit which dwells in each humble servant of God, assume a personal form while in such tabernacle? Or is it limited in its locality to some particular part of the tabernacle, as the brain or the heart? We answer, that as the gift of the Holy Spirit is, in Scripture, called a baptism, there is no doubt, but that the whole
“inner man” is immersed in this holy Substance: this is still more evident from the scriptural expressions which often represent the disciples of Jesus, as “being full of the Holy Ghost.” These expressions convey the idea that the Holy Ghost, not only dwelt in the brain or in the heart, but in and throughout the whole tabernacle, quickening the human spirit in every limb and joint from the head to the feet: or, in other words, the body which is the temple of the Holy Ghost, was full of this holy Fluid, even as the temple of Solomon was full of the glory of God, when the cloud and fire descended upon it.

But if the body of each Saint is full of the Holy Ghost, it is evident that this holy Substance dwelling in each temple must assume the same shape and magnitude as the temple which it fills. If any one should, by vision, behold the tabernacle of man, filled throughout with this Substance, he would perceive it existing in a personal form of the same size and shape as the human spirit or tabernacle. . . .

But does the Holy Ghost ever exist in or assume a personal form, when separate from the tabernacles of men? We answer, . . . there remains but little doubt, as to the existence also of a personal Being, called the Holy Ghost. . . .

Joseph Smith, the Prophet, says, “The Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a PERSONAGE of Spirit.”— (See History of Joseph Smith, “Deseret News,” Vol. vi. No. 18, p. 137.)

So, while he resolved to his satisfaction the issue of whether the Holy Ghost is a personage of Spirit, quoting the revised text of what eventually became D&C 130:22, he did not change his position on the fluidity of that embodiment or the literal indwelling and omnipresence of that same being. This might be due to the fact that he was not aware of Joseph’s original statement, “a person cannot have the personage of the Holy Ghost in his heart,” because it was replaced in the Deseret News with the revised text “Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us.”

From Brigham Young’s and Orson Pratt’s statements herein quoted, it becomes apparent that these two leaders (particularly Orson Pratt), who were both instrumental in the production of what eventually became Doctrine and Covenants 130:22, may have been able to accommodate the notion of the literal indwelling of the Holy Ghost, despite Joseph Smith’s

April 2, 1843, statement that “the Holy Ghost is a personage, and a person cannot have the personage of the Holy Ghost in his heart.”

It is important to note that several other General Authorities, some of whom were contemporaries of Orson Pratt, as well as those Church leaders who were present when the changes were made, namely Brigham Young, Jedediah M. Grant, and George A. Smith, also understood the phrase “were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us” as figurative and may not have agreed on its meaning. Although possibly Brigham Young, but most assuredly Orson Pratt, may have believed and taught the literal indwelling of the Holy Ghost, it appears that as Joseph Smith’s teachings regarding the Holy Ghost being a “personage of Spirit” were published and then became more well known, the difficulty surrounding the indwelling of a “personage of Spirit” began to be understood in a different way, thus compelling some to believe the statement “were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us” was referring to the spiritual influence that radiates from the Holy Ghost, or administered through the medium of the Light of Christ by the Holy Ghost.

**Exegesis of Textual Modifications**

I have been unable to locate any extant historical evidence that Joseph Smith ever deviated from teaching the plural and anthropomorphic nature of all three members of the Godhead. Thankfully, before his death, he was able to amplify and clarify his teachings regarding not only the literal embodiment of the Father and the Son, but also the nature and status of the Holy Ghost. Regarding the Holy Ghost, Joseph Smith was reported to have taught that “the Holy Ghost is now in a state of Probation” and that he “is yet a Spiritual body and waiting to take to

28. See, for example, Joseph F. Smith, *Gospel Doctrine: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Joseph F. Smith*, comp. John A. Widtsoe (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1977), 60–61; and George Reynolds and Janne M. Sjodahl, *Commentary on the Book of Mormon*, 7 vols., ed. Philip C. Reynolds (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1956), 2:169. Admittedly, Joseph F. Smith did not serve as a counselor to Brigham Young when the changes occurred, but he was a counselor in the First Presidency when section 130 was published in the 1876 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, and he was retained as a counselor to John Taylor when this section was canonized in 1880.

himself a body, as the Savior did or as god did or the gods before them took bodies.”

Importantly, the text that emerges from the revisions of Joseph Smith’s recorded statements given at Ramus, Illinois, on April 2, 1843, not only retained his original teaching regarding the embodiment of the Holy Ghost as a personage of Spirit but accentuated the difference between the Holy Ghost’s body and the bodies of the Father and the Son. In addition, the final portion of the revision, “Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us,” although enigmatic, actually improved upon the Clayton and Richards diary entries in that it brought these teachings into conformity with other scriptural passages from the New Testament and the Book of Mormon that assert the Holy Ghost dwells in us (for example, see 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:16; and Hel. 4:24).

A proper exegesis of Paul’s teaching that “ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,” demonstrates how closely this final revision complies with biblical teachings. The Greek word that has been translated as ye in 1 Corinthians 3:16 and 6:19 is ἐστέ (esté), which is plural. As a result, LDS scholars almost universally agree that the word “temple” referred to in these and other New Testament scriptures referred to a body of believers, or church members as a group, not an individual (hence the use of the plural “ye”). Similarly, just as the

31. See David Paulsen’s excellent treatment of the word “personage” in David L. Paulsen, “The Doctrine of Divine Embodiment: Restoration, Judeo-Christian, and Philosophical Perspectives,” BYU Studies 35, no. 4 (1995–96): 25–27. It is important to note his treatment of the embodiment of the Holy Ghost (pages 17–19 of the same article), but only that his spirit was anthropomorphic and not in regards to the indwelling treated in this article.
32. Even though the scriptural eisegesis or personal application of these teachings has almost universally referred to one’s body, Richard Lloyd Anderson argued, “The King James Version is archaic but often helpful in its precision. In expressing a subject of a sentence, today’s English uses ‘you’ for one person or for many, whereas, ‘ye are the temple of God’ translates the Greek plural form; the Corinthians collectively were referred to as God’s temple here. This is not the analogy of the body as a temple.” Richard Lloyd Anderson, Guide to Acts and the Apostles’ Letters (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999), 39. He also noted, “Usually the Church is the temple of God. The members (‘ye’, older plural English for the plural Greek) are ‘God’s building’ (1 Cor. 3:9), with Christ its foundation (1 Cor. 3:11), or in summary, ‘the Temple of God’ (1 Cor. 3:16).” Richard Lloyd Anderson, Understanding Paul (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990), 86. Comparable
“ye” evoked by Paul is plural and the word “temple” refers to a body of believers, the word “us” in D&C 130:22 is also plural—suggesting that the Holy Ghost dwells in “us” as a body of believers, not in our individual temples, or bodies. Significantly, this retains Joseph Smith’s original correction to Orson Hyde regarding the embodiment of the three members of the Godhead, which meant not only that “a person cannot have the personage of the [Holy Ghost] in his heart,” but also that “the idea that [the Father and the Son] will dwell in a mans heart is . . . false.”

Although it is not possible to know if this interpretation is what was originally intended by those making the revisions to Joseph Smith’s teachings of April 2, 1843, it does illustrate how these changes helped bring those teachings in line with other scriptures, while still retaining the original intent of the corrections Joseph Smith made to Orson Hyde’s sermon on April 2, 1843. In other words, this exegesis shows that the phrase “Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us” rather than referring to the literal indwelling of the Holy Ghost in each individual Saint, which Joseph Smith’s teachings indicate is not possible, actually refers to the fact that the Holy Ghost dwells in “us” as a body of Saints, or in the Church membership as a whole.

Dr. Ronald E. Bartholomew (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) has been a religious educator for thirty years and has held faculty, visiting faculty, or adjunct faculty positions at BYU–Provo, BYU–Salt Lake, BYU–Idaho, and the Orem University LDS Institute of Religion. He has published scholarly articles in academic journals in the United States and Europe and has written several chapters in various published volumes. His research interests include nineteenth-century missiology in Victorian England (nonurban areas) as well as various topics in ancient scripture and LDS Church history. He became interested in the textual development of D&C 130:22 while working as a visiting professor in the BYU Department of Ancient Scripture, and this research eventually led him to the archives in the LDS Church History Library. He is deeply indebted to Andrew F. Ehat, one of the volume editors for the Joseph Smith Papers project, for his invaluable assistance in acquiring access to documents related to this research as well as input on the research and writing of this article.

Certification and Signaling
The Importance of Markets and What Makes Them Work

J. Michael Pinegar

BYU Studies has a long history of publishing the annual lecture given by the recipient of the Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Award, BYU’s highest faculty honor. And so it is with great pleasure that BYU Studies Quarterly publishes this year’s lecture by Dr. J. Michael Pinegar of the BYU Department of Finance, this year’s Maeser Lecturer. His speech was delivered as a forum address on May 21, 2013, at Brigham Young University.

I am humbled by and grateful for the privilege of speaking to you today. I know my presence here has more to do with others than it does with me. I love BYU. I love my colleagues in the Marriott School and across campus. I love my students. I also love and am grateful for my family.

When I was finishing my PhD at the University of Utah, I met at a national conference with several schools to interview for potential positions at their respective universities. One of those schools was the University of North Carolina. After discussing my, as yet, incomplete dissertation and various other details of my training, one of their faculty members began to study my résumé. After looking at the personal section that listed my wife and five children, he looked at the professional section that listed no publications or substantive teaching experience. Then he looked at his colleagues in the room and said, “I don’t know about the rest of you, but I am much more impressed with this guy’s wife than I am with him.” That comment signaled a quick close to our interview.
Since that interview, I have been blessed with more teaching experience and a number of publications. But if my friend from North Carolina looked at my improved professional résumé today and also met my wife, he would still be more impressed with her than with me. Nevertheless, she insisted that I be the one to speak today. Acknowledging my ultimate responsibility for what I say, I hasten to thank her and other friends whose comments on earlier versions of this talk have improved what you will hear in this forum.

To contextualize what I will say, I will first read a short but important excerpt from the dedicatory prayer of the Provo Temple:

Let that great temple of learning, the Brigham Young University, and all that is associated with it . . . be prospered to the full. Let thy enlightening power rest upon those who teach and those who are taught, that they may “seek learning, even by study and also by faith.”

Bless us, O Lord, that we may “teach one another the doctrine of the kingdom,” as thou hast commanded. May we do so with such diligence that thy holy grace shall attend, so that we may “be instructed more perfectly in theory, in principle, in doctrine, in the law of the gospel, in all things that pertain unto the kingdom of God.”

In this temple of learning known as BYU, all things we teach should be temple worthy and should pertain to the kingdom of God. To reach that goal, we must train the whole soul, both body and spirit (see D&C 88:15). Joseph F. Smith stressed the interconnectedness of our temporal and spiritual well-being when he wrote “that a religion which has not the power to save people temporally and make them prosperous and happy here, cannot be depended upon to save them spiritually, to exalt them in the life to come.” When we understand the interconnectedness between the temporal and the spiritual, the body and the spirit, our learning by study and by faith will instruct us more perfectly in all theory, regardless of our respective disciplines.

In that context, I will now speak on the importance of markets and what makes them work. I will focus first on financial markets and then on labor markets. In discussing labor markets, I will illustrate the concepts I share by referring to former students.

---

I begin my discussion of financial markets by posing a question I have asked my students a few times right after general conference, namely, “Did you hear the prophet give thanks for the market in conference?” Hearing my question, you may wonder, as have some of my students, from what planet I watch conference, if I watch it at all. However, for a few moments, I invite you to consider the implications of the prophet’s expression of gratitude for those who attend conference and for those who broadcast conference to a worldwide audience.

Suppose a conference visitor flies into Salt Lake City on Delta, rents a Toyota at the airport, buys gas at an Exxon-Mobil station, stays in a room in a Marriott hotel, and wears a tie he purchased online through Google. In that process, the visitor employs the services of firms with combined stock market values approaching $900 billion. Members who watch conference at home on their Panasonic TVs on a station carried by Comcast and use Cheerios to keep their kids quiet employ firms with a combined value exceeding $160 billion. Even if members access BYUtv to watch conference on their iPads, they employ a firm that, by itself, has a market value that exceeds $420 billion.3

“So,” you might ask, “why concern ourselves with firms’ market values?” Firms that provide products and services we use daily access financial markets to pay for assets used to produce those products and services. If we live in a home, drive a car, or eat, we benefit from products and services made possible by financial markets. And we benefit more if those markets work well.4

The Church also benefits from markets that work well. Imagine the difference in our conference experience if no Internet providers or cable or satellite companies existed or if no companies produced TVs or other

---

3. Estimates come from Yahoo Finance as of May 3, 2013. Importantly, aggregate stock market values understate the total market values of most publicly traded firms because they do not include the value of other financial instruments that these firms carry on their balance sheets. Moreover, even adjusted market values of public firms underestimate the value of funds provided in financial markets, because they do not include venture capital and other important sources of private funding.

broadcast media. Imagine what would happen to our missionary force if foreign exchange markets failed or if airline and automobile companies and suit manufacturers went out of business for lack of funding.

Actually, airline and automobile companies have failed. At the end of one flight I was on years ago, the captain thanked passengers for flying with his airline because, in his words, “there [were] many bankrupt airlines we could have chosen.” Indeed, after Delta filed for bankruptcy in 2005, four of the top seven U.S. carriers were operating under bankruptcy protection.\(^5\) In no small measure, however, the existence of capital markets enabled Delta and other “failed firms” to correct their difficulties and to continue to operate.

Thus, I say again that you and I and the Church collectively benefit from financial markets.

The benefits to the Church revolve significantly around its mission to share the gospel. In section 58 of the Doctrine and Covenants, verse 9, the Lord speaks of the gathering of Israel as a “supper of the house of the Lord . . . unto which all nations shall be invited.” Verses 10 and 11 indicate that invitations to this supper will be sent first to “the rich and the learned, the wise and the noble,” and then to “the poor, the lame, and the blind.” Joseph Smith, the first to be invited to this supper in this dispensation was neither rich nor well educated. Thus, he may have wondered what the revelation meant when it said the invitation would be sent first to the “rich and the learned.”

One interpretation of these verses, provided by Joseph McConkie and Craig Ostler, is that “the gospel was destined to come forth in a nation that had sufficient natural resources and land to which the scattered remnants of Israel could gather and find means to provide for themselves . . . so that [they] could in turn send forth missionaries by the tens and hundreds of thousands to others.”\(^6\)

My first point today is that we live in that nation and that the development of natural resources here and in other countries is strongly associated with the existence of capital markets. To see this, consider the following graph that depicts the relation between ranked market capitalizations and ranked economic output for the ten countries with


the highest gross domestic product in 2011. The upward sloping line illustrates my point. Countries with higher market capitalizations have higher economic output, on average.

Without delving into the question of causality, I will just assert that, if nothing else, capital markets facilitate economic growth. Niall Ferguson, the Lawrence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, makes this assertion more strongly. Specifically, he states, “The evolution of credit and debt was as important as any technological innovation in the rise of civilization.” He states further that “without the foundation of borrowing and lending, the economic history of our world would scarcely have [gotten] off the ground.”

Given the significance of financial markets, it is important to understand what makes them work. To illustrate that, I will demonstrate what makes them fail by stressing the absence of one key ingredient—reliable information. To do so, I use an adapted version of the Akerlof lemons problem, named for George Akerlof, a corecipient of the Nobel Prize in economics in 2001.

---


Imagine a world in which only two types of used cars exist—high-quality cars worth $1,000 and so-called lemons worth $500. Some dealers sell only high-quality cars; others sell only lemons. No dealers sell both. Moreover, dealers know what kind of cars they sell, but buyers do not. Nor can buyers reliably discern differences in quality because of hidden mechanical problems. Under these conditions, buyers would not pay $1,000 for any car for fear they would be getting a lemon for the price of a high-quality car. Without some means of overcoming this information asymmetry—this gap between what buyers and sellers know—the market would fail because sellers of high-quality cars would withdraw from the market. Significantly, this failure would impose a cost on everyone who wants to buy a used car, now and in the future. Thus, the cost to society would be high.

Two common ways to reduce information asymmetries are certification and signaling. With certification, a reputable third party, such as an independent mechanic, affirms or certifies the quality of the car. With signaling, the seller himself incurs a cost to convey the quality of the car to potential buyers. This signal could come in the form of a warranty that sellers of lemons could not afford because of the poor quality of their cars. Both of these mechanisms alleviate fears of paying for high-quality cars but getting lemons in the used-car market today.

Like the used car example, investors also worry about the quality of the securities they purchase. To be comfortable, they must feel that they are not disadvantaged by information asymmetries. As in the used car market, certification and signaling may help reduce information asymmetries in financial markets. For example, certification is a common justification for accounting audits, bond ratings, the use of investment banks in the security issuance process, and many other institutional practices. Signaling is used to explain stock price movements when firms unexpectedly increase dividends or announce share repurchases or when insiders in initial public offerings choose not to sell their shares.

---

for an extended period of time.\textsuperscript{10} To the extent these and other mechanisms work, financial markets function more efficiently. To the extent they fail, market prices do not reflect the intrinsic value of the underlying assets and markets falter.\textsuperscript{11}

**Labor Markets**

For most of you, certification and signaling in financial markets are new concepts. However, in labor markets you are, or should be, intimately familiar with these concepts, because you are the product about which information must be revealed. You are the product whose value must be certified and signaled.

Indeed, the labor market—the market in which you will be engaged very shortly—was the context in which Michael Spence developed his signaling model that allowed him to share the 2001 Nobel Prize with George Akerlof.\textsuperscript{12} More to the point, attending college was the signal that conveyed the quality of potential employees. Now, you are in college and are creating your signal. What do you want potential employers to know about you? Or, from their perspective, what do they want to know about you?

Warren Buffett—the most famous and successful investor of our time—answered that last question in a speech to students at the University of Florida. Quoting his friend Pete Kiewit, Buffet said a good employee will have three attributes—integrity, intelligence, and energy—and of


\textsuperscript{11} The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends critically upon the incentives of the parties responsible for certifying and signaling value. If those incentives are misaligned, relevant information may be withheld or distorted. For recent discussions of this problem, see Jeffrey N. Gordon, “What Enron Means for the Management and Control of the Modern Business Corporation: Some Initial Reflections,” *University of Chicago Law Review* 69, no. 3 (2002): 1233–50; and Jie He, Jun Qian, and Philip Strahan, “Credit Ratings and the Evolution of Mortgage-backed Securities,” *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 101 (2011): 131–35.

these three, integrity is the most important, because if an employee lacks integrity, the employer wants the employee to be dumb and lazy.\textsuperscript{13}

For a few moments now, I will speak about certification and signaling as they relate to the three qualities Warren Buffett cited. I will substitute the word “initiative” for “energy” and rearrange Buffett’s order of the attributes. I will illustrate the attributes by referring to students I have known at BYU. In this discussion, the few mentioned students represent many more who go unmentioned.

**Integrity**

Several years ago, I was in the Provo Temple where, by chance, I met a former student. When we had a moment to talk, I said, “If I remember correctly, you are a convert to the Church.” He said he was and then related his conversion story.

When this student was twelve, his mom and dad got a divorce. He then moved to Provo with his mom, where they both joined the Church. However, he joined only because his mother did and was, therefore, inactive throughout his teenage years.

After high school, he went to Snow College and then to Idaho State University to play football, but before he began playing at Idaho State, he responded to a prompting to read the Book of Mormon. Responding to that prompting led to a desire to serve a mission. When he announced his desire, his father disowned him, his coach told him he would lose his scholarship, and his mother worried because she could not replace the money from his scholarship to pay for his education. Despite these obstacles, this student served a faithful mission.

About two months before his scheduled release, he received a call from his mother saying some schools were willing to give him a scholarship if he would come home early to play. He told her he loved his mission and would not come home early. Days later, he received a call from Norm Chow, who told him BYU had a scholarship waiting for him after he finished his mission.

This student signaled integrity by making, owning, and accepting the consequences of a difficult decision when he received a witness of the truth. He continued to signal integrity by remaining true to that witness. When

\textsuperscript{13} “Warren Buffett MBA Talk—Part 1,” \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DfuXKpMFUjc}. Peter Kiewit was CEO of the Kiewit Corporation, an employee-owned business and one of the largest and most successful contractors in the world. The firm is headquartered in Omaha, Nebraska.
we met in the temple, he was forty-one years old and had been serving as an officiator for twelve years. He had also served in other callings and was working hard to provide for a young family.

This student is not unlike others I have known. On several occasions, I have received temple ordinances with, and sometimes under the hands of, my students. On one such occasion, my wife and I knelt at the altar with a former student while Gerold Davis, a professor who taught me here in a German class, used his priesthood keys to seal a long-deceased son to long-deceased parents. In linking that family, the temple also tied three generations of my BYU family together.

**Initiative**

Though integrity is indispensable, it is incomplete without initiative. I have written many letters for students in our Masters of Accountancy program who sought admission into law school or a PhD program. Near the top of these letters, I always include a statement about the quality of these students generally, typically using words to this effect: “These students have competed to be admitted into BYU, competed again to be admitted into our undergraduate business program, and competed a third time to be admitted into the Masters of Accountancy program. Each competition becomes increasingly demanding, resulting in a class of bright, highly motivated students.” I then describe individualized signals I have received that justify my assertion that the particular students I am recommending are “highly motivated.”

One such student recently completed his law degree at the University of Virginia. In my class, he was perpetually asking questions, not just to get participation points, but to learn the material. One day, after we had discussed a challenging concept, he asked if I could explain the concept again. I did so. Still not understanding, he looked around at his classmates and asked if they were satisfied with my explanation. He did not mean to be demeaning. He only wanted greater clarity. When I went back to my office, I reflected on our interchange and realized that my explanation had been wrong. I was disappointed and embarrassed by my mistake, but I was grateful for my student’s insistence on understanding the material, because it allowed me to return to class the next period to try to correct the misinformation I had given the period before.

This student also frequently visited my office to ask questions not related to my class. When he was ready to begin his last semester, he asked for guidance on his schedule. He had completed most of his
required classes and had flexibility in his course load. He had also just finished a time-consuming commitment as a member of the tax team that had won the master’s-level national tax competition. His question to me was whether he should take Hal Heaton’s advanced corporate finance class or choose a class in which he could finally relax. My finance colleagues will be amused at that question, because they know Hal’s class is not conducive to relaxation. However, this student took Hal’s class so he could learn from someone students and faculty universally recognize as a challenging but masterful teacher.

The last time I saw this student was at his wedding reception. He got married between his second and third years of law school to a beautiful young lady who is his equal. The job market for law students at that time was very tight. Many students had difficulty finding internships, but this student had two, both with very good firms. Surely, his genuine and consistent signals of initiative opened doors.

Sometimes we signal initiative more clearly in times of trial than in times of triumph. After a disheartening performance on a midterm, one accounting student came to me a few years ago to see how he could do better in my class. We discussed how a strong performance on the final could replace his midterm score and improve his grade. When he took the final, his score improved so much that his grade moved from a B to an A–.

About a year later, I received a call from a recruiter at whose firm this student had applied for employment. The recruiter wanted to know if I had ever had occasion to tell this student his performance was lacking and, if so, how the student responded to my criticism. I was grateful I could certify that this student did not wait to be told he was underperforming. Rather, he initiated the discussion himself and accepted responsibility for his own improvement. The student received and accepted an offer to work for that firm and eventually also became a recruiter.

**Intelligence**

The final attribute mentioned by Warren Buffett is intelligence. The Doctrine and Covenants says that “the glory of God is intelligence, or in other words, light and truth” (D&C 93:36). Truth is “knowledge of things as they are, as they were, and as they are to come” (D&C 93:24). Though knowledge is integral to intelligence, it lacks glory without light. I repeat, knowledge lacks glory without light.
One reason for that is that light shows us how to use knowledge. Our most significant source of light is the Holy Ghost who, Parley P. Pratt said, “quickens all the intellectual faculties, increases, enlarges, expands, and purifies all the natural passions and affections, and adapts them, by the gift of wisdom, to their lawful use.”¹⁴ Perhaps that “lawful use” was the motivation behind Brigham Young’s charge to Karl G. Maeser “not to teach even the alphabet or the multiplication tables without the Spirit of God.”¹⁵

In a meeting last year with our department, Jim Gordon, assistant to the university president, asked members of our faculty why they came to BYU. Without hesitation, one colleague said he came because of Jim McDonald, in whose econometrics class he had felt the Spirit. My colleague felt the Spirit both in Jim’s teaching and in his own ability to learn. When Jim’s name was mentioned, several members of our finance faculty spontaneously nodded their heads in assent, having shared similar experiences in Jim’s class.

I have also seen my students learn by the Spirit. On one occasion, after I read the answer to a question on a difficult final exam, I emailed the student who wrote the answer and said, “Your essay indicates that you were guided by the Spirit.” This student wrote back and simply said, “How did you know?”

How did I know?

I learned by experience. I learned most poignantly in my PhD program, in which I occasionally felt I was teetering on the precipice of academic extinction. When I received my first paper back in that program, my faculty mentor said my paper read like a trade journal article. He then said, “Once you get your degree, you are welcome to write for trade journals if you want, but to get your degree, you have to learn to write for an academic audience.” He then handed me a chapter from a dissertation written by Roger Clarke, a friend who had graduated from Stanford and who was then a member of the BYU finance faculty. My mentor then told me that the faculty’s goal for me was to learn to write like Roger. When I read Roger’s paper later that day at home, I wept at the disparity between his work and mine.


Later, as I prepared for my qualifying exams, I spent eight hours a day, five days a week, for six to eight weeks reading and summarizing papers we had read in finance seminars in the preceding two years. Each review session began with prayer. When I took the exam, the Spirit brought to memory the things I needed to know to answer the questions with insight. When the mentor who commented on my first-year paper gave me the results of my exam, he told me if he did not know better he would have thought I had received help on the test. The truth is I did receive help. The Spirit helped me to perform far beyond my own capabilities. It “[quickened my] intellectual faculties” and taught me that spiritually and intellectually “it is by grace that [I am] saved, after all [I] can do” (2 Ne. 25:23). That feeling of quickening was what I recognized in my student’s answer.

In my experience, that quickening rarely comes quickly. Nor does it come all at once. Like the Brother of Jared, we must sometimes climb our own Mount Shelem, hew stones out of rock, and then work patiently while we wait to see the hand of the Lord touching those stones “one by one with his finger” (Ether 3:6). However, when we see those stones light up, we can be assured that our knowledge is becoming intelligence.

Sometimes intelligence has little to do with academic training. A year ago, I taught a young man from Madagascar. In 2008, he and his wife flew 1,300 miles to Johannesburg, South Africa, to be sealed in the temple. They were able to make this trip, in part, because of the financial assistance they received from other Malagasy Saints. After they were sealed, they made a goal to attend the temple as often as possible. Two years later, they had finally saved enough for a return trip. About a month before their scheduled departure, four families came to their home in the span of one week to ask for financial help. My student and his wife knew they would not have enough for their temple trip if they helped those families; they also knew that Heavenly Father had enabled them to save the money in the first place. They knew he wanted them to go to the temple, but that he would help the families if he were there. So, they decided to do what he would do. In the words of my student’s wife, “What would have been the point of going to the temple if we didn’t help?”

Miraculously, the Lord then lit the stones my student and his wife had hewn out of their mountain of faith. They checked the airfare again and found the price had gone down by about the same amount as what they had given the four families. Thus, they were able to go to the temple after all.
Of course, the airfare could have gone down even if my student and his wife had not helped. But imagine the difference in their feelings when, in the temple, they recommitted to follow the law of sacrifice, knowing that they had just recently done so without knowing the outcome, rather than waiting to see if they would have enough to help others from an uncertain surplus. The experience taught my student and his wife the temporal value of planning and saving. But it also taught them the spiritual value of being sensitive to the promptings of the Holy Ghost to use what they had the way God wanted them to use it. That way, in their words, God could “bless [them] more so [they could] bless more of his children.”

**Conclusion**

At the beginning of my talk, I mentioned my interview with the University of North Carolina. As you might guess, I did not receive an offer from them. However, I did receive and accept an offer from the University of Iowa. My family and I spent six enjoyable years in Iowa City.

Toward the end of our stay, I was serving as the bishop of our ward. One Sunday, a sacrament meeting speaker discussed how the Lord moves families to accomplish His purposes. Lehi’s family was the illustration in our speaker’s talk; my family was the illustration the Spirit imprinted on my mind. At the time, I was preparing my packet for tenure, but the Lord was preparing me not to get it. When the department chairman told me I would not receive tenure, I was peaceful because the Spirit had already prepared me. BYU had maintained contact with me since I received my PhD, but for various reasons, the time was never right. Now, it was. I interviewed and gratefully accepted the offer to join BYU’s faculty in 1988.

A few months after we arrived here, our oldest daughter came to me and said, “Dad, I know why you didn’t get tenure.” When I asked why, she said it was because she needed a new set of friends. Her friends in Iowa had begun making decisions that influenced her decisions badly and made her feel uncomfortable with the direction she was taking.

Sometime later, I also received a call from the department chairman at the University of Iowa who told me they had made a mistake and asked if I would consider coming back. I do not believe they made a mistake. I believe they did what they thought was best for the University of Iowa at the time. In doing so, they also did what was best for me.

You see, the name “BYU” appears on all my official correspondence. It will also appear prominently on the diplomas you students receive. It
certifies that we all belong to a temple of learning. It reminds us that we must signal values consistent with temple learning, values that invigorate both body and spirit, values of integrity, initiative, and enlightened intelligence.

I have been surrounded here by students and colleagues whose examples in these areas have made me a better person. The Lord has managed my career and my attempts to signal my personal and professional worth much better than I could have on my own. For these tender mercies I am and will always be profoundly grateful.

At the time of this lecture, J. Michael Pinegar (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) was the Joel C. Peterson Professor of Finance. He earned his MBA and PhD from the University of Utah and his BA from BYU. Before joining BYU’s faculty, he taught at the University of Iowa. At BYU, he has served as the Finance Group leader, the chair of the Business Management Department, and in many other assignments at the department, college, and university levels. He has been honored with the Marriott School Outstanding Faculty Award, the Marriott School Outstanding Researcher Award, the Merrill J. Bateman Outstanding Professor Award, and the Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Lecturer Award.
Joseph F. Smith and the Reshaping of Church Education

Scott C. Esplin

From 1901 to 1918, President Joseph F. Smith presided over one of the most expansive eras in the history of Latter-day Saint education, when the Church operated a series of after-school religion classes, private secondary academies, normal colleges, and a university. “The course of the church educational system from 1900 to 1930,” observed historian Thomas G. Alexander, “resembled nothing quite so much as a balloon. Expanding during the period to 1920, it shrank rapidly during the 1920s.”1 Interestingly, though President Smith chaired the Church Board of Education during an era of explosive educational growth, near the end of his presidency he remarked, referring to the high cost of public education in the state of Utah, “I believe that we are running education mad.”2 Responding to this concern, President Smith oversaw policy decisions during his administration that set the stage for the Church’s drastic reduction of the academy system following his death. Ultimately, it was his presidency that supported growth in the Religion Class system and the creation of the released-time seminary program, innovations that reshaped Church education, guiding it toward the supplementary education model it employs today.3 This paper analyzes the educational

---

3. The Religion Class program was instituted in 1890 to provide separate weekday religious instruction for children attending first through ninth grades.
As a parent to young children, I am applying something I learned as a graduate student in BYU’s Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations: there is great value in examining how and what we learn. As the means by which families and societies transmit core knowledge and beliefs to the next generation, education demonstrates what is most important to a people. Much of my time with my family is spent finding ways to help my own children know what I know and love what I love. How I spend my time with them demonstrates what I most value. Within Mormonism, the early revelations of Joseph Smith contained numerous educational directives (see D&C 55, 88, and 93), and educational venues like a schoolhouse in Zion and the Kirtland Temple were among the faith’s first completed structures. While communities including the Latter-day Saints seek to use education to shape society, in many ways educational practices reflect cultural values as much as they influence them.

For these reasons, I find the educational history of the Church during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries particularly insightful. As others have argued, during this period the Church transitioned from its pioneer to its modern era. Educationally, it began the era by isolating itself from outside influence, endorsing an expansive academy system over the growing public school system as it sought to preserve its core values. Eventually, the faith shifted its course, embracing public education by augmenting it with private religious education in the form of a growing seminary and institute program. As an active participant in both the isolationist and accommodationist paradigms, President Joseph F. Smith personifies Mormonism’s transition. The educational changes of his era reflect the values of Latter-day Saint society and how it balanced these priorities within a broader culture. The educational choices we make, either as families or as societies, not only shape those whom we care about deeply, but they act as windows into our own souls.
background, philosophy, and legacy of Joseph F. Smith and their impact on Church education. Beginning with his own limited education, it traces the role President Smith played as a counselor in the First Presidency in expanding the academies and later in facilitating the formation of the seminary system as Church President. It places these changes within the context of the dramatic growth in public education and the financial challenges faced by the Church and its academy system that occurred during the Smith era, demonstrating how he was shaped by his time and the part he and others played during the transformative era of Church education.

Joseph F. Smith’s Educational Background and Philosophy

While little is known about Joseph F. Smith’s formal education, it seems apparent that his early life experiences heavily influenced his later educational philosophy. Though he grew up in frontier settlements, education was a hallmark of the communities where Smith was raised. Nauvoo, where he lived until he was nearly eight years old, enjoyed a robust educational system. “From the unsettled state of the Saints, in consequence of being driven from their inheritances, and their sudden transitions from affluence to poverty,” Joseph F. Smith’s uncle Don Carlos Smith editorialized in the Times and Seasons in 1841, “the education of their children has consequently been neglected.—But we hope the night of darkness has passed away, and that we behold the dawning of a refulgent morn, which shall shine upon our youthful city.”

Encouraged by this educational zeal, each of the city’s four wards operated a school, overseen by the board of regents of the University of the City of Nauvoo. These common schools were augmented by numerous private schools throughout the city. However, while schools were available in Nauvoo, we know


only that Joseph F. Smith frequented school one winter in the City of Joseph, attending Merilla Johnson's class in the basement of the Nauvoo Neighbor print building.  

Smith had what one of his biographers later termed an abbreviated childhood, brought about by the death of his father when the boy was five. For what should have been his common school years, his widowed mother, Mary Fielding Smith, tutored Joseph. “Well-educated, in her own right, and properly reared,” Mary Fielding Smith received an education in her native Britain, raised in “the home of a pious, refined, intellectual and educated family.” In Kirtland, Ohio, she taught school and tutored pupils privately for a brief time in the fall of 1837 before marrying Hyrum Smith later that December. The influence she had on young Joseph left a deep impression. Later in life, he declared, “To her I owe my very existence as also my success in life, coupled with the favor and mercy of God.” His son Joseph Fielding Smith similarly observed, “Most of his education up to the time of his mother’s death had been obtained from her. Busy as she was with the many cares and tribulations, she nevertheless found time to teach her children some of the fundamentals of education, she being a well educated woman.”

Though Nauvoo was different for the Church and Joseph F. Smith following the death of his father and uncle, the drive to educate the children of the Church was not extinguished. At a conference in October

1845, the Church and its leaders discussed various business items preparatory to their westward exodus the following winter. Addressing the congregation, Heber C. Kimball declared, “There is yet another piece of business of great importance to all who have families; that is, to have some school books printed for the education of our children, which will not be according to the Gentile order.” Answering the call, it was moved that “W. W. Phelps write some school books for the use of children.” 13

Joseph F. Smith, however, seemed not to have benefited much from these educational endeavors. Rather, since Smith left Nauvoo at age seven, his education became a practical one, as he forsook formal education for the rigors of riding herd and leading oxen. 14

Education continued to be stressed in the Utah territory of Smith’s boyhood. The first schoolhouse in the Salt Lake Valley sprang up in an old military tent just three months after the arrival of Brigham Young and his pioneer company. In time, it was replaced by a log schoolroom inside the city’s old fort. By 1850, the Deseret News reported the beginnings of a Parent School, designed to qualify teachers for schools across the region. 15 Wilford Woodruff was reported to have “a large and well selected assortment of school books,” and wards were invited to “procure a supply that their children may be rapidly advanced in the various branches which will be taught.” 16 While the educational conditions varied throughout the territory, Leonard Arrington later summarized, “School was held wherever a place could be found.” 17

Arriving in the valley in September 1848, Joseph F. Smith settled with his mother and siblings in the Mill Creek area, where they built a small cabin. While schools sprang up around him, Smith continued his practical learning. “My principal occupation from 1848 to 1854,” he later recalled, “was that of herd-boy, although I made a hand always in the harvest field and at threshings, and in the canyons cutting and
hauling wood.” His son later wrote, “After the family was settled in the Salt Lake Valley, the children found time to attend school a portion of the time, but the many cares and labors of those early days did not permit of any extended course of schooling.” The lack of formal education seems not to have deterred Joseph F. Smith’s learning. His son continued, “However, being of a studious mind, Joseph F. Smith never let an opportunity to gain knowledge escape him. The early records which he kept all bear strong evidence of this great desire, and it can truthfully be said, that in his later life he stood preeminently among his fellows for the extensive knowledge and wide understanding which he possessed.”

Smith’s youth was further changed when his mother died and he lost his guiding light. “It was in 1852 that my blessed Mother passed away,” he later recalled, “leaving me fatherless & motherless, but not altogether friendless at the early age of 13 years. . . . After my mother’s death there followed 18 months—from Sept 21st, 1852 to April, 1854 of perilous times for me. I was almost like a comet or fiery meteor, without attraction or gravitation to keep me balanced or guide me within reasonable bounds.”

While it is unclear what formal schooling Smith received in Utah prior to his mother’s death, one known reference to his education comes from the era of imbalance that followed her passing. Speaking of the influence Church leaders had on Joseph F. Smith, George A. Smith recalled, “His father and mother left him when he was a child, and we have been looking after him to try and help him along. We first sent him to school, but it was not long before he licked the schoolmaster, and could not go to school. Then we sent him on a mission.”

Years later, President Smith elaborated on the incident:

The reason [I] had trouble with the schoolmaster was that the schoolmaster had a leather strap with which he used to chastise the children. He was a rather hard-hearted schoolmaster, one of the olden type that believed in inflicting bodily punishment. My little sister [Martha Ann] was called up to be punished. I saw the school-master bring out the leather strap, and he told the child to hold out her hand. I just spoke up loudly and said, ‘Don’t whip her with that!’ and at that he came at me

and was going to whip me, and instead of him whipping me, I licked him good and plenty.\textsuperscript{22}

Ending his limited formal education, Smith began informal education through Church service and employment. In addition to his several missions, where he learned to preach the gospel and administer its ordinances, Smith worked in the Church Historian’s Office, learning from Elder George A. Smith and other leading brethren about the history of the Church as well as gospel principles and Church organization. “This contact in the Historian’s Office,” his son later wrote, “was also a wonderful school for the young man who had spent so much time in the mission field.” In addition to his work in the Historian’s Office, Smith “also engaged in the ordinance work and recording in the Endowment House under the direction of Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and the Apostles, who were trained in this labor under the Prophet Joseph Smith,” further expanding his knowledge of the gospel.\textsuperscript{23}

The shaping influence of Smith’s lack of formal education coupled with his practical training by Church leadership is reflected in his later statements regarding education.\textsuperscript{24} Indeed, they framed his worldview. Acknowledging that truth could come from many sources, Smith argued as Church President that ignorance was inexcusable. “Search out the truth of the written word; listen for and receive the truth declared by living prophets and teachers; enrich your minds with the best of knowledge and facts. Of those who speak in his name, the Lord requires humility, not ignorance. Intelligence is the glory of God; and no man can be saved in ignorance.”\textsuperscript{25} While encouraging the acquisition of “knowledge and fact,” Smith also reflected his upbringing, placing a primacy on the spiritual over the secular. “Educate yourself not only for time, but also for eternity. The latter of the two is the more important. Therefore, when we shall have completed the studies of time, and enter

\textsuperscript{22} Smith, \textit{Life of Joseph F. Smith}, 229.
\textsuperscript{24} Smith seemed conscious of his limited formal education. Near the end of his life, he lamented that, unlike some of his more educated colleagues, “he would be forgotten because he had no written work to leave behind.” This prompted John A. Widtsoe to work with others to compile Smith’s sermons and writings into the text \textit{Gospel Doctrine}. The volume was formally presented to Smith just seventeen days before his death. Alan K. Parrish, \textit{John A. Widtsoe: A Biography} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003), 206–7.
upon the commencement ceremonies of the great hereafter, we will find our work is not finished, but just begun. 26

While emphasizing the significance of spiritual education, Smith also drew upon his experiences learning from his mother to shape his educational philosophy. As Church President, he challenged parents, “Let [your children] see that you are earnest, and practice what you preach. Do not let your children out to specialists in these things, but teach them by your own precept and example, by your own fireside. Be a specialist yourself in the truth. Let our meetings, schools and organizations, instead of being our only or leading teachers, be supplements to our teachings and training in the home.” 27 He later declared, “Schools are instituted to help the home, not to domineer and direct it.” 28 The value of education in the home was reflected in Smith’s later support for the Home Evening program, which he instituted in 1915.

Emphasizing more than mere book learning, Joseph F. Smith also reflected the influence of his own practical education and the rural society in which he was raised. “We need manual training schools instead of so much book-learning and the stuffing of fairy tales and fables, which are contained in many of our school books of today,” Smith counseled. “If we would devote more money and time, more energy and attention to teaching our children manual labor in our schools than we do, it would be a better thing for the rising generation.” 29 Though he allowed educational diversity in Church schools, Smith editorialized in 1903, “None can deny that there is too great a tendency among the young men, especially in our larger cities, to seek the lighter employments. Politics, law, medicine, trade, clerking, banking are all needful and good in their place, but we need builders, mechanics, farmers, and men who can use their powers to produce something for the use of man.” 30


29. Joseph F. Smith, in 73rd Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1903), 3.

Championing Educational Expansion

Armed with an educational philosophy emphasizing both the spiritual and the temporal, Joseph F. Smith was called to Church leadership at a young age. At the age of twenty-seven, he was ordained an Apostle and called as a counselor to Brigham Young.31 He continued to serve as a counselor in the First Presidency to Church Presidents John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, and Lorenzo Snow, until his call as President of the Church in October 1901. These callings also placed him on the Church Board of Education, giving him influence during a time of significant educational change. In fact, some of the First Presidency statements issued during Smith’s years as counselor heavily directed Church education during his own presidency.

The presidencies in which Smith served as counselor faced severe attack centered on the Church’s social dominance. This opposition was inextricably linked to education across the Intermountain West. As the population of the region became increasingly more diverse because of the federal military presence in 1858, the discovery of silver in 1863, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, Protestant church groups fought to minimize Latter-day Saint control over society. Creating mission schools, Protestant leaders sought to lure away youth with the promise of better education, even boasting, “The Mormon people will send their children to our day schools, and [Church President] Brigham [Young] and his bishops can’t prevent it.”32 Ultimately, ninety non-Mormon denominational schools operated in Utah from 1869 to 1890. At their peak, they employed over two hundred teachers and enrolled seven thousand students, over half of whom came from Latter-day Saint homes.33 While Protestant groups made educational inroads among the Church’s youth, the federal government sought to reduce the

31. Smith’s close association with Brigham Young as a young Apostle also likely influenced his educational view. For Young’s role in Utah education, see Frederick S. Buchanan, “Education among the Mormons: Brigham Young and the Schools of Utah,” History of Education Quarterly 22, no. 4 (1982): 435–59.
Church’s political power, likewise influencing schools. The Edmunds-Tucker Act, with the most stringent antipolygamy provisions of the era, made the office of superintendent of district schools appointive rather than elective. The federally appointed replacement was charged to “prohibit the use in any district school of any book of a sectarian character or otherwise unsuitable.”

These attacks on Church dominance in Utah education mirrored national efforts of the common school movement, whose goal, James Fraser described, was “Christianizing, generally ‘Protestantizing’ Catholic immigrants, Southern slaves and free blacks, and the native population of the land.” Dominating the mid-nineteenth century, the movement itself was a response to troubling social conditions unleashed by changes in American society, including urbanization, industrialization, immigration, and political democratization. Common school advocate Calvin Stowe summarized the perceived threat, “Unless we educate our immigrants, they will be our ruin. It is no longer a mere question of benevolence, of duty, or of enlightened self-interest, but the intellectual and religious training of our foreign population has become essential to our own safety; we are prompted to it by the instinct of self-preservation.”

Religious difference could be tolerated within the schools, so long as the roots were Protestant. Though most of Mormonism’s founders were Americans themselves, the Church’s unique doctrines and hierarchical loyalty caused Protestant America to view Mormons as outsiders as well, a perspective augmented by the flood of immigrant converts to the region at the invitation of the faith’s global missionary force. Federal

35. James W. Fraser, Between Church and State: Religion and Public Educa-tion in a Multicultural America (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999), 103.
officials and Protestant missionaries turned to education to acculturate Latter-day Saint youth.

In March 1886, at the height of this opposition, the First Presidency issued a lengthy epistle to the Saints. While Smith did not sign the letter because he was in Hawaii at the time of its issuance, he shared the positions it outlined. In part, the epistle decried efforts in the Idaho Territory to revoke teaching licenses for Church members. Fearing that “the placing of our children, by the help of our taxes, under the tuition of those who would gladly eradicate from their minds all love and respect for the faith of their fathers,” the Presidency declared, “the duty of our people under these circumstances is clear; it is to keep their children away from the influence of the sophisms of infidelity and the vagaries of the sects. Let them, though it may possibly be at some pecuniary sacrifice, establish schools taught by those of our faith, where, being free from the trammels of State aid, they can unhesitatingly teach the doctrines of true religion combined with the various branches of a general education.”

Six months later, another First Presidency epistle praised the work of the Brigham Young Academy in Provo and the Brigham Young College in Logan, declaring, “We would like to see schools of this character, independent of the District School system, started in all places where it is possible.” The call for Church schools came to fruition when, following the death of President John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff announced in 1888, “We feel that the time has arrived when the proper education of our children should be taken in hand by us as a people.” Woodruff formed the Church Board of Education, and stakes were instructed to organize their own local boards and create a stake academy “as soon as practicable.”

As a counselor to President Woodruff and his successor, Lorenzo Snow, Joseph F. Smith witnessed the Church’s enthusiastic response to the call for separate education. From 1888 through President Smith’s


presidency, the Church operated as many as fifty-six schools.\textsuperscript{43} For those too young to attend one of the Church academies, leaders championed the formation of the Religion Class program, an after-school supplement to secular education prevalent in public schools.\textsuperscript{44} In 1890, Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, and Joseph F. Smith wrote to local leaders, lamenting “training which our youth receive in the district schools,” noting that it did not “increase their feelings of devotion to God and love for His cause, for, as is well-known, all teachings of a religious character are rigorously excluded from the studies permitted in these institutions.” Their remedy was “that in every ward where a Church school is not established, that some brother or sister or brethren and sisters well adapted for such a responsible position by their intelligence and devotion, as well as their love for the young, be called, as on a mission . . . to take charge of a school wherein the first principles of the Gospel, Church history and kindred subjects shall be taught. This school to meet for a short time each afternoon after the close of the district school.”\textsuperscript{45} As Church President, Smith oversaw an increase in Religion Class enrollment as well as further expansion to the educational system, including the creation of the Big Horn, Dixie, Knight, Millard, San Luis, and Summit Academies, all under his watch.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{43} The Church operated as many as thirty-six stake academies and twenty other schools, called seminaries because a corresponding stake academy already existed in the stake. These seminaries are not to be confused with the present Church education endeavor of the same name that was also begun during Smith’s presidency at Granite High School in Salt Lake City in 1912. Scott C. Esplin and Arnold K. Garr, “Church Academies: 1875–1933,” in Mapping Mormonism: An Atlas of Latter-day Saint History, ed. Brandon S. Plewe, S. Kent Brown, Donald Q. Cannon, and Richard H. Jackson (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 2012), 126–27.

\textsuperscript{44} Quinn, “Utah’s Educational Innovation,” 379–89.

\textsuperscript{45} Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, and Joseph F. Smith, “A Letter to the Presidents of Stakes, Bishops, and All Whom It May Concern,” in Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, 3:196–97 (October 25, 1890).

\textsuperscript{46} Adam S. Bennion, “A Brief Summary of the Historical Background, the Present Status, and the Possible Future Development of the Latter-day Saint Educational System,” February 1, 1928, Adam S. Bennion Papers, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Though Religion Class enrollment increased during Smith’s presidency, it was criticized by some as a superfluous auxiliary because of its overlap with the Primary and the Sunday School. It also created tension because of church and state questions surrounding the use of public school teachers and buildings. Quinn, “Utah’s Educational Innovation,” 382–83, 388.
As Church school alternatives expanded during Joseph F. Smith’s presidency, public school options likewise blossomed. Progressivism led to curriculum expansion and increased educational opportunity. Growth in the Utah public high school system matched similar growth nationally in secondary education, where, from 1890 to 1920 secondary school population in the United States exploded from 360,000 to 2,500,000. “If the 19th century was the age of the common (or primary) schools,” John L. Rury summarized, “the opening decades of the 20th were the era of the high school.” In Utah specifically, at the beginning of the twentieth century, only six high schools existed in the entire state (Salt Lake, Ogden, Park City, Brigham City, Nephi, and Richfield). Of the six schools, only the schools in Salt Lake and Ogden boasted student populations of more than sixty-five. In 1914, during the height of Smith’s presidency, State Superintendent of Public Instruction A. C. Matheson summarized, “No other branch of the public school system has developed so rapidly during recent years. In a little more than a decade the number of high schools has increased from four to forty and the enrollment of students from one thousand to eight thousand.” Matheson boasted that the state of Utah constructed twenty-five high school buildings in a six-year period from 1908 to 1914, ranging from “substantial modern structures costing $40,000 each to the East Side High School, Salt Lake City, which represents an expenditure of $600,000.” Jordan High School in Sandy, Matheson continued, “is declared by leading educators to be the finest and best equipped rural high school in the west.”

47. Educational historian Lawrence Cremin described progressive education as “a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals.” An outgrowth of the larger Progressive movement throughout the country, it “began as part of a vast humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life—the ideal of government by, of, and for the people—to the puzzling new urban-industrial civilization that came into being during the latter half of the nineteenth century.” Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876–1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), viii. For a brief examination of the impact of Progressivism on the Church, see William G. Hartley, “From Men to Boys: LDS Aaronic Priesthood Offices, 1829–1996,” in My Fellow Servants: Essays on the History of the Priesthood (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 2010), 59.


A System “Run Mad”: Reining in Educational Exuberance

The expansion of public high schools in the West during the early twentieth century led to a dramatic educational shift during the Smith presidency. During the early years of his presidency, the Church moved toward endorsing public schools, in spite of rhetoric by Smith and his predecessors against taxation for secular curriculum. The softening toward public education came, in part, because of the realization that many members were unable to send their children to Church schools. In fact, if the Church and the public school systems were in competition, the Church’s program was clearly losing, at least from a statistical perspective. In 1890, for example, public high schools in Utah enrolled only five percent of the state’s secondary student population. By the decade after President Smith’s death, ninety percent of all high school students attended public schools.51 This growth reflected the post-Manifesto easing of tensions between Mormons and non-Mormons and growing confidence by the Church in its ability to protect youth in spite of secular influence.

In February 1905, President Smith and his counselors endorsed the growing public school system. Interestingly, they also expressed support for its secular curriculum. “We wish it distinctly understood that we are not in favor of, but are emphatically opposed to, denominational teachings in our public schools. We are proud of that splendid system of schools, and do not desire that they should be interfered with in any way whatever. For religious and devotional training, other institutions are provided, by our Church as well as by other churches, and we cannot too strongly urge that the two systems continue to be kept entirely separate and apart.”52 The open support of public schools came on the heels of national examination of the faith as part of the conflict over the seating of Utah Senator and Apostle Reed Smoot in the U.S. Senate.53 The wide-ranging hearings included criticism of Church influence in public education, especially by its Religion Class program.54 As part of the debate,

both the Utah state superintendent of public instruction and the attorney general opined that Church use of public classrooms for after-school religious instruction was unconstitutional. Smith’s endorsement of public schooling and his urging that religious training be kept separate from it reflect Church efforts to ease non-Mormon feelings about the program. Two years later, Smith and his counselors further clarified, “It has been charged that ‘Mormonism’ is opposed to education. The history of the Church and the precepts of its leaders are a sufficient answer to that accusation.” Summarizing the Church educational legacy from Joseph Smith to the present, Smith concluded, “The State of Utah, now dotted with free schools, academies, colleges, and universities, institutions which have given her marked educational prominence, furnishes indisputable evidence that her people—mostly ‘Mormons’—are friends and promoters of education.”

Not only did President Smith openly support public schools, but he also sought to get Latter-day Saint teachers employed in them. In May 1911, Smith wrote to the State Board of Education, requesting “recognition of the normal work in our Church schools, so that the graduates from our normal courses may be regarded in the same class as State normal graduates, and be granted certificates to teach in the public schools without examination.” This was done to satisfy the growing need for public school teachers in the region while providing employment opportunities for Church school graduates. While a practical solution both for the burgeoning public school system and the prospective teachers emerging from Church schools, the placing of Church-trained educators in public school classrooms furthered Church interests as well by limiting the impact leaders previously feared regarding secular education.

58. Two years after Smith’s death, as Church leadership debated closing the Church academies, David O. McKay similarly appealed to the training of Latter-day Saint teachers as a reason to preserve Church schools. Arguing for their continuance, McKay reasoned that if the Church normal schools were
President Smith’s support of public education may have also been a practical response to the realization that Church members were flooding its classrooms. Eventually, though the state superintendent of public instruction claimed that “the rapid growth of high schools in the state is a matter for congratulation,” the expense of the burgeoning public and private educational system worried Joseph F. Smith. Knowing he would be “criticized by professional ‘lovers of education’ for expressing [his] idea in relation to this matter,” Smith voiced his concern about escalating costs to support the new programs in his opening address of the October 1915 general conference. “I hope that I may be pardoned for giving expression to my real conviction with reference to the question of education in the State of Utah,” Smith declared. “I believe that we are running education mad. I believe that we are taxing the people more for education than they should be taxed. This is my sentiment.” During his presidency, Smith supported others who founded educational alternatives and issued cautions regarding expansion, setting the stage for the modern Church Educational System.

Finding a way to provide religious instruction for Mormon children attending public schools led to the creation of the most significant educational legacy of President Smith’s administration, the formation of the modern released-time seminary program. Initiated by Joseph F. Merrill, a counselor in the Granite Stake presidency, as an alternative for Latter-day Saint students attending Granite High School instead of one of the Church’s academies, the program quickly blossomed from one program in 1912 to thirteen by Smith’s death in 1918. Seminary programs formed

strengthened, they could produce enough teachers in five years to dominate the teacher supply in the state. James R. Clark, “Church and State Relationships in Education in Utah” (PhD diss., Utah State University, 1958), 283. Church Board of Education minutes summarize the prevailing philosophy: “Now, if by cooperation, recommendation, and instruction sufficient number of capable young men and women of the Church can be induced to graduate from the normal colleges and the BYU, and accept positions as leaders in the various public schools and high schools throughout the state, there should be no reason why these schools should not be permeated by a truly wholesome and upbuilding atmosphere of true morality.” Minutes of the General Board of Education, March 3, 1920, in Jerry C. Roundy, Ricks College: A Struggle for Survival (Rexburg, Idaho: Ricks College Press, 1976), 99–100.

61. For additional information on Joseph F. Merrill’s role in the founding of the seminary program, see Casey Paul Griffiths, “Joseph F. Merrill and the
during his presidency include Granite (1912), Box Elder (1915), Mt. Pleasant (1916), American Fork (1917), Lehi (1917), Huntington (1918), Mesa, Arizona (1918), Sandy (1918), Blanding (1918), Roosevelt (1918), Richfield (1918), Pleasant Grove (1918), and Heber (1918). Enrollment jumped from 70 students the first year to 1,528 students in 1918.62 At the same time, high school enrollment at Church academies remained steady, ranging between 4,000 and 5,000 students from 1912 to 1918.63 While Smith did not personally effect these changes, as chair of the Church Board of Education, he oversaw those who did.

**Spiritual and Temporal Concerns within Church Education**

While the seminary program flourished, Church academies caused problems for President Smith during his presidency. In particular, controversial teachings relating to evolution and biblical interpretation shaped Smith’s educational legacy. Reflecting on one of the most divisive issues of the era, in 1909 President Smith and his First Presidency published a statement entitled “The Origin of Man.” The document, originally drafted by Apostle Orson F. Whitney, was revised and approved by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.64 The following year, one of his biographers wrote, “President Smith’s conservative approach toward education collided with the competing desires of some of the faculty and students on the Provo campus”65 of Brigham Young University, which had become a university in 1903. Perpetuating modernist critiques on the authenticity of the Bible and the origin of man, three BYU professors—Ralph Chamberlin, Joseph Peterson, and Henry Peterson—created a stir by publicly advocating their positions on


63. Seminary and Institute Statistical Reports, 1919–53, Unified Church School System (1953–70), Church History Library.


evolution and higher criticism. Word of their teachings quickly spread to Salt Lake, where Superintendent of Church Schools Horace H. Cummings was charged to investigate. In February 1911, Cummings reported to the Church Board of Education that “from an educational standpoint,” the three professors were “perhaps the strongest men in the institution, and they have a potent influence with the students, thus making their theological teachings the more dangerous to the faith of the students.”

University President George H. Brimhall sadly concluded, “The only thing that he could see to do was to get rid of these teachers.” Following additional investigation, Ralph Chamberlin and Joseph Peterson voluntarily left the university; Henry Peterson was dismissed.

President Smith’s educational legacy is connected to his response to the modernism controversy. The flare-up elicited several comments by Smith and ultimately a warning regarding the dangers false educational ideas could pose. In April 1911, he issued editorials in both the Juvenile Instructor and the Improvement Era, where he explained the Church’s actions. Smith acknowledged that “recently there was some trouble . . . in one of the leading Church schools—the training college of the Brigham Young University—where three of the professors advanced certain theories on evolution as applied to the origin of man, and certain opinions on ‘higher criticisms,’ as conclusive and demonstrated truths.” He explained the investigation that ensued and the conclusion that “teachers in a Church school . . . could not be given opportunity to inculcate theories that were out of harmony with the recognized doctrines of the Church.”

Outlining the Church’s position, Smith reflected his own practical educational background: “There are so many demonstrated practical material truths, so many spiritual certainties, with which the youth of Zion should become familiar, that it appears a waste of time and means, and


67. General Board Minutes, February 3, 1911, in Wilkinson, Brigham Young University, 1:424.

68. Mary Jane Woodger and Joseph H. Groberg, From the Muddy River to the Ivory Tower: The Journey of George H. Brimhall (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 2010), 178. For additional information about the modernism controversy at BYU, see Wilkinson, Brigham Young University, 1:412–33; Woodger and Groberg, From the Muddy River to the Ivory Tower, 170–89; Bergera and Priddis, House of Faith, 134–48.
At the Church’s general conference the same month, President Smith defended sources of eternal truth: “I believe that the Latter-day Saints, and especially the leading men in Israel, have sufficient knowledge and understanding of the principles of the gospel that they know the truth, and they are made free by its possession—free from sin, free from error, free from darkness, from the traditions of men, from vain philosophy, and from the untried, unproven theories of scientists, that need demonstration beyond the possibility of a doubt.” Reflecting the supremacy he placed on revealed truth and the skepticism he shared for unproven ideas, Smith continued: “We have had science and philosophy through all the ages, and they have undergone change after change. Scarcely a century has passed but they have introduced new theories of science and of philosophy that supersede the old traditions and the old faith and the old doctrines entertained by philosophers and scientists. These things may undergo continuous changes, but the word of God is always true, is always right.”

He later warned of the influence of false ideas in a caution to the Church, “There are at least three dangers that threaten the Church within, and the authorities need to awaken to the fact that the people should be warned unceasingly against them. As I see these, they are flattery of prominent men in the world, false educational ideas, and sexual impurity.” President Smith’s response to the modernism controversy at Brigham Young University reflects his philosophy of truth and shaped his direction of Church education.

Concerns about teaching at Church schools were coupled with rising expenditures. Financial pressures had long plagued the Church and, by association, the Church school system. The challenges dogged the Church’s flagship school, the Brigham Young Academy, from its founding in 1875 through the end of the nineteenth century, and doomed most of its sister schools. Of the nearly thirty academies begun Churchwide


70. Joseph F. Smith, in *81st Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1911), 7–8.


72. For a discussion of the fiscal challenges facing Brigham Young Academy during the late nineteenth century, see Jed L. Woodworth, “Refusing to Die:
between 1888 and 1895, less than half survived the decade, a casualty of the economic panic of 1893 and the financial distress caused by the antipolygamy crusade. Smith inherited these financial difficulties as he moved into his own presidency and struggled with them the entirety of his tenure. In a 1909 letter to Brigham Young College in Logan, he voiced his concern about escalating expenses at Church schools: “Within less than a decade the annual appropriation for maintaining the Church schools has increased almost ten fold, so rapid has been the growth of the schools. This is altogether out of proportion to the increase of the revenues of the Church; a ratio that cannot longer be maintained.” In the April 1916 general conference, he further lamented Church school costs. Summarizing Church expenditures for the fifteen-year period from 1901 to 1915, he reported spending $3,714,455 for schools, the largest expenditure in the entire Church budget for the time period. By comparison, $3,279,900 had been spent through all Church channels aiding the poor during the same era. Slightly over $2,000,000 was spent building meetinghouses and only $1,169,499 was spent on maintenance and repair of temples. Of concern to President Smith, Church schools were receiving the lion’s share of the faith’s funds and requesting more at an alarming rate.

Financial Crisis at Brigham Young Academy, 1877–1897,” BYU Studies 38, no. 1 (1999), 71–123.


74. Describing an era he called the “graveyard of church business ventures,” which claimed businesses such as the Provo Woolen Mills, Consolidated Wagon and Machine, and the Saltair Beach Company, Thomas Alexander summarized, “In many ways, the economic challenges that the church faced during these three decades [1900–1930] could not have come at a worse time. Intent upon shifting from the nineteenth century, when it had been a prime mover in intermountain economic development, to the twentieth century, where the spiritual side of religion received greatest emphasis, the church was caught in pressures which were impossible to control and difficult to manage. . . . Though some enterprises served as harbingers of a brighter future, the period from 1900 through 1930 was not a pleasant time for the temporal kingdom.” Alexander, Mormonism in Transition, 87, 91–92.

75. Minutes of the General Church Board of Education, June 30, 1909, citing a May 20, 1909, communication, “To the President and Members of the Board of Trustees of the B. Y. College, Logan, Utah,” in Centennial History Project Papers, Perry Special Collections.

76. Joseph F. Smith, in 86th Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1916), 7.
Church Board of Education minutes for April 28, 1915, reflect Smith’s growing apprehension regarding educational expenses. Responding to Weber Academy’s request for funding to add a normal course, the minutes record:

President Smith explained to the brethren the condition of the Church finances and clearly pointed out that the trustee-in-trust is in no position at present to promise an increase of funds for educational purposes. While he was heartily in favor of the idea of our turning attention to the making of teachers and would be very glad if some of the smaller schools could be turned into public high schools, to have the means thus saved expended for normal work, he did not see how he could undertake at present to branch out and incur more expense; we should simply have to trim our educational sails to the financial winds.77

While the minutes report President Smith’s concern, they also hint at his solution. By transforming smaller schools into public high schools and focusing on teacher training in the remaining institutions, President Smith saw a way out of the fiscal dilemma Church schools presented.78 His successor, President Heber J. Grant, augmented these

77. General Church Board of Education minutes, April 28, 1915, in William Peter Miller, Weber College—1888 to 1933, Church History Library.

78. Minutes of the Church Board of Education, June 30, 1909, reflect support for limiting the number of Church schools and emphasizing teacher training:

“This recommendation was also unanimously adopted by the General Board of Education.

“It is not the feeling of either of the committees, nor is it thought a wise policy by this Board to use from the limited money available the large sums that would be needed in giving college education to the comparatively few who are able to take it; but it is thought that this portion of the tithes of the people should be spent in making many Latter-day Saints of our children in high schools rather than a comparative few in colleges.

“Though desirable, the Church cannot maintain a complete system of schools from the primary grade to the college work and has, therefore, concentrated its efforts in maintaining a system of high schools to best meet the needs of the young people.

“Nevertheless, the need for teachers, not only for our own schools, but for the many other organizations of the Church, make it necessary to have a teachers’ college; but neither the money at our disposal nor the number of college students in the Church at present who desire to become teachers, is sufficient to warrant maintaining properly more than one such college.

“Therefore the General Board of Education has decided to discontinue all college work in the Church schools except what is really necessary to prepare
solutions with religious instruction through the seminary system that was in its infancy during Smith’s administration. Grant concluded the educational transformation begun by Joseph F. Smith by closing or transferring to the state nearly all of the Church academies during the 1920s and early 1930s, replacing them with an expanded seminary and institute program.79

Summary and Conclusion

The last Church President to have known Joseph Smith personally, President Joseph F. Smith was a transitional figure, leading the faith from its pioneer founding into its modern era, turning Church attention beyond the Intermountain West.80 His legacy continues to impact Church teachings and practice today. Smith personifies the shifts in Mormonism that occurred in his era. His early life and teachings reflect those of an orphaned son with limited educational opportunity. He represented teachers; and we feel that when the people understand this matter they will see the wisdom of the decision and feel satisfied with it.

“We would be pleased if you would furnish copies of this communication to all the Presidents of Stakes included in the Brigham Young College district that it may be read at their conferences or priesthood meetings or ward meetings.

“Your brethren and fellow laborers in the gospel,

“The General Church Board of Education,

“Joseph F. Smith, President.”

Minutes of the General Church Board of Education, June 30, 1909, citing a May 20, 1909 communication, “To the President and Members of the Board of Trustees of the B. Y. College, Logan, Utah,” in Centennial History Project Papers, Perry Special Collections.

79. While there was not complete agreement regarding their discontinuance, of the more than thirty Church academies, only four (Brigham Young University, Ricks College, LDS Business College, and the Juarez Academy) survived as Church-sponsored institutions after 1933. Meanwhile, seminary enrollment grew exponentially from nearly three thousand students in 1920 to thirty-four thousand students in 1933. For additional information regarding the discontinuance of Church academies and the growth of the seminary and institute program, see Scott C. Esplin, “Education in Transition: Church and State Relationships in Utah Education, 1888–1933” (PhD diss., Brigham Young University, 2006).

80. During his administration, the first temple outside the continental United States (Laie, Hawaii) and the first temple outside the United States itself (Cardston, Alberta, Canada) were announced. Historically, he also guided Church efforts in acquiring and developing significant historic sites, including the Carthage Jail, the Joseph Smith Sr. farm, the Sacred Grove, the Joseph Smith birthplace, and the Hill Cumorah.
the tension present in late-nineteenth-century Mormonism as it fought secular influences to preserve the isolationist mentality that had helped it settle the West. This paradigm “necessitated the integration of religion, politics, society, and the economy into a single non-pluralistic community,” something that, by Smith’s later life, “was simply unacceptable to Victorian America.” During his presidency, Smith and his faith transitioned themselves, saving “essential characteristics of their religious tradition” to “provide sufficient political stability to preserve the interests of the church, and allow them to live in peace with other Americans.”

Financial expediency, the easing of the Mormon-Gentile conflict, and the genesis of supplementary religious education paved the way for educational change. As demonstrated in 1905 by his championing of public education and the encouragement that it “be kept entirely separate and apart” from religious instruction, Smith and the Church had accepted “the practical limits of religious life in America.”

This positioning of Church education within a larger American framework was one of President Joseph F. Smith’s most important legacies. Even though he was the least formally educated Church President of the twentieth century, his keen interest in education marked the faith’s educational trajectory for the century. While others led in its creation, he presided over the formation of the Church’s seminary program, laying the groundwork for the transition to supplementary religious education. Nurtured at his own mother’s knee, he encouraged the beginnings of the modern Family Home Evening program, counseling parents to “gather their boys and girls about them in the home and teach them the word of the Lord.” His fiscal restraint reined in excess, curtailing Church academy growth. Educationally, he placed a primacy on spiritual learning, and his teachings continue to influence our understanding of the development of Mormon education in the United States.

83. Of this era, historians Leonard Arrington and Davis Bitton observed, “A half-century and more of heated confrontation with the U.S. government had taught Latter-day Saints the practical limits of religious life in America. By the end of World War I, if not before, the Mormons were more American than most Americans.” Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 184.
of eternal things. Of his teachings, President Harold B. Lee observed, “When I want to seek for a more clear definition of doctrinal subjects, I have usually turned to the writings and sermons of President Joseph F. Smith.” Indeed, much of the doctrinal understanding and educational practice of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints today is an outgrowth of the life and ministry of Joseph F. Smith.

The Closedown of LDS Iowa Settlements in 1852 That Completed the Nauvoo Exodus and Jampacked the Mormon Trail

William G. Hartley

In the Mormon Trail’s twenty-three-year history, a handful of years merit special attention because of their historical importance: 1846 for the exoduses from Nauvoo, 1847 for the first companies to Utah, 1849 for the Gold Rush, 1856 for the first handcart companies, and 1861 for the first down-and-back wagon companies.1 To that list, the pivotal year 1852 needs to be added and its story told.

A vigorous Church campaign closed down about forty lingering LDS settlements in Iowa in 1852. Branches transformed into wagon trains, whose pullouts terminated what had been a strong Mormon presence in the Midwest for five years, and brought to completion the Nauvoo exodus process. This Church-ordered evacuation completed a covenant

---

that Saints made in Nauvoo to help all go west who needed assistance. It produced the Mormon Trail’s heaviest traffic in any year before or after. It terminated six years of Winter Quarters and Kanesville being the outfitting point for LDS emigrating companies. It planted handcart seeds that sprouted four years later. And it let Perpetual Emigrating Fund (PEF) assistance shift from Nauvoo exiles to European Saints.

The Nauvoo Covenant and the Perpetual Emigrating Fund

After Utah became Mormonism’s new gathering place, Church leaders diligently tried to fulfill a covenant Saints made in the Nauvoo Temple in October 1845 to assist those needing help to move west.2 In 1849, the Church created the Perpetual Emigrating Fund (PEF) for that purpose. “Shall we fulfill that covenant, or shall we not?”3 asked First Presidency Counselor Heber C. Kimball when presenting the PEF plan in general conference. “We are under obligation by covenant, firstly to apply the Perpetual Funds gathered in this country, to bring home the poor Saints who were driven from Nauvoo,” the First Presidency stipulated, “and as soon as this shall be accomplished, we shall be ready to extend our exertions to other places and countries.”4 Immediately, Bishop Edward Hunter headed east, carrying PEF funds, which he used the next year, 1850, to bring the first PEF-assisted Nauvoo refugees to Utah. Orders said the funds should buy oxen, not wagons, to be resold in Utah, generating replacement funds for the PEF.5

---


3. Minutes of the General Conference Held at Great Salt Lake City, in Journal History, October 6, 1849. Thomas Bullock was the clerk of the conference.


Back in 1846, up to 15,000 Saints left the Nauvoo region, most of them intent on going west to some wilderness home. To survive that first winter, the refugees hunkered down in the Mormon settlements of Winter Quarters, Garden Grove, Mt. Pisgah, and Ponca Camp; in southeastern Iowa villages like Keosauqua, Bonaparte, Bentonsport, and Iowaville; in scores of camps dotting southwestern Iowa Territory; and in St. Louis. When spring came in 1847, a paltry 1,500 headed for the Rocky Mountains. In 1848, when Winter Quarters had to close down, only perhaps half of its residents headed west, while the others relocated east across the Missouri River in and around what became the LDS town of Kanesville, Iowa (today’s Council Bluffs).

Also in 1848, British LDS emigration, halted during the Nauvoo evacuation period, resumed. Those emigrants were told to reach America and, if necessary, stop and work in Iowa or elsewhere before pushing on to Utah. As a result, between 1848 and 1851, when Mormon wagon trains left from Kanesville each spring, newly arriving Saints from Europe and “the States” took over farms and homes of those leaving. During these yearly population rollovers, a sizeable pool of former Nauvooers remained in the area.6

Kanesville and Its Surrounding LDS Settlements

After Winter Quarters shut down in 1848, Kanesville (formerly Miller’s Hollow) grew and became the central community, the hub, for Saints not yet westbound.7 Ringing it were “heavy settlements in all directions on the good land that abounds in the country.”8 Most were small clusters of families settled near a grove or stream, who adopted such place names as Council Point, Carterville, McColney’s Branch, Zebriskie’s Hollow, Macedonia, Big Pigeon, Upper Keg Creek, Harris Grove, Six Mile


Grove, Walnut Grove, and Plum Hollow. At least three score of these settlements have been identified, some but short-lived.9

Kanesville and those other places were meant to be temporary because “abandonment, not establishment, was the watchword.”10 For four years, 1848 to 1852, Kanesville served as the Church’s headquarters for “the States,” most often with Apostle Orson Hyde presiding. Hyde published there an LDS newspaper, the Frontier Guardian.11 Council Point, near Kanesville, was the arrival port for Mormon emigrants coming up the Missouri River. Kanesville served as a stopover place for Saints unable to continue west, an outfitting point for crossing the plains, and a transfer station for people from Utah heading to or through the States. Federal census takers in 1850 tallied 5,058 residents for the Kanesville precinct, and 7,828 for all of predominantly Mormon Pottawattamie County.12 In and after 1849, because of the discovery of gold in California, Kanesville saw more gold seekers outfit there than in any other Missouri River jumping-off point.13 Those argonauts purchased food, supplies, and services, boosting Iowa Saints’ incomes while fueling the Saints’ reluctance to head for Utah.

As of 1852, Kanesville stood fourth in importance among LDS cities in Church history, behind Kirtland, Nauvoo, and Salt Lake City. As of mid-April 1852, Kanesville had 300 houses, 16 mercantile establishments, 2 drug stores, 2 printing offices, 5 hotels, 4 groceries, 8 wagon shops,

Settlements around Kanesville, Iowa, in 1852. © Brandon S. Plewe.
5 boot- and shoemakers, 5 physicians, 9 attorneys, 7 blacksmith shops, and “about 1200 to 1500 inhabitants.”

Orders to Evacuate

Four letters and two Church envoys sent to Kanesville in 1851 made the 1852 closedown happen. The 1851 letters, their dates when written, and their dates when published in Kanesville’s *Frontier Guardian* newspaper are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Date written</th>
<th>Date published in <em>Frontier Guardian</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Presidency’s Fifth General Epistle</td>
<td>Apr. 7</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Hunter and eight others</td>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>Aug. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presidency to Pottawattamie Saints</td>
<td>Sept. 21</td>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presidency’s Sixth General Epistle</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first letter, the Presidency’s Fifth General Epistle, counseled Saints in the United States and Canada to “arise as one man, and come to Deseret, where they can do more for Zion in one year than they can in many years where they are.” Then on June 8, newly sustained Presiding Bishop Edward Hunter and eight other leading Utahns penned a letter directly admonishing Iowa Saints to “sell your farms and houses, and let Kanesville be in the hands of strangers . . . let the cry be that a saint cannot be found, the cities are vacated.” The writers advocated “that there will not be a man who once lived in Nauvoo, and has had five years already to make an outfit, but will have energy of character to fit himself, and some poorer family who have been sick or unfortunate.”

17. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatamie,” September 21, 1851, in *Frontier Guardian*, November 14, 1851, 2.
19. First Presidency, Fifth General Epistle, April 7, 1851.
Either because of or independent from the two first letters, two major Iowa branches decided in 1851 to close down. Garden Grove Saints, some 140 miles east of Kanesville, moved as a company of sixty wagons, one threshing machine, and twenty-one families to Utah in 1851, and a few who had remained departed in 1852. Then in October 1851, the Harris Grove settlement posted a “selling out” ad in the *Frontier Guardian*. “The Mormon population of Harris Grove wishing to emigrate in mass to the Salt Lake next season offer to sell out their interest to this beautiful section of Iowa.”

The settlement, well supplied with water and timber, consisted of twenty farms, each with between five and twenty acres fenced and cultivated and between 160 and 320 acres claimed. They offered to “sell this fall at cost of improvement. Also a part of the crop on the ground. They will take cattle, store goods and money in exchange.”

Unlike the first two 1851 letters, which urged, the last two letters ordered. Of influence in this change of tone had to be Elder Hyde’s quick visit to Utah. On June 28, he left Kanesville and reached Salt Lake City on August 17. He attended meetings, gave speeches, and “spent hours in discussions with other Church leaders.” He attended a Council of Fifty meeting on August 25 where members “agitated” the question of “bringing all Pottatattamie Saints who wish to come” next spring. Elder Hyde explained that because he had a great deal to do in order to close down his affairs, someone else needed to be sent to direct that mass evacuation. The council then approved sending Elders Ezra T. Benson and Jedediah M. Grant “to gather up the people of Pottatattamie, all who can

fit themselves out and send them on here next spring.”22 Their mission was to close down the Iowa settlements.23 During the general conference held September 7–10, the Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company officers were sustained, and Elders Hyde, Benson, and Grant were specially sustained to be agents of the PEF “to gather the poor to this place.” On September 11, the PEF Company officers met “and deliberated upon matters pertaining to the next season’s emigration” and how to help the poor. We lack records of that meeting. After Elders Benson and Grant spoke in the bowery on September 21, President Young told attenders that the two men would “take up every Saint, man, woman and child . . . every officer and every member and bring them here,” and if Saints don’t do it, “soon they will wish they had.”24

The third letter, the First Presidency’s September 21 letter to Pottawattamie Saints, announced that Apostle Benson and Seventy Grant were sent to herd Pottawattamie Saints to Utah. “We desire you to come . . . to this place with them next season; and fail not . . . We wish you to evacuate Pottawattamie, and the States, and next fall be with us.” The letter instructed that “if you can get one good wagon and team to five families, and five teams to 100 souls; or no teams at all, more than cows and calves to your handcarts, you can come here with greater comfort and safety than the Pioneers came here. . . . Arise and come home.”25 The Presidency took seriously an idea to use handcarts and wheelbarrows (back in April 1850 the First Presidency had advocated that those with sufficient faith could come to Utah using just a wheelbarrow).26

The Presidency reinforced the handcart and wheelbarrow idea the next day in their September 22 Sixth General Epistle, the fourth 1851 letter. In it they issued a “thus saith the Lord” command that the “voice of the good Shepherd” was to “gather yourselves together, come home; and more especially to the Saints in Pottawatamie, the United States, Canada, and the British Isles; come home! come home!” Families could start from the Missouri River, they said, “with cows, hand-carts, wheel-barrows,

22. Research Notes from Council of Fifty Minutes, August 25, 1851, Church History Library.
23. Journal History, September 5, 1851; First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatamie,” September 21, 1851.
24. Loose minutes, September 21, 1851, Brigham Young Papers, Church History Library.
25. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatamie,” September 21, 1851.
with a little flour, and no unnecessaries, and come to this place quicker, and with less fatigue, than by following the heavy trains, with their cumbersome herds.”27 On September 23 and 24, two dozen men, including Elders Hyde, Benson, and Grant, headed for Kanesville, carrying the two new letters containing the evacuation orders. They reached Kanesville early in November.28

Why the Closedown

Why such urgency to close down Iowa residences and complete the Nauvoo exodus in 1852? The above letters and their Utah contexts identify five factors:

1. Lingering Time Had Expired. Rather than ask why 1852 became the deadline year, the real question is, why didn’t a deadline come sooner? Gathering to Zion “as speedily as possible” was “the commandment of the Lord.” That Saints must gather to Zion as quickly as possible was a standing commandment, not a suggestion.29 Ideally, all of those from Nauvoo still committed to the Church should have gone west in 1847, or at least in 1848 when Winter Quarters had to close down. But a lack of wagons, teams, and food kept most back. In mid-1850, the LDS First Presidency, feeling that Saints who had stopped temporarily in Iowa were becoming too comfortable, instructed Elder Hyde to “push the Saints to Zion, and persuade all good brethren to come, who have a wheelbarrow, and faith enough to roll it over the mountains.”30 Yet the February 1851 Frontier Guardian, when giving counsel for that year’s upcoming emigration, lacked urgency and sounded not pushy but wishy-washy: “It is the wish and counsel of your brethren in the Valley that you should emigrate there as fast as possible; and consequently, it is our wish and counsel also. But those who cannot go this year, had better begin to repair farms, fences, and to make preparations to go as largely

27. “Sixth General Epistle of the Presidency of the Church.”
29. Wilford Woodruff to Jesse C. Little, in Frontier Guardian, November 13, 1850, 2.
into agricultural pursuits as possible in this county. Every farmer ought to put in a spring crop, whether he goes west or not.”31

So the First Presidency blew the whistle. “We have been calling to the Saints in Pottawatamie ever since we left them to come away,” the First Presidency said in their September 21 letter; “but there has continually been an opposing spirit, whispering; as it were—Stay another year, and get a better fit-out.”32 Lingering now was unacceptable.

2. Labor Needs in Utah. Unlike in Nauvoo, where the doctrine of gathering caused major problems due to job shortages, Utah needed manpower to develop its agricultural base, natural resources, and building projects. Late in 1849, the Presidency had pleaded with Elder Hyde about Utah’s “need of more laborers, for more efficient help, and multiplied means of farming and building at this place. We want men; brethren come from the States, from the nations come!”33 In April 1850, the Presidency hoped that year’s emigration would bring a “host of Saints” because “the labors of the valley are great, compared to the number of laborers.”34 They noted that “the public works are languishing for help, and we want the Saints at home,” and “we shall need double the hands at harvest we have now.”35 Late in 1850, President Young told a Sunday audience in Salt Lake City, “We want to plant colonies from here to the Pacific Ocean.”36 The nine writers of the June 8, 1851, epistle bluntly said, “It is as much a duty binding on every saint to build up the vallies of the mountains, as it is to be baptized for the remission of their sins, or any other commandment given the servants of God to his people.”37

Early in 1851, just prior to the command to evacuate, President Young directed that construction start in Salt Lake City on a badly needed tabernacle (the Old Tabernacle), and the April general conference voted to build a temple. A newly planted San Bernardino colony drew off some five hundred Saints from Utah. New settlements in and around Cedar

32. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatamie,” September 21, 1851.
35. Presidency of the Church to Elder Orson Hyde, April 13, 1850, in Frontier Guardian, July 24, 1850, 2.
36. Journal History, October 27, 1850.
37. Cain and others, “To the Saints, Scattered Abroad through the Eastern States,” Frontier Guardian, August 22, 1851, 2.
City (to develop iron manufacturing) and at Manti needed population.  

In that context, the Presidency’s Sixth General Epistle (September 22, 1851), which included a “thus saith the Lord” endorsement, spelled out Utah’s “want of laborers . . . which might be avoided, if a few score of thousands of the Saints who are abroad, would rise up in the name of Israel’s God and come home, and help us to do what is required at our hands.”

3. Need for Missionaries. The Presidency’s April 7, 1851, epistle lamented, “There is enough for all to do who are here to prepare for the coming of others; consequently, it is not wisdom to send many elders on foreign missions at present.”

The nine Utahns’ June 8 letter pleaded that “there rests on the shoulders of every faithful elder in the church,” referring pointedly to those in the Midwest, the call to missionary work: “We ask you to come and . . . let us go to the nations of the earth to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ: for as elders of Israel, we feel the responsibility resting upon us, and the Lord requires it at our hands; and as long as you hold back our hands are tied. . . . Come then, brethren . . . for there rests on the shoulders of every faithful elder in the church the burden of bearing the gospel to the nations of the earth.”

4. Europeans Needed the Perpetual Emigrating Fund. Church leaders in Europe constantly pleaded for the PEF to assist thousands of European Saints, suffering from hard economic conditions, to emigrate. But that could not happen until former Nauvooers lingering in Iowa had been assisted first. In tandem with the Iowa evacuations in 1852, the First Presidency authorized the first PEF emigrations from Europe.

5. Dangers of Disaffection. It is clear the First Presidency wanted to stanch disaffections that happened when LDS emigrants stopped to work in St. Louis and in Iowa. Pockets of apostates aggressively tried to dissuade those who stopped to not go on, some claiming Brigham Young was not Joseph Smith’s rightful successor. Thus, the June 8 Utahns’ letter admonished Saints in Iowa and the Eastern States to shun those “who would counsel you not to come to this place as you would

38. In December 1850, close to one hundred people left for the Iron Mission and what became Cedar City, and the Deseret legislature created a name for that Little Salt Lake region, called Iron County.


40. First Presidency, Fifth General Epistle, April 7, 1851.

41. Cain and others, “To the Saints, Scattered Abroad through the Eastern States,” Frontier Guardian, August 22, 1851, 2.
a rattlesnake; for the gathering of the Saints is as true a doctrine now, as it was when the Prophet Joseph lived.” Anyone lacking the spirit of gathering “is not of us.”42

To reduce disaffections, the evacuation ultimatum included a major emigration policy change. Until then, leaders had designated the “Pot- tawatamie lands” as the best place where Saints could “speedily bet- ter their condition for their further journey.”43 At times the Presidency said they wanted European converts to halt in the States for a while so that those who would otherwise apostatize in Utah would do it before coming.44 But the First Presidency canceled the stopover option. British Mission President Franklin D. Richards counseled Saints early in 1852 that emigration no longer would be on the old plan, and that during such stopovers “some have lost the Spirit and apostatized, and many, when they get there, become lukewarm and indifferent.” Saints should stay in England “until they can go through to the Valley.”45

Related to the problem of disaffections was a concern, minor if not major, to get converts west before plural marriage practices in Utah became publicly announced, which happened in August 1852, two months after the last LDS evacuees had left Iowa.46

**Elder Benson Spearheads an Organized Evacuation**

Elders Benson, Grant, and Hyde arrived in Kanesville on November 5, 1851, after a speedy forty-day trip.47 Immediately, Elder Hyde convened a special conference on November 5. Elder Grant was too ill to attend.48 “The Elders and friends from the Valley, all spoke freely to a very large

42. Cain and others, “To the Saints, Scattered Abroad through the Eastern States,” *Frontier Guardian*, August 22, 1851, 2.
45. “Minutes of the Special General Council: Closing Address of President F. D. Richards,” London, April 6–9, 1852, in *Millennial Star* 14 (June 12, 1852): 244.
46. No definite connection between the evacuations and the polygamy announcement has been demonstrated; see David J. Whittaker, “The Bone in the Throat: Orson Pratt and the Public Announcement of Plural Marriage,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 18 (July 1987): 293–314.
47. Journal History, November 15, 1851.
and attentive audience” urging all to prepare to emigrate the next spring.49 Elder Benson spoke and no doubt read his and Grant’s credentials from the First Presidency: “We have sent Brs. Benson and Grant to bless you, and counsel you and relieve Br. Hyde. Therefore we wish you to evacuate Pottawatomie, and the States, and next fall be with us.”50 The Utah arrivals bore “united testimony . . . for the Saints to prepare for emigration to the Valley in the Spring.”51 They shared sentiments close to if not the same as what the First Presidency said in its September letters:

Have you any good excuse for not coming? No! you have all of you, unitedly, a far better chance than we had when we started as Pioneers to find this place; you have better teams and more of them. You have as good food and more of it; you have as much natural strength as we have had to come; our women and children have walked here, and been blessed in walking here, and bare-foot, too, only as they could occasionally get a skin from the Indians to make a moccasin, and can you not do the same? You can. And we say again, come home!52

Elder Benson told the conference he would spend the winter with them, organizing them into wagon companies. At the meetings’ end, one report said that “every face seemed looking westward.”53 One of those Utah arrivals, Samuel W. Richards, saw a “hearty response” to the call to gather, and “their hearts seem Zion ward.” He noted that “the subject of the hand-carts and wheel-barrow trains, seem to be, by

---

50. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatomie,” September 21, 1851.
52. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatomie,” September 21, 1851.
53. Journal History, November 8, 1851.
many, of rather a novel introduction.” That option’s intent was to get the departure fires “well kindled.” But, he added, “In order that the fire may not be crowded too hard at first, the present call or proposition for arrangements only consists of 1,000 wagons, 2,000 hand-carts, and 1,000 wheel-barrows, and measures to be taken immediately for getting out timber for manufacturing purposes.”

Elder Grant left on November 14 to do Church public relations work in Washington, DC, related to the controversies of the “runaway” Utah officials.

Unknown to Elder Hyde, Brigham Young had given Elders Benson and Grant a private, written, sealed instruction. If Elder Hyde hindered or obstructed their mission in any way, they were to read in public the private communication, which authorized the two to assume the presidency of the Church at Pottawattamie and in the United States, removing Elder Hyde from that position.

54. ”Extracts of a Letter from Elder S. W. Richards to Joseph Cain,” November 12, 1851, in Deseret News, March 6, 1852, 1.
55. Journal History, November 3, 1851, excerpts from Willard Snow’s account covering events before and after that date.
56. “Private Instructions to Ezra Taft Benson and Jedediah M. Grant,” September 22, 1851, draft copy, in Brigham Young Papers.
The postconference issue of the *Frontier Guardian*, published on November 14, promoted evacuation. In it Hyde published the First Presidency’s September 21 letter to the Pottawattamie Saints, to which he appended his own advice: “Cease to murmur or repine, and do the best and all you can, and you will be prospered, and the hand of Providence will work for your good.”57 Under the headline “Pottowattamie County for Sale,” another article said in part, “The Mormons are about to make a general move from this place in the Spring; and now is the time for speculation and investment, for all such as wish to increase their wealth. It is the best point for producing, in all the West, and the best market on the Frontier. Now is the time for purchasers:—Strike while the ’Iron is hot’ and secure a fortune while you can.”58

Going on circuit, Elder Benson visited the different branches and preached evacuation.59 He “commenced immediately to organize them into companies” to march “enmass,” taking their poor with them.60 On November 28, he met with and organized the Council Point Branch and made a remarkable observation: “This call for the Saints to come home has been the greatest ever since the Church has been in existence.” Those

---

57. First Presidency, “To All the Saints in Pottawatamie,” September 21, 1851.
59. One such visit is recorded in Gibson Condie, Reminiscences and diary, 1865–1910, Church History Library. The trail section of this document is excerpted online in Thomas C. D. Howell Company, 1852, *Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel*. By December 20, Elder Grant was in the nation’s capital, according to Benson’s March 16, 1852, letter to Brigham Young and Counsel, copied into Journal History, that date.
60. Ezra T. Benson to George A. Smith, March 12, 1852, in Journal History, that date, p. 1.
The Frontier Guardian, November 28, 1851, publicizing Ezra T. Benson’s meeting schedule with Iowa settlements, to reorganize the branches into wagon trains.

The Frontier Guardian, November 28, 1851, published Elder Benson’s schedule for meetings in nineteen locations to organize the departures. It listed two or three visits each day from Monday, December 1, through Tuesday, December 9. The visits were scheduled for 10:00 a.m. and either 3:00 p.m. or 6 p.m., depending on distances between the meeting places. At some locations, representatives from more than one branch attended.

Difficult to Uproot

Elders Benson and Hyde’s crusade worked. By late 1851, according to Mormon Jonathan Layne in Iowa, “nearly all of our people in Pottawatomie County prepared to go the next year to Salt Lake Valley.” But emigrating was not easy or cheap. For Saints to head west meant giving up jobs, selling or trading farms and homes, procuring wagons, obtaining teams to pull the wagons, collecting clothing and provisions sufficient for the hundred-day trek, and in some cases regaining health.

On March 16, Elder Hyde advised Saints not to dispose of their farms and cabins “for trifles,” but to “try for a good price in cash or its equivalent.” Two months later, Elder Benson reported that the uprooters were selling a “goodly number” of their farms and improvements and wanting to be blessed “must give heed to this call.” He left no room for excuses.

On November 28, the Frontier Guardian published Elder Benson’s schedule for meetings in nineteen locations to organize the departures. It listed two or three visits each day from Monday, December 1, through Tuesday, December 9. The visits were scheduled for 10:00 a.m. and either 3:00 p.m. or 6 p.m., depending on distances between the meeting places. At some locations, representatives from more than one branch attended.

---


63. Jonathan Ellis Layne, Autobiography, 1897, 10–18, Church History Library, excerpted online in Benjamin Gardner Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
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“some are getting pretty good prices.” Albert Dickson said that in the spring of 1852 he “sold his place and bought 2 yoke of oxen and 2 yokes of cows” in order to go west. Young marrieds Lewis and Susan Whitesides traded their 160-acre farm for an ox team in order to be able to leave.

This mass pullout created great demand, and hence shortages, for wagons, cattle, and provisions. That winter witnessed large-scale wagon constructing in the branches. A typical outfit consisted of a wagon, two yoke of oxen, two cows, and provisions. Early in 1852 the cost for a yoke of oxen was $60 to $75, “and still advancing.” Add to that about $75 for two cows, and $125 or more for provisions, and the expense neared $350 (equivalent to roughly $8,000 to $10,000 in 2013 dollars). The Macedonia Branch records provide a rare insight into what the wagons carried. Member David Bowman’s load weighed 2,069 pounds and included beds (weighing 67, 32, and 37 pounds each), a bucket (12 pounds), a stove (89), a boiler (22), pots (23), flat irons (11), soap (21), containers of meal (23, 76, 87, 115, 103), boxes (88, 46, 47, 21, 120, 53), sacks (75, 75, 26, 32, 42), and iron (36). His wagon also carried bacon, crackers and cheese, sugar, and ginger, but weights were not stated.

People obtained outfits or else tried to go with others who did. By 1852, Zadock and Sarah Bethers, who had known Joseph Smith well, had lived in the Kanesville area for six years. They left for Utah (as a family of nine) on June 4 with three yoke of cows, three oxen, and three new wagons.

65. Ezra T. Benson to President Brigham Young and Council, May 13, 1852, Journal History, that date.
66. Albert Douglas Dickson, Reminiscence [c. 1911], 2–5, Church History Library, excerpted online in John B. Walker Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
68. Benson to Smith, March 12, 1852.
70. “Macedonia Branch, Iowa, Record 1847–1852, fd. 2,” Church History Library, also excerpted online in Henry Bryant Manning Jolley Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
71. Mary Jane Bethers York, Autobiographical Sketch, Mormon Biographical Sketches Collection 1–2, Church History Library, excerpted online in Joseph Outhouse Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
Mary Ann Frost Pratt headed out in 1852 with two children and with Mary Ann Stearns, age 19, in a wagon that Hiram Winters gave to them—“one of the best that has been made in our shop,” Winters told them. The family had lived in Nauvoo and at Winter Quarters.72

As late as April 20, 1852, a report said that “the Saints are generally poor, and the way looks dark and gloomy.”73 Sellers and traders became desperate. Oren Jefferds “staid on my place this summer [1851] and prepared for gitting toem [team] and outfitt for the Mountains.” He sold an old ox, a mare, and a one-horse wagon and bought “one more cow.” That fall he went into Missouri and bought two yoke of steers. He “broke them and my cows” and in June 1852 started west.74 The George B. Hicks family sold their home for a “song,” and on June 5 “we bade adieu to our home where we had toiled for 5 years preparing for the journey.” They had but one ox team, a couple of cows, and “great faith.”75 The Gibson Condie family could not sell their farm, and, Condie said, others could not either, so they just “left their places.”76

Those with oxen but no wagon agreed to hook up, literally, with a wagon owner who needed more oxen. Those with outfits and space took others with them in return for labor on the plains, such as cooking, tending children, being teamsters, or driving cattle. The Isaac and Adah Phippen family had participated in the Nauvoo exodus, stayed two years at Winter Quarters, and then moved back to the Iowa side and farmed. Through “hard work and economy,” they came up with two wagons for the 1852 move. Then, to help the poor, “my father had a widow and three children in one of his wagons,” a Phippen child recalled. The family “never got one cent” for their farm and its contents, and they “left everything only that which they could put in two wagons.”77

73. Ezra T. Benson, April 20, 1852, Journal History, that date.
74. Oren Jefferds/Jeffords, Reminiscences and Diary, 1856–64, 49–50, Church History Library, excerpted online in David Wood Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
75. George Armstrong Hicks, Family Record and History of Geo. A. Hicks, 10–11, Church History Library, excerpted online in John B. Walker Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
76. Condie, Reminiscences and Diary.
77. Isaac Phippen, “History of Isaac Phippen,” 2–3, Church History Library, excerpted online in Harmon Cutler Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel; Ada Louisa Phippen Mahoney, Autobiographical sketch, in How
Nauvooers John and Alice Ellison spent five years in St. Louis, and then in 1851 sent two cows, two yoke of oxen, a wagon, and tools up to Kanesville. They arrived too late to emigrate that year, so John rented a farm at Pigeon Grove. A neighbor's boarder who had a team but no wagon joined his team to the Ellisons' wagon and journeyed with them.78

Organizing the Mass Migration

In each branch or group, Elder Benson appointed “the best financeer” as captain, with two counselors. He said he “lost no time night or day until [he] had ridden all over this section of the country and organized forty companies.” When he met with the Lake Branch in November, the branch agreed that its president, Joseph H. Tippetts, should be their wagon company captain. Elder Benson gave Tippetts orders to organize the company and inventory the members' livestock.79 On November 25, Elder Benson met with the Buoye/Rocky Ford Branch and nominated branch president William Meeks to take charge of making wagons and preparing for the exodus.80 He visited the McOlney Branch on December 4 and organized it with a president and two counselors.81 By the end of 1851, “some [of the companies] were prepared and some were not, and the latter class I instructed to get out their timber and make all necessary preparations for the journey.”82

Captains or representatives of forty branches gave readiness reports to Elder Benson during March 6 and 7, 1852, meetings at the Big Pigeon Tabernacle.83 In a March 16 letter, Elder Benson provided the following tallies drawn from eight branch/company reports:84

---

Beautiful upon the Mountains: A Centennial History of Wasatch County, ed. Wm. James Mortimer [1963], 417–18, Church History Library, excerpted online in Harmon Cutler Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
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84. Benson to Young and Counsel, March 16, 1852.
His sampling shows an average of six people and just over one yoke of oxen per wagon. Big Pigeon Branch reported it had twenty surplus wagons for sale. Harris Grove had ten new wagons for sale. Rocky Ford had twenty-four other wagons being constructed, and Kanesville had ten “being built by subscription expressly for the poor.” Each of the eight branches said they could take their poor with them, although Council Point had forty people who needed help to complete their outfits.85 Elder Benson said that “from all appearances there will be about ten thousand of our people cross the plains this season,” a projection that other wagon estimates support.86

This report meeting, he felt, was a “good meeting” with “not a dissenting spirit in the house,” and the branch reports were “beyond my most sanguine expectations.” However, the reports do show that in the North Pigeon Branch one or two families offered “excuses for tarrying,” and in the Welsh Branch one or two families were “rather indifferent about going.” Overall, however, those willing to leave “rejoiced in prospect of the day when we shall rise up en masse together and leave the gentile nation.”

That winter President Young sent at least two letters containing names of Iowa Saints to be helped with Church PEF funds, for whom Utahns had paid the travel expenses.87

In Utah, meanwhile, during the April 1852 conference, President Heber C. Kimball voiced concerns about Saints who would cross the plains that year using wheelbarrows and handcarts. In response, ninety-three men volunteered to donate their services “to go out with their teams to carry provisions and assist them on the road.”88 On May 3, President Willard Richards wrote that “several hundreds are coming across

---
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the plains with hand carts and wheel barrows and Pres. B. Young intends to go out and meet them.”

That day Richards wrote to Elder Benson urgently requesting a count of how many were coming with handcarts and wheelbarrows, “so that we could know what to do in regard to giving assistance” and so that President Young could know if he was to go out to meet such nonwagon emigrants. The May 3 mail brought the First Presidency word from Elder Benson “giving glorious accounts of the prosperity of the saints in removing” but no handcart count.

In Kanesville, relations with “Gentiles” passing through or living in southwestern Iowa became testy at times. In September 1851, several federal appointees in Utah Territory had chafed at Church control of territorial operations and deserted their posts. In the States, they were spreading “highly colored” stories about the Mormons. Their reports triggered “a tirade of abuse and falsehood that is going the rounds of eastern newspapers” and newspapers in St. Louis and St. Joseph. “Our situation has been critical indeed and we were forced to walk as though we were treading on eggs,” Elder Benson admitted on March 16. “The report of the returning officers raised a storm that for a while threatened to burst with fury upon our heads, but the Lord has helped us; the storm has been stayed.” He discerned that “we shall now be allowed to enjoy a calm long enough to get away from our enemies.”

By mid-March, Elder Hyde had sold his Frontier Guardian press, its building, and features for $2,000. Indications were that “emigration to the land of gold” would be greater that season than in 1851. On April 7, during Kanesville’s final LDS conference, Elder Benson “spoke to the Captains of Emigrating companies,” saying “the word from the mountains was to all to come along, if they had to come 100 souls to 5 wagons.”

89. Willard Richards to Robert Campbell, May 3, 1852, Journal History, that date.
91. Thomas Bullock to Jedediah Grant, April 28, 1852, Journal History, that date. Bullock added a May 4 footnote to the letter because eastern mail arrived the day before.
93. Benson to Young and Counsel, March 16, 1852.
94. Benson to Smith, March 12, 1852. The last issue of the Frontier Guardian was February 23, 1852. New owner Jacob Dawson then printed its successor, the Frontier Guardian and Iowa Sentinel. See Hyde, Orson Hyde, 284–85.
He promised those who went that they would be blessed “in the name of Israel’s God, but if they remained here and turned away from God and forgot their covenants woe! woe! be to all such.” Elder Hyde also spoke and said he would not counsel which side of the Platte River to travel, but “to get ready to start as early as possible.”

The Emigration Season Opens

On May 1, the first of the Church-organized Iowa wagon companies ferried across the Missouri. Others followed when ready and as fast as flatboat ferries could transport the wagons, oxen, horses, sheep, dogs, cats, men, women, and children. Crossings primarily were at the Upper or Mormon Ferry connecting to where Winter Quarters once was. But some used a Middle Ferry near Kanesville or the one farther downriver at Bellevue. After the ferry crossings, wagons followed trails that converged about twenty-seven miles into Nebraska, north of where the Elk-horn River flows into the Platte River. From there they followed the same general route the 1847 Mormon Pioneers took, along the Platte River’s north side. However, five companies that year did cross south of Iowa and Nebraska and use other routes to Fort Laramie (see below). A May 13 newspaper report said Kanesville was “literally crowded with emigrants from all parts of the Globe, who are wending their way to California, Oregon, and Utah.”

By then, seven or eight different steamboats had brought passengers to Kanesville, including about two hundred Saints, with more expected daily. That day, Elder Benson estimated that from three-fourths to seven-eighths of the Saints in the “Pottawattamie Purchase” would leave that season. On May 19, Elders Hyde and Benson told those who had not sold their properties or who had been unable to buy wagons and teams to prepare to use wheelbarrows and handcarts. By May’s end Hyde and Benson had appointed Joseph E. Johnson as a general agent in Kanesville for handling the departing Saints’ properties and claims.

---
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“The Oregon and California Emigration is beyond calculation. The like was never known before,” Elder Hyde wrote to Brigham Young on May 27. “The tens of thousands of head of cattle, aside from the teams that are swarming on the plains, are truly alarming. . . . I fear that the trip may be disastrously ruinous to many for lack of grass. . . . The plains are literally covered and crowded with emigrants and their wagons and stock. For the last six weeks, and even eight weeks, the streets of Kanesville have been regularly blockaded by the throng and multitude.”

Kanesville clogged with traffic. Early in June the Frontier Guardian and Iowa Sentinel reported that “our streets are still thronged with emigrants bound for Oregon, California and Salt Lake. Although thousands have crossed the river at this point, still thousands are yet remaining to be crossed.” On July 1, Elder Benson wrote to Brigham Young to report that he had organized 18 companies with 50 to 75 wagons in each, some 1,200 wagons total, and all were then across the Missouri and taking up their line of march. They were “well rigged out” with teams, clothing, and provisions—as well fitted out, with a few exceptions, as any who had crossed the plains. He still had two or three companies to start, containing a number of the poor that probably would have weak teams. He urged President Young to send relief teams and provisions to meet and help those last companies. He said he would get to Utah as fast as a horse could carry him, but he would check on every company along the way. “Miracles have been wrought here in getting off the Saints, and this to my astonishment,” he exulted. “I never took more satisfaction in my life on a mission, than I have in this.” He would travel west with Elders Grant, John Taylor, Erastus Snow, and Franklin D. Richards. He estimated the Pottawattamie companies already included 6,000 souls and 1,200 wagons, and he believed that the total would reach 10,000 Saints headed to Utah. None were handcart or wheelbarrow companies, he noted, because “before we could get one started, they would turn into wagons and teams.”

When the recruiting and organizing dust settled, twenty-one LDS companies of “fifty” (meaning about fifty wagons) left Pottawattamie County, each one specifically numbered. Elder Benson had organized at least eighteen of them.
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The 1852 LDS Emigrating Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Number &amp; Name</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Number of Wagons</th>
<th>Departed Iowa</th>
<th>Arrival in Salt Lake City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. James W. Bay/ John S. Higbee</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>8/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. James J. Jepson</td>
<td>*225</td>
<td>*32</td>
<td>5/29</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thomas C. D. Howell</td>
<td>293 +10 fam</td>
<td>*65</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>9/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Joseph Outhouse</td>
<td>*230</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>9/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. John Tidwell</td>
<td>*340</td>
<td>*54</td>
<td>6/4–9</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Henry B. M. Jolly</td>
<td>*340</td>
<td>*64</td>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. [No company name, probably same as #17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Benjamin Gardner</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6/2–10</td>
<td>9/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Harmon Cutler</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>Sept late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Robert Wimmer</td>
<td>*230</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Isaac Bullock</td>
<td>*175</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*7/4 Platteville</td>
<td>9/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. James C. Snow</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>*55</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Eli B. Kelsey</td>
<td>*100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td>10/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Henry W. Miller</td>
<td>*229</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Allen Weeks</td>
<td>*226</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smaller Companies from Iowa

| Wm. Morley Black                       | —                | *20              | late May      | 10/2                     |
| Joel Edmunds                            | 53               | 12               | 6/10 Platteville | 9/8                     |
| William West Lane                       | *34              | *15              | 6/24          | 9/24                     |
| Crandall Dunn (quit McGaw)              | 32               | *10              | 6/23          | 9/8                      |
| _______ Betz                            | —                | 10               | —            | —                       |
Closedown of Iowa Settlements in 1852

Case Study: The Council Point Branch (Fifth) Emigrating Company

Not without patience, pain, disagreements, and hard work did branches transform into wagon companies properly equipped to convey everyone, including those lacking outfits and necessities. Excellent records for the Council Point Branch, located near the steamboat landing two miles from Kanesville, document the difficulties. On November 28, Elder Benson visited the branch to organize it. All should fit up their wagons, he said, and “those that could not get wagons was to get hand carts, and those that could not get hand carts was to get wheelbarrows or a cow to carry a pack upon and so make their way unto the Valley.” Members approved branch president John Tidwell to be the company president/captain. He chose John M. King and Thomas Robins as counselors. During the next weeks, the presidency polled the members and drew up lists of those who were going, the wagons and teams that were available, and those who needed assistance. They sent men to find lumber and to

104. “Council Point Emigrating Company, Journal.” All quotes and information used in this case study, unless cited otherwise, are from this source and not henceforward footnoted.
construct wagons. Tidwell cautioned that the poor must not expect the others to haul loads with more than what the haulers were taking. He struggled to learn who “wants assistance and how much they want.” On March 2, thirty-four families reported they could go on their own, ten needed “whole assistance,” and two needed some assistance. “Some say it looks dark and that they will stay another year to be better prepared,” counselor John M. King said, then called such thinking wrong. Grumbling caused Tidwell to request a vote of support, which he received.

He tallied wagons, teams, supplies, those who needed help, those who could take an extra person or extra baggage, and those still figuring out their situations, person by person. For example, Telemachus Rogers said he could take one person, John Andrews needed to sell his things in order to go, William Watts said it would be a “pretty good push” for him to get away, Sarah Allen needed to “join teams” and lacked some provisions, and Andrew Whitlock needed help transporting some of his family of ten but disliked having their names “on the poor list.” Tidwell calculated that “we shall be under the necessity of deviding families in different wagons” and hoped not to hurt the feelings of any involved. Members pledged to donate items for the poor, including whips, lathes, gloves, blacksmithing, groceries, corn, potatoes, and small amounts of cash ranging from fifty cents to a dollar. No one would take one sister because of her “spirit of contention,” but she repented in time. Tidwell noted that “in this branch there is a portion that is willing to do right and there is others that is eternally fault finding complaining and barking like a dog.” He asked for and received a renewed sustaining vote for his presidency.

On April 27, Tidwell grouped his branch into four companies of “ten,”105 each with a captain. In May the branch agreed to sell its schoolhouse to raise travel funds. His company waited at the North Ferry “untill the crowd of Californians have passed over.” On June 8, Elder Benson visited the company’s campsite near the upper ferry and organized them as the Fifth Company. According to the company’s clerk,

---

105. A “ten” was a group of roughly ten wagons. This unit was the workhorse in the pioneer company organization. A captain of ten knew everyone in his group, and they camped together; the whole company did not camp as one. A group of ten dealt with problems such as breakdowns, illness, or death. A captain of fifty was an “executive director” and kept track of how his five tens were doing. Often, after passing Ft. Laramie, companies with two fifties would split and travel separately for the last weeks of the journey. In rare cases, the term “ten” refers to ten people.
George Bowering, it contained 329 people, 61 wagons (or 5.4 people per wagon), 217 oxen (or 3.6 per wagon), 164 cows, 25 sheep, 14 horses, and 77 men fit for duty. Elder Benson read rules for the company to observe on the trail: prayers night and morning, a meeting each Sabbath, no swearing, guards kept every night who called out every half hour, horses corralled at night for safety, but cattle kept outside, not corralled. No one could leave the camp without the captain's permission, every man needed to have a "good gun and ammunition," and guns must be put in the wagon "with a cap on to avoid accident, and put a piece of leather over the tube." They were also instructed to treat their animals "with the utmost kindness."

Aggravated by high winds and drunk ferry operators, the Tidwell tens needed five days to cross the river, June 11–15. Then, when they tried to start west, heavy rains fell, a blacksmith died of cholera, and an elderly woman's runaway horses crashed her wagon and killed her. Finally, on June 16, the season's Fifth Company started its journey.

**Other Branches as Companies**

In preparation, the Lake Branch Company paid men to haul lumber and construct wagons and voted that “every man shall give his tenth days labour until we start for the valley or all the poor supplied.” They agreed that “any requiring help of teams wagons or provisions etc. shall give his promissory note to pay as soon as he is able to return the property with interest on his or her arrival at the Valley.”106 They joined Henry Jolley’s Seventh Company. Elder Benson organized that Seventh Company for the Macedonia Branch nineteen miles east of Kanesville. Some unsuccessfully voted against Jolley as captain, wanting Washington Lemmons instead. Passengers included residents from the Six-Mile Settlement (Barney’s Grove).107

In November 1851, Elder Benson organized the North Pigeon Branch, with Benjamin Gardner as captain and with two counselors.108 Some

---

106. Lake Branch, Iowa, Records, Church History Library.
disaffected members stayed behind and on July 11 organized their own branch. In that meeting, one spoke “harsh things” about Brigham Young, and another said Young was the “beast Daniel saw,” while a third called Brigham Young a usurper of authority. The stay-backs continued to meet in the North Pigeon tabernacle.\footnote{North Pigeon Branch Record, Church History Library.} The Plum Hollow Branch chose Louis Zabriskie as their captain, organized into tens, and traveled in the small Warren Snow (unnumbered) Company.\footnote{Plum Hollow (Iowa) Branch, Historical Record and List of Members, Church History Library.} The Welsh Branch (Thirteenth Company), located on bottomlands between Kanesville and the Missouri River, had 113 or more members, most of whom had arrived there in 1849. In late June 1852, the branch, augmented by new arrivals from St. Louis, formed a “fifty” that included some English and French. Branch president William Morgan served as captain.\footnote{William Morgan, “A Letter [June 22, 1852] to Presidents W. S. Phillips and John Davis,” in Ronald D. Dennis, The Call of Zion: The Story of the First Welsh Mormon Emigration (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center, 1987), 233. Earlier in the book the author describes the Welsh wagon company’s beginnings and journey (66–77).}

Members of the McOlney Branch (Fourteenth Company), a few miles north of Kanesville, made up most of the two hundred passengers in the John B. Walker Company. In an unnamed branch, George Mason recalled that ten or twelve families, location not stated, “all started together” and became part of the Henry Miller (Twentieth) Company on July 8.\footnote{George Mason, Autobiographical Sketch [c. 1883], 2–3, Church History Library, excerpted online in Henry W. Miller Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.} The bishop of the Harris Grove Branch organized it into tens, and with assistance from the Perpetual Emigrating Fund, they traveled with the Allen Weeks (Twenty-first) Company.\footnote{Harris Grove Branch Records, Church History Library; Fanny Parks Taggart Autobiography, 24, Church History Library, excerpted online in Allen Weeks Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.} Bishop William West Lane of the Church’s “Poor Farm,” or Lanesborough Branch, far north of Kanesville, led his members across the Missouri but died soon after, causing the company to merge into another one (unidentified).\footnote{Davis Clark, Autobiography, in Erol Clark Wiscombe, The Descendants of Maria Burr, John Clark and William West Lane [1975], 12–14, Family Accounts.}
In 1852, the Mt. Pisgah settlement, about 100 miles east of Kanesville, broke up, and its people headed west.115 Late in May, a William Morley Black wagon group from Burlington, Iowa (on the Mississippi River), linked up with the James C. Snow Company, then traveled alone. Later, twenty wagons from the Wimmer Company joined them, making forty wagons total.116

Hundreds from St. Louis, including newly arrived European emigrants, journeyed up to Kanesville and joined the Iowa companies.117 The Eli B. Kelsey (Nineteenth) Company consisted of many newly immigrated Europeans who had left St. Louis on the steamboat Saluda and survived its deadly explosion at Lexington, Missouri (see below).118 As the table above shows, at least five groups of Saints went partway up the Missouri River from St. Louis, then crossed through Kansas to reach Fort Laramie, rather than go up to Kanesville.

Elder Hyde, one of the last to leave Kanesville, gave a Fourth of July address there, then left the next morning. His family group, three wagons, and two teamsters traveled in the Henry Miller (Twentieth) Company.119

---

115. “Mount Pisgah,” in Andrew Jenson, Encyclopedic History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1941), 547.
118. William G. Hartley and Fred E. Woods, Explosion of the Steamboat Saluda: A Story of Disaster and Compassion Involving Mormon Emigrants and the Town of Lexington, Missouri, in April 1852 (Salt Lake City: Millennial Press, 2002). Identified LDS passengers are in a chart on pp. 73–78.
119. Hyde, Orson Hyde, 293, 297.
The Mormon Trail’s Largest Traffic Year

Diary and reminiscent accounts by people who traveled the Oregon, California, and Mormon trails in 1852 describe extra dust, regular competition for campsites, grass and buffalo chips being already used up, and other wagon trains often being in sight. John Unruh, in his landmark study *The Plains Across*, estimates that in 1852 on the overland trails 50,000 people went to California, 10,000 went to Oregon, and 10,000 went to Utah, making that year the trails’ busiest traffic year of all time.\(^{120}\) Elder Benson estimated 10,000 LDS emigrants, and so did eastbound traveler Thomas Margetts. Margetts and five men with him traveled from Fort Laramie along the north side of the Platte, the Mormon Trail side, and passed “one perfect camp from starting in the morning till we stopped at night” and also saw “as many wagons” on the south side. By mid-Nebraska they encountered westbound LDS companies “nearly every day” and met in total “about one thousand four hundred ‘Mormon’ teams, and not less than ten thousand Saints on their way, that is, including those waiting to cross at the ferry” near Kanesville.\(^{121}\) Although the LDS Church’s constantly updated *Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel* website currently identifies by name only 5,659 LDS 1852 trail travelers, its lists are admittedly very incomplete. But even its undercount is the largest yearly total in any Mormon Trail year before 1852 or after. More LDS emigrants crossed the plains in 1852 than in any other year.

Iowa LDS wagon companies rarely saw travelers bound for Oregon or California because those wagon trains, having farther to go, left earlier than those going to Utah. But they regularly passed, camped with, or were passed by their fellow westbound Mormon companies. Companies 10 (Gardner), 11 (McGaw), and 12 (Cutler) “traveled together for several hundred miles for mutual protection,” Ada Phippen later recalled, often leap-frogging each other in July.\(^ {122}\) On August 19, the McGaws passed the Gardners and two days later passed the Stewart (9th) Company.

\(^{120}\) Unruh, *Plains Across*, 120. Judge W. T. Smith, whose company arrived from California in Kanesville on July 15, said that between South Pass and Kanesville they had passed nearly 15,000 teams and 40,000 people, “the greater part of them on the north route.” See “Highly Important from California and the Plains,” *Frontier Guardian and Iowa Sentinel*, July 23, 1852.


\(^{122}\) Phippen, “History of Isaac Phippen.”
Chimney Rock, on August 20, the Kelsey (19th) and Weeks (21st) trains camped about ten miles apart, and near Fort Laramie the Kelseys passed the Weekses on August 26. On August 28, the Snow (18th) Company’s clerk noted that “for the past week we have passed and repassed several companys,” including the Wimmer (15th) and Curtis (16th) companies, and two “tens” from other companies.\(^{123}\) Beyond Pacific Springs, the Kelsey Company traveled with or near Captain De La Mare’s big Deseret freight wagon train. On October 6, the Kelsey Company overtook the Weeks train again, and the next day both companies crossed the Bear River and headed down Echo Canyon, nearly home.\(^{124}\)

Cholera, rampant on the trails in 1849 and 1850, also plagued the 1852 companies, most of which suffered cholera outbreaks mainly between the Loup Fork and Fort Laramie. Several had rather high death tolls, such as Smoot’s European PEF train from St. Louis that lost eleven to cholera.\(^{125}\) Trail scholar Mel Bashore estimates that ninety-nine Mormon emigrants died of cholera in 1852, making it perhaps the Mormon Trail’s worst cholera year.\(^{126}\)

Most of the 1852 LDS emigration left Kanesville in June and for about three months progressed an average of two miles per hour, ten to twelve miles per day. They arrived in Great Salt Lake City between mid-August and November. The twenty-one companies averaged 98 days to reach Salt Lake City, or twelve weeks. By contrast, the famous first 1847 pioneer company took 111 days; in 1856, the first three handcart companies

---

124. Based on individual wagon train accounts as posted on Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel website for 1852. Citing each specific one I drew from to show these connections is too complicated to include here.
125. Abraham O. Smoot to Brigham Young, July 7, 1852, Church History Library, online in Abraham O. Smoot Company, 1852, Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel.
needed 65 days and three wagon trains required 77 days (from Florence); and in 1861 the thirteen LDS wagon trains averaged 73 days. According to the First Presidency’s Eighth General Epistle, dated October 13, 1852, many of the companies “were late in their emigration this year” such that “for the last two or three weeks, have suffered from occasional snow storms in the mountains, which retarded their progress.” Because delays and snow “helped to make them short of provisions . . . some two hundred or more teams and wagons went from the Valley to their assistance, taking to the various camps some forty or fifty thousand pounds of flour, and large supplies of vegetables, which enabled them to come in, in safety.”

Because Utah became a territory late in 1850, it took that year’s federal census count late, completing it on April 1, 1851. It showed 11,354 inhabitants. That year, 1851, trail emigrants added perhaps 5,000 to Utah’s population. Thus, in 1852, the arrival of between 6,000 and 10,000 newcomers increased Utah’s population by nearly 50 percent.

**Successful Evacuation Campaign**

On August 20, 1852, Elders Benson, Grant, Taylor, Snow, and Richards reached Salt Lake City. One company had arrived before them. Eight days later, President Young conducted a special conference for more than one hundred men called on missions, the biggest wave of missionaries yet sent out from Utah. To these men he praised the Iowa evacuations that now made it possible to boost missionary numbers: “There are a great many coming; bro. Benson says all are coming, even the great grand daddies, and great grand mammies; uncles and aunts, all are coming, and I am glad of it; I rejoice for it puts us in a position that we can send out elders from this place into all the world; whereas, before, our circumstances needed all the men we had here to prepare for the gathering of the saints.”


130. Thomas Bullock estimated that by April 1852 Utah had perhaps 20,000 residents. Bullock to John M. Bernhisel, April 28, 1852, in Journal History, that date.

That same day, President Young wrote to John Bernhisel, “We are now prepared to send out Elders to the nations.” The next day in the special conference, August 29, Elder Orson Pratt publicly announced for the Church its practice of plural marriage, which announcement the missionaries would take with them to their fields of labor.\(^{132}\)

The Presidency considered the orchestrated 1852 emigration effort a success. They rejoiced that “Israel is coming home in crowds, like doves to their windows.” They explained to readers churchwide that “Elders Ezra T. Benson and Jedediah M. Grant returned . . . from their mission to Pottawatamie, which they left almost entirely vacated by the Saints, who are now in the Valley; many of whom began to prepare to come over the plains, with hand-carts and wheel-barrows, but when the Lord saw they were determined to come home, at all hazards, He opened their way to have wagons and teams, even to the last family that wanted to come.”\(^{133}\)

As fast as the emigrants arrived, the *Deseret News* noted, they were “generally desirous of obtaining information concerning their friends, and the settlements and locations in these valleys.” Newcomers received advice from several specially appointed bishops: Nathaniel H. Felt at the Public Works, Abraham Hoagland of the 14th Ward, Seth Taft of the 8th Ward, Devid Pettegrew of the 10th Ward, Alfred Cordon at the Pottery, Abraham O. Smoot of the 15th Ward, and John Banks in Battle Creek in Utah County.\(^{134}\)

On August 22, Apostle John Taylor, who had just returned from a mission to Europe, told a Salt Lake audience, “It gave me great joy, on my way home, to find the Saints leaving Kanesville. It seemed as though they were swept out with a besom [broom] almost.” While there, between May 28 and July 4, “I rode out in my carriage one day to a place called Council Point. I thought I would go and visit some of the folks there, but, when I got there, behold, there were no folks to see.” He found a stranger who had just come to town. “And the people have all left?” he asked the stranger. “Yes.” Taylor saw three people total. “When I first reflected upon this removal,” he said, he felt amazed that the poor and decrepit also were gone. “Thank God, they are coming, nearly all, old and young, rich and poor.”\(^{135}\)

\(^{132}\) Brigham Young to John M. Bernhisel, August 28, 1852, Journal History, that date.

\(^{133}\) First Presidency, Eighth General Epistle, 101, 104.

\(^{134}\) “The Emigrating Saints,” *Deseret News*, September 18, 1852, 3.

During the October 1852 general conference, President Young called for one hundred families to go to Iron County to assist with the iron works there, and one hundred families to go to Millard County, the territory’s new capital. This invitation was open to all, including those fresh from Iowa. He told newcomers that Salt Lake Valley was pretty much taken up with farms, and the wood used up, so they should, as Elder Hyde said, “go where neighbors are few and get the best places for farms. . . . The word is, go south and fill up the vallies.”

Nauvoo Covenant Fulfilled

When set up in 1849, the Perpetual Emigrating Fund’s primary purpose was to fulfill the Nauvoo covenant to help “bring home the poor Saints who were driven from Nauvoo.” How much PEF help the 1852 emigrants received cannot be determined because surviving PEF records for the early 1850s are of mixed types, are not filed together by year, and are very incomplete. However, the PEF was deeply involved. Included in Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company documents are several passenger lists and scraps related to most of the 1852 companies (but lacking PEF accountings), and two PEF promissory notes signed by 1852 emigrants upon reaching Utah. Evacuation directors Benson and Grant were PEF officers. Historian Gustive O. Larson observed that when the 1852 emigration season closed, “all the exiles from Nauvoo who wished to come had been removed to Zion,” which meant that “the obligations of the Nauvoo pledge of 1846 had been faithfully discharged.” After that, PEF funds were directed to helping European Saints.

138. William Davies, bishop of the Welch branch, signed a note promising to “pay on demand” $100 “on account of the Perpetual Emigration fund,” and Mary A. Pratt signed a note to pay the PEF $59.87 for “said company assisting myself and three children from Kanesville Iowa” in 1852. The Davies (Morgan Company) and Pratt (Tidwell Company) notes are in Perpetual Emigrating Fund, Bonds and Promissary Notes, 1852–56, Church History Library. Passenger lists or other items related to companies 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21 and the Edmund, Lane, and Dunn small companies are found in the Perpetual Emigrating Fund, General Files, 1849–98, Church History Library. It is possible these companies’ documents were given to Elder Benson and he brought them to Utah.
139. Larson, Prelude to the Kingdom, 113.
Historians lack the thorough demographic research necessary to do more than guess how many ex-Nauvooers did not go to Utah. Possibly 2,000 Nauvooers never participated in the exodus across Iowa. Of those Saints who spent time by the Missouri River, which includes non-Nauvooers, Richard Bennett has estimated that about 2,000 might have disaffected between 1846 and 1852. In southwestern Iowa, among the LDS “remnants” who remained and the “go backs” who left Utah, many became receptive to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (RLDS, now called the Community of Christ) message by and after 1860. In 1870, at least thirty-seven RLDS branches dotted southwestern Iowa.

### Other 1852 Emigration Developments

With authorization from the First Presidency, Apostle Franklin Richards sent from Liverpool in 1852 the first two European emigrant ship companies funded at least partially by the PEF. Of the 700 passengers, the fund helped 251, of which 226, as prearranged, joined the Smoot wagon train (see chart above). Captain Smoot’s 33 wagons, 24 of which were PEF wagons, and 55 yoke of PEF oxen received a warm welcome in Utah for being the first European PEF emigrants. That year also saw the first LDS party from Scandinavia, some twenty-eight souls, come to America. They joined the Kelsey Company.

When Saints pulled out of Kanesville, remaining residents renamed the place Council Bluffs. After 1852, LDS wagon trains no longer outfitted in that Winter Quarters–Kanesville region, ending a five-year practice, but instead outfitted in Keokuk (1853); the Kansas City area (1854); Mormon Grove, Kansas (1855); and Iowa City (1856).

As already noted, after 1852 the Church adopted a new “straight-through” emigrating policy whereby emigrants had to “accomplish the entire journey to the Valley without detention.” This change required

---


142. Smoot to Young, July 7, 1852. Also see several entries in Journal History, September 3, 1852.

143. Jenson, “Church Emigration, IX, Emigration from 1852 to 1855,” *Contributor* 13 (January 1892): 131–38; “Sixth General Epistle of the Presidency of the Church.”
that ships be booked to leave Liverpool in January and February instead of in the fall.144

On April 9, 1852, the Missouri River steamboat Saluda, carrying nearly one hundred Saints, exploded at Lexington, Missouri, killing twenty-nine Mormons on board. Many survivors reached Kanesville and went west in the Kelsey wagon train.145

Also notable in 1852 was the near-use of handcarts, a plan that came to fruition between 1856 and 1860 when ten handcart companies rolled west and one (of missionaries) went east.146

**Rebecca Winters’s Grave: An 1852 Trail Memorial**

Other than Elders Orson Hyde and Ezra T. Benson, perhaps Rebecca Winters is the best known 1852 Mormon Trail traveler, because of her grave. A convert to Mormonism in 1833 and an ex-Nauvooer, in 1852 she and husband Hiram and family left Kanesville in the Snow (Eighteenth) Company. On August 15, near Scotts Bluff, Nebraska, cholera killed her. A friend chiseled her name and age on an iron wheel rim. Later, Burlington Railroad surveyors discovered her grave and, to not disturb it, relocated the tracks. As one of but few surviving marked graves of all who died crossing the plains, the “Rebecca Winters Grave” is a major site that all trail guidebooks laud.147 Her wheel-rimmed 1852 marker serves as a quiet memorial to the Mormon Trail’s busiest year.

**Conclusion**

With the arrival of the last Iowa company on October 16, a notable case closed of a difficult assignment given and a difficult assignment capably fulfilled. Had the First Presidency held a “mission complete” celebration, several who made the successful evacuations happen could have been honored. The four 1851 letters that provided orders and encouragement deserve a “motivators’ award.” Elder Benson’s individual work

---

144. Minutes of the Special General Council, London, April 5–9, 1852, in *Millennial Star* 14 (June 12, 1852): 243–47.
with branch after branch, appointing company leaders, insisting that the poor be assisted, and then overseeing the wagon train departures, merit an “outstanding leadership” honor. The Iowa Saints’ willingness to respond deserves accolades, too, because so many, in order to obey the Presidency and Elder Benson, sacrificed cabins and good farms, struggled to come up with wagons and teams, and reached out to assist those unable to go on their own resources. Finally, toasts and ovations hardly do justice to the men who changed their branch president hats for “wagon captain” boots. Despite no such celebration, the arrival of the last Iowa company let Church emigration history close one vital chapter and turn the page to a new one, the large-scale emigration from Europe that characterized the 1850s and 1860s.
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Just Being There

When my father—who quit school at eighth grade
to work the farm with his mother—
said to no one in particular
“\textquote“I never felt sixteen,”\textquotenotag

it was like those instants of looking at nothing
but seeing everything, so brief it’s lost
at the moment it almost comes.

My mother tries to ignore
these spells, his living in the past,
part of diabetes and old age.

“\textquote“I’ve worried about the weather all my life,”\textquotenotag
he says,

and suddenly it seems that all those years
when we could go nowhere unless the work was finished
are still here . . . too much that won’t be done.

\textquote{Sometimes not to feel is the greatest desire,}
so I clench my stomach muscles and try
to think of times he seemed happy,

remember in a sepia haze his whistling
through his teeth, bent over the repair of a harness,
light slanting on dust particles
through slats of the barn:
  moments of concentration and happiness . . .
\textquote{perhaps they are the same.}

He remembers the names of all his horse teams,
the exact years of greatest snowfall and drought,
but describes funerals he didn’t attend, guests
at my wedding who weren’t there.
I’ve just been forced at a family dinner
to revise a vivid memory: my sister and I
chasing his favorite horse from wet pasture,
when suddenly it fell and would not get up.
But my brother was with me instead, they both agree,
who ran to get Father, who shot the mare.
Now we are silent
   in the different shades of guilt we’ve kept
   at just being there.

The end of a story like this
is that it doesn’t end, only changes . . .
leaving us to wonder at the slow
kaleidoscope of memory’s shadow
remaking itself—tomorrow and next year—
how truth holds all our versions.

—Dixie Partridge

This poem won third place in the BYU Studies 2013 poetry contest.
The ship *John Williams* was owned by the London Missionary Society. It was named after John Williams (1796–1839), an extraordinary Protestant missionary and martyr in the South Pacific. Six more ships christened *John Williams* were operated in succession by the LMS. Courtesy Council for World Mission Archive, SOAS Library, University of London.
Latter-day Saint Missionaries Encounter the London Missionary Society in the South Pacific, 1844–1852

Fred E. Woods

In fall 1843, four Latter-day Saint (LDS) missionaries embarked on the ship *Timoleon* from New Bedford, Massachusetts, to launch missionary work in the South Pacific.¹ The quartet consisted of Addison Pratt, who had commenced a career as a whaler at the age of twenty (1822);² Benjamin F. Grouard, a seaman since the age of fourteen;³ Noah Rogers, the oldest of the group and president of the mission;⁴ and Knowlton F.

---


³. Benjamin F. Grouard, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, traveled throughout the world. Because of his oceanic experience, he was well suited to accompany Pratt on a mission to the islands of the Pacific. “B. F. Grouard’s Death,” *Deseret Evening News*, April 7, 1894, 4.

Hanks, age twenty-seven and the only bachelor of the group, who hoped being in the islands would improve his poor health. Tragically, Hanks passed away three weeks into the voyage and was buried at sea.5 In May 1844, Pratt left the Timoleon and began proselytizing on the island of Tubuai, 350 miles south of Tahiti, because there were no Christian missionaries on the island and the inhabitants were eager to have a missionary abide with them.6 Rogers and Grouard went on to Tahiti.7

5. Benjamin F. Grouard, Journal, June 1843–September 1846, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, October 8–November 3, 1843, 24–25, notes that Hanks’s death was a “source of grief & anxiety” for the group.


Previous studies of the South Pacific mission have relied heavily on the journals kept by Addison Pratt, his relatives, and other Mormons. This study adds to our understanding of this mission by presenting the writings of missionaries of the London Missionary Society (LMS) that discuss their interactions with the Mormon missionaries. Here are one complete letter, parts of seven other letters, and extracts from a journal—all the known writings of LMS missionaries in the South Pacific region from 1849 to 1857 that mention the Mormon missionaries. This information sheds light on the interaction between the English missionaries and the LDS missionaries, showing that there was at times goodwill and friendship as well as the antagonism that has been previously documented.

**English Missionaries from the London Missionary Society**

In 1795, leaders of independent churches in Great Britain joined forces with Anglican and Presbyterian clergy and laymen to form a mission society whose object was “to spread the knowledge of Christ among the heathen and other unenlightened nations.” Missionaries of the London Missionary Society arrived on the Society Islands in 1797 and taught the native Tahitians English, translated the Bible into Tahitian (1835), and abolished human sacrifice. They were generally not supportive of the message the Latter-day Saint missionaries carried to the islanders in the 1840s. These LMS missionaries were a mixed blessing for the proselytizing Saints, who found them both a stepping stone as well as

---

a stumbling block. Along with benefitting from the English missionaries’ work translating the Bible and spreading the good news of Christ, Latter-day Saint missionaries also followed the English system for conducting meetings: they held several preaching services each Sunday and also normally had their baptismal services on the Sabbath just before their scheduled meetings. Historian George Ellsworth has explained, “Meetings consisted of hymns, prayers, confirmations, ordinations, and sermons. . . . School was conducted weekdays, with lessons in reading, arithmetic, geography, and, sometimes, chapters of the Bible. On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday evenings, Pratt held Bible study classes.”

Difficulties in Tahiti for the Mormons

Rogers and Grouard found Tahiti in political turmoil as the French colonizers were fighting the natives for control of the island. Upon arrival in May 1844, Grouard wrote:

We had a good deal of trouble to get permission from the french government to stay on the island, owing to the great trouble the english missionaries had caused them, in stiring up the natives to fight them, but finely we succeeded. . . . One of the english missionaries lived closes by where we took up our abode, & a day or two after we arived there he called on us. We had considerable conversation together on the gospel, & we also told him the object of our mission—that we were sent of God to prepare the way for the coming of the Son of Man which was nigh at hand. We soon found however it was useless talking to him, as he positively declared he never would believe our message, though we should raise one from the dead. He believed all the fauls [false] reports about us however, though he had no better evidence than lying newspapers. From this time thay beagan to circulate faulshoods about us among the natives, & to use every means in their power to prejudice them against us. Not being able to speak the language much, we laboured under great disadvantage One month passed away & we had done nothing, & the prospect was still very gloomy.

In June 1844, Grouard wrote of the difficulties they encountered:

We had several conversations with the [LMS] missionaries, & told them the object of our mission, giving them at the same time an account of the rise of the church, & the doctrines we had come to teach, & them meekly bore our testimony to them . . . but they only mocked it. The devil has

managed to import to this Island the corrupt production of John C. Bennetts pen,11 & his servants received it as a precious morsel, & diligently circulated it among the natives, in order to destroy entirely our influence among them. We had many sore trials to encounter, & nothing encouraging to look forward to—all was dark & gloomy—No prospect of a termination of the difficulties between the natives & French, but the contrary, of their growing still worse.12

In October, Grouard seemed still tenacious:

It was tough work indeed to plant the Lords standered [standard] on this island—we had to fight hard for every inch of ground we got against the combined opposition of Priest & people—the Devil & his self sanctified & self styled servants of God. Every individual who came forward to be baptized had to, (as it were) run the gantlet of the Devils army—. We however still felt to press forward to the object of our mission.13

Ellsworth summarized the difficult situation faced by the early Mormon missionaries in Tahiti: “The natives were interested only in ending the war [between the French and the natives for control of the island] and solving its accompanying problems. The English missionaries excluded the Mormons from the only church facilities and influenced the natives against them. In addition, the Americans had the time-consuming and necessary task of learning the Tahitian language.”14

Because of the arduous political and social circumstances encountered in Tahiti, Grouard and Rogers decided to leave Tahiti and head to different islands. In spring 1845, Grouard chose to go east to the island of Anaa in the Tuamotus archipelago in French Polynesia, where he found much success, so much so that Pratt later joined him in the abundant harvest of souls, though Pratt himself had prospered on Tubuai with many

11. The anti-Mormon literature referred to here is a book (over three hundred pages in length) by John C. Bennett titled History of the Saints; or, an Exposé of Joe Smith and the Mormons (Boston: Leland and Whiting, 1842). Before his authorship of this work, Bennett had been a Latter-day Saint and assistant president to Joseph Smith in the First Presidency for a short period of time, but it was soon discovered that he was an adulterer, and he was excommunicated. Shortly thereafter, he commenced this polemic against Joseph Smith and the Latter-day Saints. On Bennett, see “Bennett, John Cook,” on Church Historian’s Press, The Joseph Smith Papers, http://josephsmithpapers.org/person?name=John+Cook+Bennett.
converts. Before leaving for Anaa, Pratt baptized Seth Lincoln, a fellow passenger on the Timoleon, who became the Latter-day Saint ecclesiastical leader at Tahiti in the place of Grouard. Rogers chose to go west to proselytize among the Leeward Islands but was forbidden to preach by the English missionaries. Having heard of troubles in Nauvoo, he left for home to protect his family.

Pratt and Grouard received no additional missionaries from the Church and received few letters, although they sent many. On December 6, 1844, Grouard, still in Tahiti, wrote to his wife, and his letter was published in a Nauvoo newspaper:

My ever dear and respected wife: I joyfully embrace another opportunity of writing you a few lines, knowing you are ever anxious to hear from me; especially when we are so remote from each other. . . . I sometimes think it quite strange that I have never received any communication from you since I left. . . . It is now fourteen months since I have heard a syllable from you or the church. . . . My ignorance of your whereabouts troubles me a great deal, and had I known that it was going to give me so much uneasiness I never should have consented for you to leave Nauvoo, but I fondly hope you are in Nauvoo, and boarding with Brother Schwartz. If I knew that was the case, I should rest quite contented.

After receiving no reply from her, Grouard evidently considered the marriage ended. Addison Pratt wrote in his journal on April 17, 1846, that Grouard

had written some 15 or 20 letters to his wife, and he had not received a word from her, that she had not gone to Nauvoo as he had wished her to. When my wife wrote last, and Br. [Wilford] Woodruff’s letters not containing a word about our families, he believed to be because his wife had transgressed, and because he did not wish to expose her, was the reason he did not say anything about any of them. He then in confidence told me his reasons for suspecting his wife, and all the unpleasantness that had befallen them since their first acquaintance, and that he had given her up for lost, that he should never write to her again, that he should stay among these islands till he was either relieved or called home, let it be long or short. And as the Lord had said it was not good

---

15. Pratt, Autobiography and Journals, September 24, 1846, reveals that there was a conference on Anaa at Putuahara where 651 LDS converts were numbered in this island region.
for man to be alone, Jan 2nd 18th [Genesis 2:18], he had tested the truth that for these three years past, and as there was no prospect of his going home for years to come, he should not endure it any longer. . . . I parted with him, and in a few days he wrote me that he was married to Tearo, a fullblood native girl. She is a member of the church, and the prettiest and best girl on the island. . . . She is a rough stone from nature’s quarry, but Br. Grouard believes her quality to be of the choicest marble.18

Grouard’s marriage to a native woman was no doubt shocking to the English missionaries, whose English wives accompanied them on their lifelong missions.

Inasmuch as there were no missionary replacements sent during the three years since the missionaries had embarked on their mission from Nauvoo and only a couple of letters received from the Church, Pratt returned to Utah, the new headquarters of the Church, and Grouard remained in the islands. Upon arriving in Salt Lake City in fall 1848, Pratt reported his mission at the LDS general conference session, and the conference decided to send Pratt with fresh missionaries back to the South Pacific as soon as circumstances would permit. Pratt then spent winter 1848–49 teaching prospective missionaries the Tahitian language. During the late summer of 1849, Pratt and James S. Brown left for the Society Islands via California, arriving in Tahiti on May 24, 1850. An additional twenty-one other missionaries and family members departed in this same year. They included Pratt’s wife, Louisa; their daughters; and Louisa’s sister, Caroline Crosby, and her family. This second surge of missionary work was forced to close in 1852 because of the Roman Catholic French government’s influence in Tahiti.19

The London Missionary Society as Reflected in the Journals of Addison Pratt

Among the noteworthy things Pratt described during his missionary work in the South Pacific are the encounters he and his companions had with the London Missionary Society, as attested in his journals (1844–1852). On September 17, 1844, just four months after Pratt landed in Tubuai, he recorded his first meeting with three LMS missionaries, one of whom

18. Addison Pratt, Journal, April 17, 1846, quoted in Ellsworth, Journals of Addison Pratt, 275–76.
was William Howe. When Pratt held out his hand to this LMS missionary, Howe responded, “No I shall not give you my hand till we are better acquainted.” Pratt further noted that Howe said to him, “I understand you have come to these Islands in the capacity of a preacher. . . . I suppose that you are aware that so many years ago, the English missionary society of London established a mission among these islands at a very vast expense. . . . We have got the bible translated into this [Tahitian] language.”

The conversation then turned to questions launched by the English missionaries concerning the Mormon usage of the Bible and a

20. William Howe was “born in 1797 or 8, in Ireland. Ch.m., Manchester (Roby). Was Pastor at Hindley, Lancashire. Appointed to Samoa. Designated, Sept. 10, 1838, at Grosvenor St. Ch., Manchester. Married. Sailed, Nov. 8, 1838. Arrived at Sydney, April 5, and at Tahiti, Aug. 3, 1839, when, instead of going on to Samoa, he proceeded to Moorea, and settled at Afareaitu. At the close of 1844, in consequence of the aggressions of the French upon Moorea and Tahiti, he, with Mrs. Howe, and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph, returned to England, where they arrived, Jan. 27, 1845. While in England, he, with Mr. Joseph, revised and carried through the press the Tahitian Scriptures. The French Protectorate of Tahiti being fully established, he proceeded alone to that island. He sailed from England, Nov. 19, 1846, and arrived at Tahiti, Aug. 5, 1847. Mrs. Howe embarked for Tahiti Oct. 18, 1847, and arrived in April 1848. Mr. Howe maintained his position on the island in the face of very formidable obstacles, including criminal and civil actions in courts of law by the Roman Catholic Bishop, both of which were decided in Mr. Howe’s favour. In 1856 he visited Melbourne with Mrs. Howe, arriving there on Nov. 28. He returned with Mrs. Howe to Tahiti in 1857, arriving there March 11. Protracted anxiety and failing health compelling him to seek a change, he proceeded to Rarotonga in the John Williams, and arrived there May 7, 1861. He died there, June 9, 1863. Mrs. Howe afterwards went on to Sydney and resided there. She died there, Sept. 3, 1882, aged 85.” Annotated Register of L.M.S. Missionaries 1796–1923, register #392, School of Oriental and African Studies (hereafter SOAS), Archives of the London Missionary Society, University of London. See also Lovett, History of the London Missionary Society, 1:327.

brief discussion of the Book of Mormon. When things became heated, one of the LMS missionaries (Mr. Jason) stepped in to smooth things over, whom Pratt notes “seemed to be a verry different man from the two [Howe and another missionary].” Pratt then began to take the initiative in asking questions. He bore a strong testimony of the restoration of The Church of Jesus Christ to the earth. Pratt then made a very bold gesture:

I hed [held] up my right hand & called on all the Heavenly hosts to witness, that I knew Joseph Smith to be a good man & a prophet of the Lord, & I knew this work to be preparatory to the second comeing of Christ, & if I lied, I lied in the name of the Lord” eternal damnation, & nothing less, is the penalty of such as a crime, & if I told the truth, & they gave no heed to it, they would have to suffer the consequence. They thought, they dare bear testimony to what they preacht, but did not, in the way that I did. I then advanced some other points of doctrine & offered them my, bible to find scripture to confute it, & their reply was, that they must go on board, but told me, as long as I preach the truth they could pray for my success, but if I preach, error they would pray that it might fall to the ground. I told them that our prayers were united, if they would pray thus, & I could make the same prayers for them, upon this they 3 gave me the hand of fellowship. They wisht for a book of Mormon & I gave them one, also a voice of warning & O. Pratt’s pamphlet, giving a short sketch of Joseph Smith’s life.22

Pratt then relates that these English missionaries laid anchor for several days but did not continue to preach, adding that Howe asked some of the natives if they would like him to spend some time with them on the island. One native refused the request and said “they had got a man [Pratt] they liked better, for he is satisfied to live as we do & fair [fare] as we fair. But if you stop, we have to go to building you houses . . . and you will want so much waiting & tending on. They were treated verry coolly, to what they had been used to, before.”23

Pratt’s next face-to-face encounter with the LMS occurred on September 16, 1845, almost exactly one year later, again on Tubuai. When the LMS vessel John Williams came to shore, she had onboard two

22. Pratt, Autobiography and Journals, September 17, 1844. Parley P. Pratt’s A Voice of Warning and Instruction to All People (New York: William Sandford, 1837) was a tract widely used by LDS missionaries. The pamphlet referred to was penned by Parley’s brother Orson Pratt, titled A Interesting Account of Several Remarkable Visions, and the Late Discovery of Ancient American Records (Edinburgh: Ballantyne and Hughes, 1840). Both men were called to be Apostles in 1835.
23. Pratt, Autobiography and Journals, September 17, 1844.
missionaries: a Mr. George Platt and a “Mr. Crowzy” (probably Ernest Rudolph William Krause). Concerning these missionaries and their meeting, Pratt wrote the following: “She [the vessel John Williams] had 2 missionaries onboard Mr. Platt, an Englishman & Mr. Crowzey [Krause], a german, both attended [attendant] to the English mission, Mr. Platt is an old veteran in that cause [LMS], & has raised a family

24. George Platt was “born at Arnfield, near Tintwhistle, March 15, 1789. . . . Studied at Manchester. Appointed to the South Seas. Ordained at Surrey Chapel, Sept. 30 1816. Married. Sailed, Nov. 17, 1816. Arrived at Moorea Nov. 17, 1817. Here, at Papetoai (Roby’s Place), he laboured until 1824, when he removed to Borabora to take place of Mr. Orsomand. From Dec. 18, 1829, to March 2, 1830, he was occupied on a missionary voyage to the Hervey and Austral Islands. From July 31, 1835, to Aug. 20, 1836, he was absent from his station on a visit to Samoa, to prepare for the reception of the brethren appointed to that mission, where he received them on their arrival. Before his visit to Samoa, on account of civil commotions at Borabora, Mrs. Platt and her family removed to Raiatea. On his return from Samoa, occupied Raiatea as his future station. Mrs. Platt died at Raiatea. Oct. 13, 1854. In March, 1856, he left Raiatea on a visit to England, where he arrived Sept. 6. In Aug. 1859 he returned to Raiatea. He died at Raiatea, April 4, 1865, aged 76.” Annotated Register of L.M.S. Missionaries, register #172, SOAS.

25. Ellsworth, Journals of Addison Pratt, 539 n. 11, suggests that “Crowzy” was probably Ernest Rudolph William Krause. Krause was born “March 3, 1824. Arrived in Tahiti in March 1842, from Guatemala, in Central America. Was appointed provisionally by the Tahiti brethren to Atiu, one of the Hervey Islands. In March, 1842, he proceeded, with Mrs. Krause to Taaha, Society Islands. In June 1850, he with Mrs. Krause, left Tahaa to visit Sydney for the benefit of his health, and returned to Tahaa in Oct., 1850. In 1851 he removed to Borabora, one of the Society Islands, where he arrived in March, and soon after commenced an Institution for training native agents. Mrs. Krause died April 6, 1855, in Borabora. Soon afterwards he left the island and proceeded, via the Sandwich Islands and United States, to England, where he arrived Nov. 19, 1855. In 1856 he re-married. Having been appointed to superintend the mission and Institution at Rarotonga, he sailed, with Mrs. Krause, Jan. 1859, and arrived at Rarotonga in Aug., 1859. His health failing, he left Rarotonga, with his family, July 20, 1867, and proceeded, via Samoa to England, where he arrived Jan. 17, 1868. Soon after his arrival in England he proceeded to Germany, visiting Carlsbad and other places for the benefit of his health. On his return to England he took part, with Mr. George Gill, in revising the Rarotonga Bible for a third edition. In 1870 he retired from missionary work of the Society, and went to reside at Niesky, in Prussia. Here, in Nov. 1870, paralysis put a stop to his labours at revision. He died at Niesky, Dec. 26, 1873. Mrs. Krause continued to reside at Niesky after Mr. Krause’s death. She died there Jan. 29, 1879.” Annotated Register of L.M.S. Missionaries, register #449, SOAS.
among these islands that has the name of a verry licentious one. They called on me, & after talking some time, Mr. Platt went out and left Mr. Crowzey with me, who immediately commenced questioning me on my views of the Scriptures &c.”

After a rather lengthy discussion of Latter-day Saint beliefs, Pratt reported the following:

[Krause] said the grand object in which we were both engaged was the same, which is, the conversion of the world & the fundamental principles of the gospel, we both believed alike, & these extra notions . . . aught not to come between us to disturb our good feelings for each other & the union of our labours in the common cause of Christ. He presumed, if the London mission society knew the particulars of my situation, they would be willing to help me to the necessaries of life as I stood in need. At any rate, said he, I will help you, if I have any opportunity to send to you.

Pratt, obviously impressed by this remark, recorded on this occasion,

I have met with but few men that were so warm hearted in the cause of Christ. He had voluntarily spent his patrimonial estate, to get to these Islands without encouragement from any boddy, & had sacrificed the society of all his kindred in the flesh for Christ’s sake & was for some time on his own expense among these Islands, but is now supported by the London mission society—I was much interested with him, & had I oppertunity with him for a few days, & he was from under the influence of that old hypocrite Mr. Platt, I have but little doubt that he would become a Saint. It is Mr. Platt that has written to all of these Islands to reject us, & Br. [Noah] Rogers felt so severely the evil effects of it.

Before Mr. Platt and Mr. Krause went on board their ship, Pratt noted that Platt sent Krause “with a bundle of papers, which contained lessons for scholl [school] children, catechisms, &c., & said he had a few requests to make, for they had learned from the natives that I taught some things that were not according to their views.” Pratt wrote, “As theses men have the staff in their own hands, as to influence among these Islands, & they are going from Island to Island, & had promised to aid me, I thought it policy to adhere to the Savior’s advice, ‘Be wise as serpents & harmless as doves.’”

Letters from the London Missionary Society (1849–1852, 1857)

The LMS missionaries regularly reported to their headquarters by letter. The LMS preserved these letters, and they are now housed at Council for World Mission archives at the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Research has found eight letters that mention the Mormon missionaries in the South Pacific in the years 1844 to 1857. The letters were sent to the Reverend Arthur Tidman, foreign secretary of the London Missionary Society. These records provide a glimpse from another perspective of Mormonism in the South Pacific and an example of the strong influence of the LMS in the region during this period.

The earliest of these letters was written by Mr. George Platt, referred to by Pratt above, in mid-January 1849 from the island of Raiatea; it concerns the native islanders wanting to gather to a Latter-day Saint American Zion:

It grieved me much while on this voyage, to see that while the brethren have had their attention directed to the state of affairs on Tahiti and their own stations the Mormons have set a machinery to work that will soon take away all the Paumoutes [residents of the Tuamotu archipelago]. Of course they being without means, have no books, either elementary or of other kinds, except those we furnish. They have our edition of the scriptures, but in some things they pervert them, and fill the peoples minds with idle tales. One man asked me, where Zion was? Whether it was not in America. I told him he read in the scripture of one Zion, and symbolical of another. I knew of no other. He said they were going to Zion. I replied it would be well if they were found in the Heavenly Zion. He said they were going to America.29

Six months later (July 1849), two other LMS missionaries who were checking up on mission activities also wrote to Reverend Tidman from Raiatea to report their findings on the Austral Islands, which included mention of the Mormons and particularly Grouard. This letter is presented in its entirety:

Raiatea July 10, 1849

To Rev. A. Tidman.

Dear Sir,

On Monday 28 May we left this place on the J. Williams to visit the austral islands. On 31 we reached Rurutu. We were welcomed on the beach by a number of persons who conducted us to the house of the chief “Te-ao.” He expressed his pleasure that we had reached his island.

We were engaged till midnight with a crowd in his house, who came to inquire the meaning of passages of scripture.

On Friday morning, early, we attended the schools. Both at the adults’ & children’s a good number attended. There were about 30 girls & young women, who could read in the bible. Not any of the boys had made so much proficiency.

At the church-meeting 3 persons were admitted, & several children baptized.

We did not find things as we could wish among the Deacons in consequence of jealousies among them.

The people had almost finished a new schooner; & they informed us that the principal reason for building it was, to visit an island not far from them, & convey teachers to the inhabitants, who have not as yet received the Gospel.

On Rurutu all external appearances impress upon the mind that once a better state of things existed. Relative to intelligence, & scripture knowledge, they appear stationary.

There we met the Mormon Teacher [p. 1] Gourart [Benjamin Grouard] & another American, whose object was to make proselytes to the systems.

On June 2nd we landed at Rimatara & the same gladness was manifested by the people as at Rurutu; & as on that island, we were engaged most of the night explaining portions of scripture.

At the church meetings 2 were excommunicated & 3 admitted. Several children were baptized. In the schools there were 30 girls and 25 boys, 12 of whom could read.

Although the people are so few, we found them disunited. This is in consequence of a person who wishes to make himself great: He & his party, are opposed to the chief, & the laws.

We perceived there, as at Rurutu that some of the people had “itching ears” respecting Mormonism.

From Rimatara we sailed for Tupuai [Tubuai]. On that island the two mormons we met at Rurutu have been living for some years; & most of the people had embraced their doctrines. There were a number, however, who had not joined them, & some who had, were “tired” of it.

The next island at which we called was Raivavae. We spent the sabbath with them. Several children were baptized & 2 persons were received into the church. The children in the schools have made but little progress, & the people in general are not so far advanced, as at
Rurutu & Rimatara. There we met a Tahitian whom Grounart [Benjamin Grouard] had taken as teacher of Mormonism; & no doubt he will succeed to a certain extent, as several were disposed to adopt his system. [p. 2]

Leaving Raivavae we proceeded to Rapa. We found the old Teacher Hape well & cheerful. He expressed a desire to visit Tahiti but decided to wait till the vessel call again. There was not much sickness among the people but they were not well supplied with clothing, as but few vessels call there.

From Rapa we sailed to Anaa & landed on [June] 21. We were struck with the contrast in the conduct of the people to that of those on the other islands. Only one man came down to the boat, & the people on the beach appeared as though they were suspicious of us. Some inquired “for what are you come hither? We have another Teacher”. We told them our interest in their welfare continued, & on that account we visited them. They replied “that is good.” Anaa is the principal residence of the Mormon teachers, & most of the people are proselytes to their system.

On [June] 27 we reached this place [Raiatea]. During the whole time we had fair winds & particularly fine weather.

The people on Rurutu, Rimatara, & Raivavae stated “we do not desire any more Tahitian teachers, as we are “fin roa” thoroughly tired of them, but wish one of you to remain, or send us European teachers. We will build dwelling houses, give land to cultivate, & supply them with food.”

It is indeed a cause for deep regret that they are left so destitute [p. 3] of instruction. And they inquire as the Eunuch of old “how can we understand unless some one instruct us”?

Although the Mormons have been so successful on Tupuai [Tubuai]; & Anaa, we have no doubt, that if the Directors could place European teachers among them they would be re-gained. Indeed, the people say “we embraced the new system, because our old Teachers neglected us.” Some are tired, & the majority say “we desire the word of God, & if we had European Teachers connected with yourselves, we should adhere to them.”

It is a cause for joy that on all the islands their desire for the Sacred Scripture continues. May he who gave that holy book, send his Spirit, & Teachers after his own heart, to enlighten & instruct the inhabitants of those islands.

We remain Dear Sir,
yours truly,
G. Charter
E R W Krause
of instruction and the inquiry as to the Church of all, how can we understand unless some one instruct us? Although the Mormons have been so successful in Tehipi, Uawa, we have no doubt, that if the Directors could place European Teachers among them, they would be re-paired. Indeed, the people say we embraced the new system, because our old Teachers neglected us. Some are tired, the majority say we admire the word of God, why we had European Teachers connected with ourselves, we should adhere to them.

It is a cause for joy that on all the islands thus deprived of the sacred Scripture continues. May he who gave that holy book, send his Spirit, a Teacher after his own heart, to enlighten and instruct the inhabitants of these islands.

We remain dear Sir,
Your truly,
G. Charter
E.W. Krause.

P.S. The following is an account of what we received at the islands.

For Bibles - 20 - 15 - 0
Pilgrims - 9 - -
Subscription - 2 - 7 -

2 3 - 11 - This sum
Paid to Mr. Cross to whose account you will place it.
But on board the J. Williams Arrow last value - 5 - 10 - 0 For Bibles 24 Pilgrims.
ok - 2 - 18 - 0

The final page of a letter from George Charter and Ernest R. W. Krause to Arthur Tidman, July 10, 1849. LMS/South Seas/Incoming Correspondence/box 22, fd. 1, jacket C. Courtesy Council for World Mission Archives, SOAS Library, University of London.
P.S. The following is an account of what we received at the islands.

For Bibles £ 20 - 15 - 0
" Pilgrims - 9 -
Subscriptions 2 - 7 -
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In December of 1850, English missionary William Howe wrote to LMS headquarters in London, noting among other things the arrival of Mormon missionaries (family of Pratt and others) in Tubuai less than two months earlier:

Our out stations are suffering much for want of being visited—whether the Mormons have got the notion that Jerusalem is to be found somewhere about our Missions, I do not know, but they are pouring fast upon our out stations in considerable numbers. 11, men women and children landed at Tupuai [Tubuai] and have obtained permission from the Governor to locate themselves there to commence an agricultural establishment. They have made considerable progress in baptizing the people at the Paumotus.31

Two months later (February 1851), LMS missionary Alexander Chisholm32 wrote a report describing a meeting with a Mormon elder named Dunn, who had been called on a mission in the fall of 1850 to the South Pacific:

“Simeon A. Dunn Elder in the church of Jesus Christ of latter day saints has written a lay epistle full of the most absurd assumptions, he says they are wholly dependent on the bible for their knowledge, but they

1853, he left Raiatea with his family to proceed to Sydney on account of failure of health; after which his connection with the Society terminated. He settled in Sydney, where he died in 1898, aged 87.” Annotated Register of L.M.S. Missionaries, register #373, SOAS.


32. Alexander Chisholm was “born July, 1814, at Turriff, Aberdeenshire. Ch.m., Crescent Ch., Liverpool, Nov., 1834 (Kelly). Studied at Blackburn Academy. Appointed to Tahiti. Ordained, July 14, 1842 at Crescent Ch. Married Elizabeth Davies, born Dec. 23, 1822, Ch.m. Oswestry (Reeve). Sailed, Aug. 11, 1842. Arrived at Tahiti, March 13, 1843. His appointment having been changed to Samoa he proceeded to that Group, and arrived at Upolu, April 1843, and settled in June at Salailua, Savaii, as arranged by the Samoan Committee, he was instructed to join the Tahiti Mission, and in Dec., 1846, left Samoa, and proceeded to that island, and settled at Hitiia. In 1849 he removed to Papara, Tahiti. In Sept. 1852, in consequence of the arbitrary measures of the French authorities, he retired to Raiatea, where he continued to labour until April 1860, when he proceeded with his family to England, and arrived Oct. 2. After his return to England he was chiefly engaged in carrying through the press a revised version of the Tahitian Scriptures. He died at Oswestry, May 29, 1862. Mrs. Chisholm continued to reside at Oswestry.” Annotated Register of L.M.S. Missionaries, register #172, SOAS.
have also a more sure word of prophecy—he also advocates dipping in baptism the same Gent had an interview with W [William] Howe.”

The following month (March 1851), Chisholm expressed concerns that the natives were having problems with alcohol and the influence of Mormon missionaries:

We are very sorry to say that intemperance is on the increase, & that month after month calls us to the painful exercise of discipline on those who have become the slaves of intoxicating drinks.—There are also a number of Mormonite teachers now going by anointing with oil but as they can only exercise on those who have been baptized unto their faith, they present a strong [?] inducement to those who are afflicted with a desire [?] to unite with them, & if they once do so, there is generally, some means found for retaining them although the pretenders miracle be not wrought.—From these and other causes which need not be mentioned, we feel our circumstances to be very trying and difficult & therefore beg a special interest in the prayers of the Directors, and our Christian friends generally, that we may be supported and directed aright by the All wise & all mighty.—Believe me dear Brother.

One of the Mormon missionaries laboring alongside Addison Pratt, Simeon Dunn, and others at this time was James S. Brown. Brown recorded that he met with Mr. Chisholm during this same month (March 1851) at Papara and noted the aftermath of Dunn’s teachings referred to above:

While at Papara, many people came to see us . . . but showed great reluctance in shaking hands with me. I learned that the cause of the indifference was that they were afraid of the Protestant [LMS] ministers. For a while they kept very shy of me. I called on their minister,

33. A. [Alexander] Chisholm to A. [Arthur] Tidman February 3, 1851, LMS/South Seas/Incoming Correspondence/box 24A, fd. 1, jacket A, Council for World Mission Archives, SOAS. Dunn had been called on a mission September 28, 1850, to the South Pacific. Although his health had been poor for nearly a year, his family lacked resources, and he did not have the money to finance his mission, Brigham Young promised him the Lord would bless him if he would accept this calling. Dunn served faithfully in Tahiti until 1852, when the French caused the Mormon missionaries to leave the island region. See also “History of Simeon Adams Dunn” at Leon Wilde, Leon Wilde’s Genealogical Research Website, http://dkwilde.com/Genealogy/Dunn/Histories/Simeon_Adams_Dunn.htm.

34. Alexander Chisholm to Rev. A. Tidman March 21, 1851, LMS/South Seas/Incoming Correspondence/box 24A, fd. 1, jacket B, Council for World Mission Archives, SOAS.
Mr. Chisholm, and presented him with a Voice of Warning, which I asked him to read; but when I held it out to him he said no, he would not read it or anything that the Mormons had; ‘but,’ said he, ‘I want to exhort you and show you that you are deluded.’ I asked what he knew about our Church to cause him to be so excited. He said that he had had a letter from Simeon A. Dunn, one of the Elders, and that public opinion was enough to satisfy him that we were false teachers and deceivers of the people.35

Brown further notes that two days later (March 16, 1851) he converted a young, sickly, native woman who proclaimed at the time of her baptism that she had been healed. This caused quite a stir. Brown then explained that he was taken to the Protestant mission station by a French police officer and there interrogated:

I was ushered into the presence of Messrs. Chisholm, Howe and Davis. All of them were what were called English or Protestant missionaries. Mr. Howe acted as chief spokesman or prosecutor, while Chisholm filled the role of justice, Mr. Davis appearing to be his assistant. Thus arrayed, they told me that I had been arrested and brought before them because I had raised a very unusual excitement among the people, and I could not produce a permit from the government as a resident of the island . . . and the decision they had come to was that if I would not agree to leave the place by 8 a.m. next day I would be locked up in a dungeon until I did agree to leave. Of course I consented to depart, thinking I could get my permit and return in a few days.36

Brown had another close call the following year at the village of Tatake when he was nearly roasted at a native barbeque on July 4, 1852. He explained how the event was ignited: “Two young Protestant ministers came and made three or four inflammatory speeches, telling the people that they had admitted a wolf into the fold, and if they did not get rid of him [Brown], the [LMS] ministers would not call again. . . . Thus the wild and heathenish passion was fanned into a lively flame of renewed persecution.” Brown further noted that at the very time he was taken to the “log heap, which was then at the zenith of its burning,” he boldly challenged the natives and said, “I defy ten of your best men, yea the host of you, for I serve that God who delivered Daniel from the den of lions, and the three Hebrew children from the fiery furnace!”

The natives then began to fight among themselves; according to Brown, his deliverance was later explained by one native who told him, “At the moment that you defied us there was a brilliant light, or pillar of fire, bore down close over your head. . . . We thought that you had prayed to your God of power, and that He had sent that fire to burn us and our people if we harmed you.”

This same year, George Platt wrote a second letter to Tidman describing his anxiety over the influence of the Mormons among the natives. Platt had further concerns regarding their intermarriages with the islanders and the news that they had been driven by the French from the Chain Islands (the Tuamotu Archipelago):

> We began to be anxious about the Austral group. The Mormons are diligent there. . . . These mormons take native wives and live as the natives do. Some of them are runaway sailors and some from the great mormon body. When I had opportunity I used to write to the deacons and churches to encourage and direct them for a long time [and now] we have been deprived of this. Whether the brethren on Tahiti have written or not, I cannot tell, I understand there have been several opportunities. Some of the Islands would not receive the Mormons, and some have, where the [they] have formed parties. The french authorities have driven them from the Chain Island, where they had come in contact with the priests. The Lord reigneth.

Platt and preceding LMS missionaries had worked hard to teach the natives to abandon sinful practices including infanticide, elder abuse, cannibalism, and polygamy. It was abhorrent to them that one of the Mormon elders would take a native wife, which the LMS missionaries may have conflated with polygamy.

Later that same year, Brown met up with Platt on the island of Rapa when the bark *John Williams* had come to shore on October 17. Brown recalled the confrontation:

> Mr. Platt . . . was a man of fine address. He came ashore and preached, then sprinkled all the infant children in the village. Though very pleasant, he refused to talk with me in the Tahitian language, saying that if we did so on the Scriptures, it would cause a split among the people.

---

I insisted that he show the natives the scripture for his mode of baptism, but he declined to do that, and boarded his vessel and sailed away.

In early 1852, Krause wrote from Bora Bora, noting that other Latter-day Saints who had arrived in the islands from California were creating additional confusion among those laboring on behalf of the London Missionary Society:

A number of Mormons from California have arrived and gone to the Austral group which has perplexed the people not a little, 2 letters have been received by the brethren from Raivavae begging for a visit to advise them what to do. We should have been glad to send the brethren at once to those distressed places but have no opportunity and are therefore compelled to wait for the John Williams, hoping that there will be no objection of those brethren going down with us when we visit those outstations that may have the advantage of a person[al] introduction from us.49

Yet it would be the American Mormon missionaries who would ultimately be distraught at this juncture: they were forced by the French government to leave the islands in 1852. Just before his departure, Brown described a sympathetic meeting with Mr. William Howe, “the presiding official of the Protestant mission on the islands.” Brown explained that Howe had invited him to dinner and “made me a present of the Tahitian Bible, also of a Tahitian and English dictionary. He is the same Mr. Howe spoken of before, when he was so radically opposed to me, but now he seemed charitable and kind.” Soon thereafter, Brown went aboard the Abyssinia and commenced sailing to San Francisco on November 24, 1852.40

Several years later, Alexander Chisholm reported that natives of Tubuai had returned to the LMS fold and that Mormonism was no longer a problem in this island region:

We spent yesterday at Tubuai; it is a larger island than either Rurutu or Rimatara, but very thinly peopled, as if it is now under the Protectorate Flag. We [sic] doubted whether we would be received. on going on shore however we found the chief & people glad to see us. There is no French officer resident amongst them—they have got tired of Mormonism and

have all returned to the old fold, we had about 120 hearers and 27 communicants many were scattered round the island.41

That is the last known mention of the Mormons in LMS records of the South Pacific in the mid-nineteenth century.

With the missionaries out of the area, many of the native Mormon converts returned to other religions, but some remained committed to Mormonism.42

Conclusion

The London Missionary Society workers in the South Pacific, who preceded the Mormon elders by several decades, did indeed regain their turf at this time. Although there was a vying for native converts, the LDS missionaries benefited from the preparatory work of the LMS, which had launched Christianity in this region at the end of the eighteenth century. Further, primary evidence reveals that although there was certainly friction between representatives of these two denominations, some degree of mutual respect occurred when the missionaries from each party discussed their personal beliefs while meeting in private.

This study also demonstrates the diverse impact of Christian proselytizing among those who journeyed to the islands of the sea. Furthermore, it summons an investigation of descriptions sketched by missionaries of varied denominations and the impact they had on each other. The LMS missionaries performed a godly work that was certainly visible to the Mormons; for example, George Platt’s 1850 records show his charity and goodwill: “Have got the children to try the making [of] their letters on sand. Had a bible class. In the afternoon took a visit walk to see the lame and blind.”43 “This day 33 years ago we landed on Eimeo [Mo’oorea], to commence our labours, of all our company only two remain. . . . On a review of the Islands, which since that time received the Gospel, we have


42. The LDS mission to Tahiti and adjoining islands was closed for four decades (1852–92). For discussion of the Church’s reestablishment in French Polynesia in the 1890s and growth in the ensuing decades, see Ellsworth and Perrin, Seasons of Faith and Courage, and Britsch, Unto the Islands of the Sea, 21–36.

reason with amazement to say what God hath wrought!!!”44 “We labor to have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man.”45

Surely the Mormons recognized how LMS work laid the groundwork for their own, just as Paul wrote: “I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase” (1 Cor. 3:6). Later, Orson F. Whitney recognized the benefit of cooperation of religious sects: “Providence is over all, and . . . he holds the nations in the hollow of his hand; . . . he is using not only his covenant people, but other peoples as well, to consummate a work, stupendous, magnificent, and altogether too arduous for this little handful of Saints to accomplish by and of themselves.”46 The Latter-day Saints clearly benefited from the labors of the LMS missionaries as they worked side by side to bring the gospel to the people of South Pacific.


44. George Platt to A. Tidman, November 18, 1850, Council for World Mission Archives, SOAS Library.
46. Orson F. Whitney, in Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1921), 32–33.
For the Man in the Red Jacket

. . . the waters are come in . . .
—Psalm 69:1

His word, more than his face, remains,
trailing me as the rain that stuck
to my glasses and soaked my clothes,

seeping through
my windows, my façade into
the crawlspace of memory.

I see now he was serious: as we'd
passed on the street, each moving
the other way, he'd pulled off

his red jacket hood and tried
to make eye contact. Have you
necessarily taken the time,

he'd asked, to find out
what grace is for? Reluctant
to break the rhythm of my run,

I'd turned just enough to see him
in my periphery, standing alone
on the corner as the rain started,

and said nothing. If he'd asked for money
or the time, I might have slowed, at least
to tell him I didn't have any or

It's six twenty-two. But grace, I
remember thinking. Get serious, brother,
and out of the rain. It's early. I'm

running. We're about to be wet
and our garments as heavy as Genesis.
Of course I've made time for grace.

—Tyler Chadwick

Reprinted by permission from Tyler Chadwick, ed.,
Fire in the Pasture: Twenty-First Century Mormon
Poets (El Cerrito, Calif.: Peculiar Pages, 2011), 105.
Enticing the Sacred with Words

John Bennion

Intimations of Immortality

Sometime after midnight on a bitter January night when I was sixteen, I drove up to Greenjacket, the ranch that has been in the Bennion family for four generations, to join my cousin and his friend in an abandoned shack on the property. When we stayed there in the winter, we swept out the mouse droppings and stoked the fire in the cooking stove, adding wood until the central room was as warm as a sauna. In the oven, we baked a cake pan full of apples, cinnamon, walnuts, butter, and brown sugar and ate the mess, crouched around that common pot.

That cold, still night, I was last in, having driven up to the ranch after a date in Tooele. I had probably kissed the girl, the love of my high school life, but I must have saved that memory in a different site in my brain, because I don’t remember anything about the evening, just that I felt happy. The snow was too deep to drive all the way to the shack, so I had to walk the last half mile. The dew had settled and frozen on every twig of brush, weed, and strand of the barbed-wire fence. The full moon reflected in spikes of light from each crystal.

At the cabin, I rustled the two of them out of their sleeping bags. The snow was nearly knee deep, and without making a decision we automatically sloughed off all our clothing, ran across the field, and rolled in the powder. Our blood flowed with so much adrenaline that we didn’t feel cold. Then we each climbed one of the old windmill towers and howled at the moon.

Magical.
In memory, I was ravished, as the metaphysical poets liked to say, by the beauty of God’s creation, my soul connected to that shining landscape, prompting awe and jubilation. As I think about how the physical experience of four and a half decades ago relates to the way it feels as I write it now, I realize that I have told this story many times, reshaping each telling. Sometimes I’ve used the story to connect to others in the Bennion clan who also think of Greenjacket as a sacred place and to students to discompose their ideas of what is proper. When I tell the story to either group, they laugh at the image of three boys rolling naked in the snow. Laughter is the proper response to our howling at the moon, but that doesn’t mean the experience was not also joyful, powerful, and sacred, which is the way I remember it when I write the paragraphs here.

What the story means to me may not be what it means to a reader. Evoking the sacred is like trying to breathe joy as if it is air or to catch the wind in a butterfly net. For one thing, the Spirit is unpredictable, blossoming at unexpected times and often inspiring one person in a group while leaving others cold, especially with stories about rolling naked in the snow. As the Apostle John writes, “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit” (John 3:8). If the sacred is a luminous relationship between us and a place, another person, an experience, or the divine, then what we’re after when we submit ourselves to the sacred is inside us, a beneficent virus. Even when we’ve caught a sacred moment, we can only hope others will sense the germ and infect themselves. That my metaphors fall short—whether of breathing, hunting, or falling into disease—only shows that the sacred can’t be controlled by words.

This elusive Spirit, with the feeling of a sacred connection it creates in our souls, is even more difficult to evoke when we move from speech, which is immediately responsive, to writing, which is memory set in cement. Moroni complains that his weakness concerning “the placing of [his] words” made it difficult for the Spirit to use his writing as a vehicle: “Lord, the Gentiles will mock at these things, because of our weakness in writing; for Lord thou hast made us mighty in word by faith, but thou hast not made us mighty in writing.” He admits that the brother of Jared did have the ability to use writing to invite the sacred, “for thou madest him that the things which he wrote were mighty even as thou art, unto the overpowering of man to read them” (Ether 12:23–24). That is a worthy goal for any Christian author, but writing that feels sacred to author and reader is not easily packaged or delimited in a sermonic message.
Ironically, writing that preaches may not work as well as expressive or exploratory essaying. In this kind of writing, wildness and uncertainty are involved, which many of us Mormons have decided is antithetical to the sacred. For most of us, the sacred implies pious reverence, not dancing, howling, and running, whether naked or not. We also want to orchestrate, planning for our readers to experience an infusion of the sacred at predictable points. Of course that might happen, or someone might feel mainly emotion, a social experience that could prepare us for a divine one.

Still, I believe that even if we do everything right in our hunt for the sacred, an actual sighting by us or our readers will be rare. It’s like seeing a cougar, almost impossible even for people who have lived all their lives in the same terrain as that slippery creature. Moments of apprehending the sacred, unlike viewing animals in a zoo, can’t be scheduled or demanded. When Elijah complained that he had done what the Lord commanded and that all their efforts had failed anyway, he required the Lord’s answer. It came, but not in the way Elijah expected. He experienced first a great wind, then an earthquake, and finally a fire, but he didn’t perceive the Lord in any of them. Then came the still small voice, and when he heard it, “he wrapped his face in his mantle, and went out, and stood in the entering in of the cave” (1 Kings 19:13). Elijah at first demanded, but then he was trained again to watch and wait and finally rediscovered his wonder at God’s plan for him. I have had that kind of experience, but I have also been surprised by the sacred when I have wandered with my feet or brain, when my sensibility is vulnerable, ready for the unexpected.

The personal or meditative essay is a form that is well suited to this kind of elusive experience. Writing the essay is opening perception to possibility, because the writer’s injunction is to test, to try, to wander on a subject. A five-paragraph theme is to a personal essay as the straight lines of an Italianate garden are to the unpredictable tangle of a wild hillside or as a Google-mapped trip is to jumping in the car and saying “Let’s head west.” The Oxford English Dictionary says that to essay is “to put to the proof, try (a person or thing); to test the nature, excellence, fitness, etc. of. . . . Also to practise (an art, etc.) by way of trial.” Essaying toward the sacred requires writers to shut their eyes to the conventional, having faith in the unknown. As the Apostle Paul says, in this life “we see through a glass, darkly” (1 Cor. 13:12). Stumbling toward spiritual insight is the most essential kind of creation, because it involves remaking the

---

self, redesigning our own souls bit by bit, drafting and redrafting. The sacred is not a place we can drive or even walk to, but a way of seeing, a luminous connection between self and Other that enlightens the eyes and quickens the understanding.

For almost twenty-five years, I’ve tried to teach students how to use words to entice the sacred, something like showing them how to set snares for unicorns. We do this by leaving the familiar and conventional, observing the natural, following other writers who act as guides, and opening the private self to exposure but doing so in a safe community of other fledgling essayists. In all of this, we follow the process illuminated by William Wordsworth in “Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood,” which is the source from which I adapted my subheadings. Like Wordsworth, we go truant from our conventional lives, wander in the natural world, remember innocence, hope to earn wisdom through facing suffering and through reading, and participate with other creatures in the dance of creation.

**Escaping the Prison House**

In order to urge myself and students toward a fresh, creative, and previously unknown experience, we first must get out of the classroom, go walking and hiking. The classroom is full of boxes inside boxes, conventions laid upon conventions, heavily constricted. Inside that space a certain kind of learner feels claustrophobic. As we hike, backpack, camp, ski, or kayak, my students and I find ourselves moving away from the mundane world of tasks, duties, and familiar objects that swaddle us in memory and habit. Virginia Woolf says in her essay “Street Haunting” that when she leaves her flat for an evening walk, “the shell-like covering which our souls have excreted to house themselves, to make for themselves a shape distinct from others, is broken, and there is left of all these wrinkles and roughnesses a central oyster of perceptiveness, an enormous eye.” As she wanders from her normal haunts, the streets of London in their infinite variety stimulate her imagination.

Walking through a meadow, forest, or desert sparks divergent thinking because of the change in surroundings from familiar to unfamiliar, from simple to complex, from orderly to chaotic. Wilderness embodies the unexpected in the form of a flock of mountain goats, a curious rock,
moss growing on a rotting log, a horned toad or rattlesnake, a pronghorn or badger. Who knows what we will see when rambling? Many British and American essayists, from Dickens to Thoreau, have written about the connection between perambulation and thinking freely. For Dickens, walking opens the mind to fancy and mental wandering, and he often walked twenty miles a day. He once said, “If I could not walk far and fast, I think I should just explode and perish.”  

For Thoreau, walking in the wild enables us to leave the world of order and industry and enter the Holy Land, where the sun will “perchance shine into our minds and hearts, and light up our whole lives with a great awakening light.” In “An Apology for Idlers,” Robert Louis Stevenson writes that it isn’t busyness that we will remember when we are old, but “a faculty for idleness.” The first is a “symptom of deficient vitality”; the second “implies a catholic appetite and a strong sense of personal identity.” He writes, “There is a sort of dead-alive, hackneyed people about, who are scarcely conscious of living except in the exercise of some conventional occupation. Bring these fellows into the country, or set them aboard ship, and you will see how they pine for their desk or their study. They have no curiosity; they cannot give themselves over to random provocations; they do not take pleasure in the exercise of their faculties for its own sake; and unless Necessity lays about them with a stick, they will even stand still.” He ends his essay talking about those who trade their “priceless youth” for “chimerical or hurtful” ends. He writes that “the glory and riches they expect may never come, or may find them indifferent; and they and the world they inhabit are so inconsiderable that the mind freezes at the thought.” The act of temporarily wandering away from one’s ordered life can open the mind to caprice and lay bait for the sacred.

Even though our stated purpose in the outdoor classes I teach is to hunt the sacred inside each of us, our trips and their essays are sometimes so focused on an itinerary that we lose sight of our purpose. Despite these impediments, my students and I have often discovered spiritual insight, uncovered our core identities and beliefs, and felt awe in the face of the creation through writing about our outdoor experiences.

Also, patience is required. Sometimes it takes considerable time to turn our attention to what is before us, to shed our former modes of seeing. One early spring, Katy Street had visited cathedrals for six weeks in England, observing stained glass, thirteenth-century tile, and gothic towers, but had remained relatively unmoved. After walking through a sodden forest to discover Milton Abbey rising before her in a green valley, she felt transformed. She wrote that “standing in [Milton Abbey], wet and cold and dirty on a Thursday afternoon, I felt the weight of God more forcibly than I had in any other place. The other distractions were finally gone.”8 Her experience came because of the contrast between the muddy woods and the impossibly tall and elegant abbey, and because she had left her familiar world behind.

I believe that our minds consume experience, but that it often doesn’t transform us—unless something stark and unusual displaces familiar interpretations. When my son Christopher was three, he was obsessed with dinosaurs, so we took a family trip to the Dinosaur National Monument, which is located at the bend of an ancient river. For centuries and millennia, animal carcasses fell into the stream and accumulated at the bend, where the bones petrified. A massive earthquake turned the strata on its end, so digging across the bed scientists went backward in time. The scientists left the last layer uncovered—a massive boneyard of half-exposed femurs, skulls, and hipbones. A dinosaur in a museum, assembled out of plaster and a few natural bones, seems contrived, a probable fiction. But those massive petrified bones were foreign, nearly incomprehensible, and I was impressed with how huge the universe is, how unbounded God is, how massive and changeable his creation. Christopher was more impressed with the lifelike models back in town, but these bones shook me awake.

**Splendour in the Grass, Glory in the Flower**

Another story: I’ve always loved rain, but when we moved to Houston for my PhD program, I was unprepared for Texas rain. Behind our house we discovered a huge cement canal. The Provo River in Utah in full stream would not have overflowed the banks of that man-made bayou. The first rain after our move, Karla and the children and I ran outside and let the warm drops drench us. It was nothing like the cold rain of

---

Utah. Rain falling in that buzzing, humid, verdant, oppressively green city was enlivening. When I walked out back a couple of hours later, the huge bayou was brimming with water. I felt an edge of fear at a place so wet that it could create that massive flood in such a short amount of time. I knew that only a little more rain would cause the water to overflow the banks and flood our house. Writing, I feel it again, as if for the first time—awe at the power of the unruly, gray water.

When we essayists get outside, we’re not merely leaving our conventional lives behind. We could do this by changing living spaces, jobs, or habits. Focusing on the natural world helps us leave the familiar, but it also fosters dynamic reverence. Mormons recognize the long Hebraic and Christian tradition of going to the wilderness for spiritual insight. Getting outside the classroom and then writing about the experience exhilarates me and my students—whether we’re walking the dramatic cliffs of Cornwall on the Irish Sea or rolling in a pile of leaves on campus. When we observe the natural world, turn our attentions toward it, something extraordinary happens. This matches what modern natural history writers, the British Romantics, and the American Transcendentalists promote—when we read ourselves against nature, a reverence occurs that facilitates the written sacred.

On a class trip to the Uinta Mountains in March 2008, Rose Card, one of my students, stepped outside the yurt. She began scooping snow into her water bottle. The others were inside laughing and telling stories, but where she crouched the sound was dampened, the night still. The moon was full and made the snow glow as if it was its own source of light. Looking at the rolling, piney hills, she was impressed with the expanse of the world. She writes, “The trees had ceased to be trees, but had merged together into infinite. I had heard people talk about feeling tiny in huge expanses of creations. But I had seldom had the feeling myself. . . . I had stepped into a world that was much bigger than I was.”

She thought of mountains and valleys stretching into continents, all encompassed by ocean. “And the Earth in all its hugeness, still just a tiny pebble in the pocket of the universe. Which is just another creation amongst the many creations bumping together in the pocket of God. I inhaled slowly, as if to suck it all in. It was too big for my senses. So beautiful it hurt somehow, yet I smiled drunkenly and tried to breathe in more.” She connects her feeling to the sublime, as comprehended by the Romantic poets.

First came her act of pausing outside, which was memorable; second came the thrilling, trilling lift of her soul; and third came wisdom, as she articulated what happened. Three acts of creation. Meditation through writing created the sacred out of her feeling of instinctual awe.

On a trip to England with students, when we hiked across the moors in Brontë country, I found the whole horizon bound by heather, colorless because it had not yet bloomed. It seemed we would traverse that sameness forever, never reaching a different, greener country. The wind seemed a blind, incessant force. Thinking we were lost, one student had a panic attack, and that bleak landscape is forever in her memory, reminding her of the expanse and power of the earth. Later on that same trip, we climbed Helvelyn in the Lake District. The weather seemed all right when we started up, but I had never been on top before and wasn’t sure where to come down. By the time we reached the top of the long ridge, the weather had turned cold, wet, and misty. At the lower elevation we had chatted as we walked; now the wind and the mountain had our full attention. It was as if we had crossed into a different universe full of wonder and danger. I could hardly see the back of the group from my position in the front. We had a map, but in the howling wind, with sleet blowing horizontally, it was hard to read. We followed a trail, and it led us to a place where a pathway went down to our left. Down is where we longed to go, out of the wind and wet. I looked at the map, prayed, and was overcome by clear faith. I knew that instead of following the obvious path, we should hike in the opposite direction and cross the trackless crown of the ridge to our right. On the other side of the massive ridge, we ran into the correct path, and that took us into the valley. Later I discovered that the left-hand path led to Striding Edge, a yard-wide bridge to the deeper mountains. It’s probable that in that blinding wet with such a large group someone would have slipped. On the correct path, we descended, still wet and cold but relieved and grateful. Clouds still cloaked the top of the ridge, but we walked through a pine forest, lit by the unveiled sun. Writing this, I feel it again, the awe and fear at the power of the wind, the relief and gratitude of escaping it.

Standing on Ben Lomond in Scotland, on Dutch Peak or Mount Nebo in Utah; hiking across a hillside saturated with mint and wild garlic in Hardy Country; swimming in the bitter water at Tintagel in Cornwall; walking toward Hole-in-the-Rock in Utah under the persistent, omnipotent sun; or being bitten by swarms of horseflies on the San Rafael River, I have felt similar awe at natural power. The raw world makes me feel small, stretches my confidence in my own identity, and
Enticing the Sacred with Words

strengthens me spiritually, especially when I wrestle to interpret the experience later. As I write, I can translate the picturesque and miserable to a more profound awe.

Guides to the Immortal Sea

Often the context for reinterpreting natural experience is literary: students and other writers can discover the sacred when a great author has already hacked out a rational pathway. In 2009, Rick Duerden and I took our classes to climb Scafell Pike but found it too rainy and windy. We needed to get our group over the mountain somehow, so we chose a lower route, Styhead Pass. We should have hired taxis to take us around the mountain. Before we had climbed for an hour, the rain was blowing horizontally. One of the students, a thin woman with no natural insulation, started shivering. The fog socked in, and we could hardly see twenty yards around us. I’d been over that pass twice, but the lack of visibility made it completely unfamiliar. The student leader of the day was Tiffany, a shy but competent woman who fought fires in Utah over the summer. She took control like a boot camp sergeant, keeping the students together. After climbing for several hours, unable to see anything but the path, I became convinced that we should have crossed the pass already and started our descent. I panicked and decided we had left the correct trail and had joined a side trail, one that led to a peak. Tiffany went ahead and returned, convincing me that we should stay on the broad and visible trail. We huddled together and kept going, soon coming to the summit of the pass and descending into the sun. Pushed to their limits, many students knew after that climb that they could deal with extreme weather and arduous physical exertion. The experience frightened and humbled them, showing them their smallness but ironically also giving them confidence in their ability. But something else happened that helped us see the experience as manageable.

On the top, in the middle of the worst blast of freezing rain, Rick Duerden rose up in his poncho and quoted King Lear, “Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! Blow! You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout!” He raised his fist against the storm. Some students laughed then, more did later, but those words—used by a tragic and heroic character as he recognizes and defies the force of nature—transformed how we saw the experience. It helped us reprocess a miserable and dangerous trek into a sublime event.

William Wordsworth, Annie Dillard, Wendell Berry, and others have taught me and my students ways to meditate on experience. They give
us modes of questioning existence, processes for closely observing the world, and patterns for seeing the sublime in experience. Student Kelli Towers thought she could arrange to have the literary tourist experience on Tennyson Downs in England by reading Lord Tennyson’s poetry where he walked when he mentally composed it. She climbed the Downs in the rain, but while she was struck by the beauty of the place—the endless striation of whitecaps, the shadows of clouds sweeping across the Channel, the nearly invisible line between sky and sea—the reading did nothing to move her soul. She writes, “Poetry doesn’t often speak to me, and my mind wandered to my notebook which was getting soaked and to my umbrella which wasn’t functioning at all.”

So instead of forcing herself to read the poems, she put away her books and played ultimate Frisbee with the other students. The next day, reading Tennyson’s poem “Break, Break, Break,” she had new insight. She wrote in her journal, “This time, as Tennyson said ‘O well for the fisherman’s boy, that he shouts with his sister at play! O well for the sailor lad, that he sings in his boat on the bay!’ I wanted to add, ‘O well for the BYU students who play Ultimate Frisbee.’” Her lines don’t have the grace and lilt of Tennyson’s, but she realized something important by writing her own: “Suddenly his sadness at the vanished hand was so much more real. My own joy had shared a location with his despair. But I hadn’t desecrated that shrine on the hill under the shadow of a Celtic cross [the Tennyson Monument]. If anything, my experience made it more holy.”

Three fabrics of influence overlap—the residue of Tennyson’s emotion in the poem, the shouts of pleasure the other students gave while playing Frisbee, and Kelli’s own responding feelings. The act of writing weaves them all together, creating a new and organic way of seeing. “It’s strange that my own opposing emotion would give me more sympathy than all my efforts to feel his sadness. However, my own emotion, because I felt it, made me human.” Her sought-after lift of spiritual and personal connection to Tennyson couldn’t be forced, but it came freely when she perceived the poem and author differently after her physical experience with the other students on that bluff above the ocean.

In Darkness Lost, the Darkness of the Grave

Apprehending the sacred is often accompanied by an edge of fear, which makes me and others focus on the experience and eventually view

ourselves in a different manner. Once two of my sons and I hiked all day in the rain in the Uinta Mountains. At evening we were drenched. I had little hope that we could build a fire, but we needed one. More than needed. Casting about, we found a pitchy pine log about a foot in diameter and poured some of our cooking fuel on kindling to get a fire started on the end of the log. My sleeping bag was wet, and we dried our gear as well as we could before dumping everything into our leaky tent. In the night, I began shaking and severe cramps gripped each leg. In the sleeping bag, I couldn’t get them straightened out, so I swore with pain and fear, waking my two sons, who were together in a doubled sleeping bag. I knew I had the beginning stage of hypothermia, but I couldn’t focus on what to do about it. I thought, “When I die here, my sons will not be able to carry me out.” Even now, as I put those words to paper, I am possessed again by fear. My oldest son got me into the bag with him and his brother, and soon I was warm enough to be out of danger. Facing my mortality and later speaking and writing about what happened, I find myself thinking of that experience and place as sacred, a locus of awe for the power and hazard of the earth. The next morning we discovered that the pitchy log had burned completely, except for the bark, which was still intact, a hollow shell in the form of a log.

When we take students into the outdoors, no matter what safety precautions we have in place, some students become frightened. As Joseph Vasicek faced a rappel from the top of Corona Arch near Moab, Utah, he grew more and more unsettled. While most of the class got into harnesses, he wondered whether he should or even could make himself rappel. He sat at the foot of the arch and wrote in his journal, “As lame as it seems, this is my limit. I can read, analyze, and write dense, academic articles on political science; I can travel halfway around the world to the Middle East and feel right at home living there; I can put my most cherished beliefs on the table and argue for them in the face of the most polemic opponent; but I don’t think I can do this rappel.”

Then he wondered whether he was “condemned to be a Terrestrial outdoorsman.” He talked with Stacy Taniguchi, the outdoor teacher, who told him that he could have a meaningful experience without doing the rappel. “He [told] me that everyone’s got their limits, and that a smart man knows his limit and doesn’t push himself past it just to prove himself.” He trusted Stacy, so instead of interpreting the advice as just

teacher-talk, he took it seriously. “Meaningful experience, [Stacy] says, helps us to come closer to an understanding of our sublime nature—the part of ourselves that lies beyond description.” Joseph finished his journal entry, which eventually became an essay, by saying he believed he had found his own divine or sublime nature sitting in the shadow of an arch he couldn’t make himself climb.

Later in a classroom presentation, Joseph quoted Kant’s *Critique of Judgement* as support for why he could have a sublime experience in this natural setting when he decided not to do the rappel. Kant writes, “It is rather in its chaos, or in its wildest and most irregular disorder and desolation, provided it gives signs of magnitude and power, that nature chiefly excites the ideas of the sublime.”12 Joseph cited part of Kant’s reasoning, that natural objects “raise the forces of the soul above the height of vulgar commonplace.” Observers discover within them “a power of resistance, . . . which gives us courage to be able to measure ourselves against the seeming omnipotence of nature.”13 This courage, when accompanied by careful thinking and the use of imagination, enables the observer to accept more than mere discomfort, disassociation, substitution for the familiar (thinking a wilderness is like a park), or terror when facing the grand complexity of the outdoors. Using Stacy and later Immanuel Kant as guides, he discovered how to reformulate his apparent weakness into strength.

Joseph’s discovery depended on him being free to choose whether to rappel or not; he also had to be able to diverge from the group in thought and action, which wouldn’t have happened if the experience had been organized according to authoritarian principles, as occurs with some survival camps for troubled youth and with some reenacted pioneer treks. Even when not in a hypercontrolled group, we can sometimes be authoritarian with ourselves, fearing failure and so limiting our choices. I fear failure if I’m not the first one to the top of the peak, if I don’t act calm when facing uncertainty or danger, or if I become disoriented. We all swaddle ourselves with certainties when we could open ourselves to uncertainty.

---


We in Thought Will Join Your Throng

Ironically, one essential cause of Joseph’s, Kelli’s, and other students’ solitary sense of sacredness came through identification with other members of the group. Joseph was guided by Stacy the outdoor teacher, Kelli by the Frisbee players. We often think that being alone in the depth of the natural world will produce sacred feelings, but when we travel with a community of spiritual explorers, we feel braver and can risk exposure. In an open and well-bonded group, we feel that we can essay in more experimental ways. Also, we have spiritual, sacred experiences in solitude, but we learn to interpret them in communities.

I am depressive, and when I make mistakes, my tradition is to suffer in solitude, beating up on myself. On one trek to England, we had a student, Claire, who bought a cheap ticket, one with half a dozen legs of her journey. Of course her luggage was lost. It was almost two weeks of both frigid and sweaty hiking before her other clothing caught up to her. We bought her a towel and a few necessities, but mostly she wore one outfit the whole time. However, she never complained. When I asked her about her good cheer, she said that she was not going to let her loss ruin the trip she had earned. Despite her clear pleasure when her luggage finally arrived, she bore her discomfort without despair. Later, when we stayed at the Preston temple lodgings, I drove early with a few students to buy food for breakfast. On the way back from the grocery store, I stopped at a petrol station to fill up. As I finished and hung up the nozzle, I realized that I had filled the tank of our diesel vehicle with gasoline. My entire being started to sink at this tragedy. I could have berated myself, could have added to my own misery, but because of Claire’s example, I decided simply to deal with the problem. I called the rental company, called a roadside emergency company for a tow, and found a garage that would pump out the petrol and replace it with diesel. All the while I was repeating the mantra, “If Claire could bear her trouble without tearing of hair and gnashing of teeth, so can I.” It was painful and expensive, but for once I didn’t add to the trouble with self-denigrating mental patter. That night I told the students the story-within-the-story. The next morning we went to the temple. Among the group was a woman who for the previous eight years had done about every self-destructive thing she could imagine. She came on the trip with us to find her way back to herself. Waiting for her turn to be baptized, she started to feel guilty. “What am I doing here?” she asked herself. “I don’t deserve to be sitting in this place with all these righteous people.” But the thought followed, “If John can
bear up under the trouble caused by his mistake and Claire can endure without complaint, then I’m not going to let myself be sucked into this kind of thinking.” Hiking with students through England and Utah, suffering inclement weather and incompetence in myself and others, I have learned the value of community to a writer. An open community gives us the courage to break patterns, take greater emotional risks, write more significant essays.

A similar group helped Jessie Scoville, who, as she started on her tour of England with the other students, sought healing from depression and the feeling that she was subject to the wrath of God. She thought relief would come through escape, through turning off her feelings. Instead, she had to use writing and conversation with others to face her demons. She writes, “I had to look at my testimony, at my relationships with people, at all of my questions. As I came to terms with the fact that I couldn’t hide from people or God anymore, I began to find answers.”

While the others were performing a fireside for the ward in Bath, Jessie sat in the back, writing in her journal. One of the speakers, a fellow student, said something that opened her to influence from God. Jessie writes, “I was struck with the sudden understanding that the atonement is not to prevent sin—but to wipe the tears of those it affects.” She realized that Christ didn’t come to remove pain, but God sent his Son to comfort us in our pain. She realized that it “wasn’t God’s fault anymore that I and the people I loved suffered; instead, He became merciful in my eyes again. Merciful because He allows us responsibility and agency but also provides us with comfort when agency or sin or the natural rhythms of life hurt us.” She was struck by the beauty of God’s plan, “that we can have both responsibility for our actions and the mercy of a loving God.” Jessie needed isolation from her former environment, space to face her problems, and the embrace of the group as a safety net for her experiment with putting herself together again. What she wrote in that context is honest, clear, and deep, writing that can give readers hope and the feeling that they are sacred beings.

I identified strongly with Jessie’s piece and other similar declarations, and eventually I wrote my own, entitled “Like the Lilies of the Field,” in which I described how I learned to feel God’s love and forgiveness through learning that other people, his children, loved and forgave me. Because fallible people forgave my mistakes, they taught me of God’s

goodness. We all leapfrog toward heaven, taking turns supporting each other as we jump forward.

As an aid to this process, we focused on introspection, but the specific subject and form of expression were open. All these students and I were encouraged—but not required—to reach toward spiritual insight as we crafted and recrafted our essays. We can lead our souls to the spring of the sacred, but we can't force ourselves or others to drink. Through the years I've known Brooke Larson, she has ardently rejected any arranged epiphany. At the end of her time at the Jerusalem Center, everyone gathered for a testimony meeting and farewell, but Brooke felt that she “could not be bothered” and stayed in her room. Finally, almost against her will, she joined the others, but this just intensified her feeling that the meeting produced only “prosaic and trite” testimony, the “tearful, quavering words,” which she saw as a “choked-up liturgy on leaving [their] hearts in Jerusalem yaddah yaddah.” At the same time, she knew her “relentless criticism” was spiritually crippling. She writes, “I wanted to feel the communion and love I knew those around me were experiencing, each expressing her affection and awe, yet I couldn’t stop throwing darts. . . . [It] occurred to me that my bosom would not burn were it even in hell.” And then after she had waited a few minutes in a state near torture, fireworks started blooming above Jerusalem, and she could see them through the window. For some reason, as she watched “platinum slate rain down from the sky,” she was moved to remember “times where God had pressed in from creative angles to penetrate [her] hard heart.” She felt love for the other people in the center, whom she had previously criticized. She writes that this was “love I did not own, did not know, that was distinctly on loan to me.” Whether it was a loan or a gift of love, she writes that it was not earned but came spontaneously. “Never had I worked to cultivate and individuate a love and understanding of these people.”

Why did the fireworks prompt Brooke’s feeling of the sacred when the testimonies of others didn’t? Why did ultimate Frisbee evoke in Kelli emotions that Tennyson’s poems couldn’t? Why did not rappelling

rather than rappelling reveal to Joseph new aspects of his divine nature? The answer to these questions is complex, but Brooke’s essay demonstrates one cause—the futility of trying to guarantee a spiritual experience, of forcing the sacred. But we can still prepare the ground for such an experience by helping ourselves and other writers focus on the process of introspection, stepping outside our common shell of experience, urging ourselves to see truly the natural universe, reading other meditative writers, occasionally braving emotional or physical danger, giving ourselves an antiauthoritarian environment, and insuring that we feel safe to experiment inside the circle of a group of like-minded Christian pilgrims.

A native of the Utah desert, John Bennion (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) writes personal and historical essays and fiction about people struggling with that forbidding landscape. His collection of short fiction, *Breeding Leah and Other Stories* (1991), and a novel, *Falling toward Heaven* (2000), were both published by Signature Books. He has published short stories and essays in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought, Best of the West II, Journal of Mormon History, High Country News, English Journal, Southwestern Review*, and others. He is an associate professor in the English Department at Brigham Young University, where he teaches the writing of fiction and creative nonfiction. He has twenty-three years’ experience leading outdoor writing programs that use personal essay to promote student growth.
Design and Construction of the Great Tabernacle Arches

Elwin C. Robison with W. Randall Dixon

The genesis of the idea for the structure of the Great Tabernacle was heavily influenced by Brigham Young’s contracting for road bridges. North Temple Street crosses the Jordan River about two miles west of Temple Square in Salt Lake City. In 1849, the single-lane bridge was a prominent feature on the landscape. By 1860, the bridge was judged an “ill-shaped, ill-contrived and ponderous concern” that was costing the territorial government hundreds of dollars in maintenance. Accordingly, the territorial legislature appropriated fifteen hundred dollars for construction of a new bridge on the condition that the city and county appropriated the same. Acting as general contractor, Young hired Henry Grow, a “scientific bridge builder,” to design and build the new bridge.

Grow had worked in Philadelphia for the Remington Company, which owned the patent rights for a lattice truss. The most important lattice truss patent was granted to Ithiel Town on January 28, 1820. Town’s lattice truss design consisted of diagonal timbers pegged together in a lattice form, with half of the timbers slanting forward and half slanting rearward. Grow used the Remington Company’s patent rights to build lattice truss

1. James William Ure, Statement, November 16, 1908, typescript, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
4. Town’s January 28, 1820, patent was amended in April 3, 1836, to include multiple lattice and chord layers (U.S. Patent x0003169-001).
One of Young’s daughters explained the relationship: “A convert by the name of Henry Grow arrived in the city from Philadelphia. He had been working for the Remington Company, who owned a patent right for slat bridge construction, and as a compliment to him the company gave him the privilege of using it in Utah, which fact he made known to the authorities upon his arrival here.”

5. Although Henry Grow’s business card mentions a “Remington Patent of Lattice Bridges,” there is no Remington patent for a building truss design in the U.S. Patent office records. Traditionally, writers have confused historical statements about the Remington Company and Grow’s relationship to that company to mean that Grow was using a new, patented truss type. However, in reality he was granted the right to use the truss design in Utah, which rights the Remington Company had apparently purchased.

Despite the moniker "scientific," lattice trusses were not calculated the way professional engineers were just learning to do in the nineteenth century. Instead, lattice trusses tended to be built on rule-of-thumb principles. The multiple diagonals provided multiple load paths for forces through the truss, and the trusses in essence designed themselves, with forces running through the diagonals that matched the load path of the bridge. This resulted in many of the wood diagonals in a lattice being lightly loaded, making the form inefficient. Nevertheless, a carpenter without specialized engineering skills could build a strong truss. The depth of the truss was determined by proportion to its length and by the performance of previous bridges. Connections were typically made by wooden pegs, a decided advantage in the iron-poor territory of Utah.

Young was directly involved with the construction of the Jordan River Bridge (fig. 1). Given his practical bent and lively interest in building—plus the fact that his money was at risk if the bridge did not succeed—he

7. Squire Whipple was one of the first American engineers to publish a rational method for the calculation of trusses in 1847. See Squire Whipple, A Work on Bridge Building: Consisting of Two Essays, the One Elementary and General, the Other Giving Original Plans and Practical Details for Iron and Wooden Bridges (Utica, N.Y.: H. H. Curtiss, 1847).
became very familiar with both Grow and the lattice truss design. In fact, the bridge was assembled in Young’s walled compound near his home, then partly dismantled and re-erected on site.  

The bridge had a three-truss arrangement with the central truss dividing the driving lanes. According to Lorenzo Brown’s diary, it appears that the diagonal lattice and bottom chord (the planks fastened to the bottom of the lattice) were launched across the river, probably floated and pulled by ropes, and then raised into position. The upper chords were then drilled, pegged, and wedged in place. Brown also talked of setting string pieces, or stringers as they are more commonly known today—the transverse beams that support the roadbed.

The bridge on North Temple lasted until its replacement in 1908. Given their relatively slender shape (like a wooden yardstick), the planks bowed out when placed into compression, and the planks worked their way off the wooden pegs. Importantly, in the Great Tabernacle, Grow later doubled the number of pegs at intersections and drove wedges into both ends of the pegs. Although in a dilapidated condition by the twentieth century, the bridge performed very well before weathering compromised the connections and vehicle weights increased beyond what its designer had envisioned.

It is significant that the clear span of the bridge over the Jordan River is similar to that of the clear span of the Great Tabernacle. In the absence of numerical theory on which to base structural design, precedent governs. Of course, a straight truss is not the same as a trussed arch, and those with practical building experience such as Grow and Young understood that. However, the proven performance of the truss at one hundred thirty feet served as a powerful starting point in imagining a suitable congregational space for the Saints.

Young could have chosen to have Grow design a series of straight trusses to support the roof of the Great Tabernacle, as many convention centers and sports arenas do in the twenty-first century. However, he

10. Close examination of the photograph shows that some lattice intersections were reinforced with an iron bolt, which would restrain the planks from working off the pegs. Since only isolated connections are reinforced with the iron bolts, it is assumed that these were installed as a later repair.
had several years’ experience speaking under the arched ceiling of the Old Tabernacle. While he might not have understood wave propagation theory and reverberation times, he would have known what worked acoustically and what did not. The curved apse and curved plaster ceiling of the Old Tabernacle possessed excellent acoustic properties for speaking, and those who had addressed congregations there would have understood how well their voices carried by the reaction of the congregation. The design of the Great Tabernacle can be thought of as a combination of these two successful ideas—the wood trusses of Henry Grow and the acoustical properties of the curved ceiling of the Old Tabernacle.

The distinctive shape of the Tabernacle roof was chosen early in the planning process. Grow’s son related that Young came to his father and asked him how large a roof he could construct. Grow reportedly replied, “150 feet wide and as long as it is wanted.” Grow was absolutely correct in his answer—once the system of arches was established, the only limits to the length of such a building were time, money, and functionality. Young’s question to Grow implies that Young had already decided on the curved shape of the Great Tabernacle. Young’s daughter Clarissa reconstructed the following conversation between her father and Grow:

Henry, I am desirous of constructing a building for our people, anticipating the future numbers, and I have been wondering what plan we should use, for I have built many buildings and no two alike, and I am anxious that this should be different to anything else. What do you think about the Remington construction? Henry, I had an egg for breakfast this morning, cooked hard, and in lieu of chopping it through the center, I cut it through end-wise and set it up on tooth-picks. I was strongly impressed that we might use this plan for the building.

11. Grow, “Historical Study of the Construction,” 76; Scott Esplin, ed., The Tabernacle: An Old and Wonderful Friend (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, 2007), 154. Note that Kate B. Carter, The Great Mormon Tabernacle (Salt Lake City: Utah Printing Company, 1967), 10, repeated the story but reported a span of one hundred feet. Since the original statement was a reminiscence, it was the confidence and bravado that were of interest, not the exact span.


13. Spencer with Harmer, Brigham Young at Home, 281–82. Although Clarissa was only three years old when the reported event occurred, she spent much time with her father, since she lived in the Beehive House and commonly breakfasted with him. Presumably, her reconstructed conversation is based on later recounting by her father.
The main support for the soaring Tabernacle roof is a series of forty-four stone piers three feet wide, nine feet deep, and of varying height to accommodate the terrain’s gentle slope to the west (fig. 2). It is not known how big a crew was used in digging the foundations for the new piers, but Samuel Fletcher was remembered as the first man to break ground for the Tabernacle. Digging the forty-four holes in the ground by hand would have taken significant effort because of the relatively dense gravel on which the Tabernacle is built. Stone footings were placed underneath the piers, broadening the contact with the soil.

The great arched wood trusses are as deep as the stone piers so that the top chord of the truss (the uppermost line of planks) lines up with the outside face of the pier, while the bottom chord of the truss lines up with the interior face (fig. 3). Massive wood sleepers bear on the top of the stone piers, transferring their load to the stone below. The builder’s intention was probably for the trusses to bear along the nine-foot length of the piers. However, after 140 years of service, the only point of contact between the wood arch and stone pier occurred at the inside face of the pier. During

14. “Recent Deaths, Fletcher, Samuel,” *Deseret Evening News*, February 17, 1910, last edition, p. 3, col. 4. “He had the honor of being the first man to break ground for the foundation of the Salt Lake Tabernacle and at one time was one of Brigham Young’s bodyguards.”
the seismic upgrade in 2006, engineers removed the wood trim at the top of a stone pier to look for a positive connection (such as iron bolts) fastening the arches to the stone piers. They found that they could slide a piece of paper underneath the arch at the outside face of the pier. The tremendous horizontal thrust from the arch had pushed the stone pier and rotated it outward. The slight rotation lowered the outside edge and

15. Correspondence with Craig Wilkinsen of Reaveley Engineers and Associates, July 15, 2010.

16. Earlier statements on the Tabernacle arches failed to reflect the knowledge gained through modern engineering investigations. For example, Earl Olson stated that “the method of construction on the roof, although a great weight was involved, was such that the roof could not spread at its base as all
raised the inner edge so that only the inner timbers of the wooden arch were in contact with the stone pier. Ironically, rather than being detrimental, this deflection of the wood arch trusses and stone piers resulted in a stable structural system.

Half-Arch End Sections

Grow’s son related an interesting aspect of the Tabernacle design. He said his father walked the floor at night for two weeks attempting to arrive at a solution of how to arch the end sections. The Tabernacle is not a simple barrel vault (or half cylinder). Rather, the building has semicircular ends to the east and west that give the Tabernacle its turtle-shell appearance. These ends were formed of half arches that are oriented radially from the center of the last full arch to stone piers on the east and west. The weight of all these radial arches bears on that last full arch (commonly called the king arch), loading it much more heavily than the center arches (fig. 4). Grow was concerned about how to make the connection at the top, but another concern might have been creating equilibrium between the two sets of radial trusses at the east and west.

Grow understood that half arches at the east and west ends of the Tabernacle push inward at the top, for he inserted a large ridge truss at the top of the roof between the east and west half arches. Under gravity loading, the push from each set of half arches is equal, resulting in equilibrium between the two ends. As long as there is no significant

the weight was exerted straight down toward the center. The strain on the great timbers served only to intensify their union because of the way they were fastened together.” Quoted in Carter, *Great Mormon Tabernacle*, 13. This erroneous understanding of the Tabernacle structure, plus other factual errors, might have come from an article preserved in the Journal History on November 14, 1915, from the *Salt Lake Tribune*: “A notable fact is that architects and constructors who know or are informed of the methods employed unanimously agree that the great dome cannot spread at its base. So far-seeing was the arrangement of timbers that every ounce of weight exerts its pressure on the plumb line, precisely in accord with the law of gravitation—directly toward the earth’s center. They say that a sufficient load could be put in that roof to crush it, but not to spread its base.” In reality, although gravity pulls only straight down, the transfer of that gravitational force from the center of the span to the stone piers resulted in substantial horizontal forces at the arch supports. Had the stone piers not been as deep as they were, they would have been pushed over, and the wood lattice truss would have cracked and splintered due to the increased stress.

settlement or rotation of the stone piers which support the lower ends of the half arches, the half arches and ridge truss would form a stable structural system, and no significant weight would bear on the king trusses. This is likely the way Grow envisioned the roof system to behave, for the king trusses are not bigger or stronger than the arch trusses in the center of the building. Unfortunately, as was discussed above, the stone piers did not remain perfectly in place, having rotated slightly outward. More seriously, skylights cut into the roof to illuminate the interior of the Tabernacle inadvertently cut Grow’s ridge truss, eliminating the compression member between the two sets of half arches that push in toward the center. As a consequence, the half arches have transferred much of their weight onto the king trusses.
When the roof was removed and the bow in the king trusses was discovered, engineers placed temporary struts across the skylight, joining the original wood ridge truss to the radial trusses until a new steel ridge truss could be installed.

Construction of the Great Arches

Despite the urgency to complete the structure, Young insisted that the stone piers be allowed to sit a season and let the mortar cure and harden before construction of the massive arches that bore on them. Construction of the great arches was a formidable task, for the scaffolding had to extend to the height of a five- or six-story building. The arches were formed from heavy pine planks pegged and bolted together (fig. 5). The planks are about twelve inches deep and vary from two and a half to almost three inches thick. Most early sawmills could not produce dimensional lumber with greater accuracy than that. Each arch has four chords that follow the curve of the arch and that are spaced roughly equally from the top to the bottom of the arch. These four chords are made of four thicknesses of wood held together by the nine-foot-high lattice to which they are fastened by wood pegs. Joints in the chords are staggered to provide continuity along the chords.

The erroneous claim that nails were not used to build the Tabernacle has been repeated often.\(^\text{18}\) In reality, tens of thousands of nails were used in construction, although procuring nails was challenging at the time.

\(^{18}\) For example, “Ancient Lighting Systems Gradually Give Way to New Units,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, July 12, 1929: “A modern touch to Salt Lake’s historic tabernacle, meeting place for pioneers as well as present-day folk, is added by the installation of an entirely new lighting system . . . in the building, which has gained world wide fame for its acoustic qualities and its construction without nails.”
Many cut nails from the Tabernacle were saved during the 2006 seismic upgrade (fig. 7). These cut nails feature square-sectioned, tapered shafts and machine-made heads.

At the time the Tabernacle was constructed, there were at least two nail machines operating in the Salt Lake Valley. A. W. Sabin built one machine and later sold it to George J. Taylor. Taylor advertised nails for sale in the newspaper, but along with his offer of goods was the plea, “Bring on your iron!” He was just as concerned with securing a supply of raw material as he was with selling the finished product. Another nail machine was made by Jon Pugmire and operated in Young’s blacksmith shop. The nail machines in Utah were relatively simple and consisted of...
primarily of a set of rollers and a shear cutter. Iron was first heated and passed through rollers to produce a sheet of the desired thickness, typically about one-eighth to three-sixteenths of an inch. This plate was cut to the desired length of the nail and fed into a cutting machine that produced a slight taper on the shaft. The first nail machines cut only the shaft, leaving the head to be formed by hand in a blacksmith shop. Later, Salt Lake City businessman Daniel H. Wells introduced the first machine that actually formed a head on the nail. The tapered shafts were fed into a machine that clamped down on the shaft and formed the malleable iron into a head. During the seismic upgrade, the authors observed only nails with machine-made heads in the Tabernacle. This evidence indicates that by the time construction commenced on the arches in 1865, nails with machine-made heads were readily available. Although newspaper accounts reported finding handwrought nails during previous renovations, reporters probably assumed any nail that was not a modern wire nail must have been hand produced. In reality, no serious production of handmade nails had taken place in most of the United States since the 1820s.

What was unique about the nails of the Tabernacle was the source of the iron used in their manufacture. Young was eager to find local


23. “Wrought Spikes Are Found in Frame under Choir Seats,” Salt Lake Tribune, December 2, 1933, 24. The article states, “Tradition that the L. D. S. tabernacle was built without the use of a single nail—a story which has received credence the world around—was proved ill founded during the past week when a number of sturdy hand-wrought spikes were found in the original framework beneath the choir seats.”

sources for needed commodities to prevent bleeding the region of currency and capital. He sent a group to Las Vegas to mine lead, but that venture was unsuccessful due to contaminating impurities in the lead, which others later found to be silver. He even established a colony in Iron County with skilled members being called as “iron missionaries” to mine ore and smelt the metal. Although the Saints produced some iron near present-day Cedar City, the quantities consumed by large-scale construction would have taxed their production capabilities.25

According to the nail makers, their primary source of iron came from the government wagons of the United States Army, which had marched on Salt Lake City in 1857–58. The heavy military wagons that accompanied the army had thick iron hoops around the circumference of the wooden wheels and heavy chains and bolts used with brake levers, axles, and wagon trees.26 Many of these wagons had been burned in Wyoming by Lot Smith during his campaign to slow the army’s progress toward Utah.27

In addition to the iron needed for nails, iron was needed for bolts. In the Tabernacle, long iron bolts attach the chords of the timber arches to the lattice. Thousands of bolts fasten the arch chords where the planks abut each other. These bolts vary between one-half and three-quarters of an inch in diameter. Some are over twenty-three inches long, running through the lattice arch chords and stiffeners. Other bolts are shorter, fastening only the chords and lattice planks, or just fastening two planks where they butt together. The bolt heads are square and typically of substantial size. The shaft of the bolt and the head were visibly welded together by blacksmiths. The heavy, square bolt heads and nuts were made by shearing through one- to one-and-a-half-inch-thick stock material, which would have required heavy machinery not easily


transported across the plains before the arrival of the railroad. That, together with the quantity of bolts used, suggests that they were purchased in the East. By the time the arches were being raised, residents of Utah Territory would not have had to travel all the way to the Missouri River to buy bolts. The transcontinental railroad started construction in 1863, about the same year as the Tabernacle. However, the railroad did not come to Utah until early 1869, two years after the completion of the roof structure of the Tabernacle. Although newspapers mentioned “trains” during the construction of the Tabernacle, this term referred exclusively to wagon trains. Still, the bolt supply inched closer to the Great Basin with each mile of track that was laid. In fact, it seems likely that many of the bolts used in the Tabernacle were purchased from railroad inventories.
Mute testimony to the expense and difficulty of obtaining these bolts is the fact that many bolt holes, drilled at the junction between the lattice truss chord junctions, never had bolts installed in them (fig. 8). Typically two bolts were intended to be placed at each junction, but especially in the half-arches at the ends, many of these bolts are missing. Since the loads carried by the end arches were considerably less than those borne by the complete arches over the central portion of the building, it may have been a conscious decision on the part of Grow (and Young) to economize in areas where loads would be reduced. Of the approximately six thousand holes drilled for bolts, my survey of the roof structure shows that only about three quarters had bolts installed.

The source of the bolts was rather different from that of the washers used underneath them. Virtually all of these washers were scavenged and reused pieces of iron. Many of these were ox shoes, with a characteristic wide crescent shape and nail holes on the outer perimeter. In a few cases, a nail that held the shoe on the animal’s hoof still dangled from the washer (fig. 9). Most ox-shoe washers had the tail end of the shoe (to the right in the figure) cut off, presumably thrown into the scrap heap to be reused in the blacksmith shop. Another class of washer was a square iron plate, sometimes generically referred to as wagon iron. Most of these were crudely hammered flat, indicating they had been reused (for example, the washer in figure 8). Finally, there were irregular-shaped plates of relatively thin iron used as bolt washers. Some of these trapezoidal shapes might be the ends of plates left over from nail manufacture. While the bolts probably were purchased in the East and transported west by wagon, the washers used on the bolts definitely were not.

The “no nail” Tabernacle myth likely stemmed from the use of wooden pegs that fastened together the arch lattice planks (fig. 10). Although pioneer economy and scarcity of iron encouraged the decision to use wood pins, a much tighter fit is possible using wood pegs. For example,
the wedge driven into the peg expands the peg to ensure a tight fit and prevent the peg from working itself out of the hole. Discarded pieces of wood pegs found in the attic of the Tabernacle are turned dowels with very smooth surfaces. Young reported that “the pins are of well seasoned timber, turned to about the 32nd part of an inch larger than the holes, they were well greased and driven home with sledges and wedged at each end.” A blunt taper was turned into one end of the peg. Workers always drove the wedge into the peg so it expanded in the direction of the grain and not across the grain. Had the workers done the latter, each plank in the arched lattice truss would have split. This was an especially critical detail because the lumber available from local canyons to build the tabernacle was not of high quality. Most planks have many knots in them that interrupt the grain of the member, reducing their strength. Such knots also increase the susceptibility of the member to splitting. Some arch planks are split in the zone of the pegs, but because of the orientation of the wedges in the peg, this condition is relatively rare.

The tightness of the peg in the hole was critical for two other reasons. First, any slack, or “play,” in the pegs would have caused the arch lattice trusses to sag even before any load was applied. Second, shifting winds and eddy currents can blow first from one direction and then another. Any play in the connections would wear the timbers and cause eventual failure. Instead, the installation of the pegs was such that, even after 140 years, the arched lattice trusses are still sound and able to carry their loads.

If wood pegs were so efficient, then why did the Tabernacle have several thousand iron bolts? While the pegs form a secure shear connection (two planks sliding against each other), bolts are superior when used in tension (two planks being pulled apart). The bolts were used exclusively at the ends of the planks to keep their butted surfaces from spreading apart. With large compressive forces in the arch members, there would have been a tendency for the butted joints to buckle out of plane, which would have caused the arch to fail. To prevent this outcome, two iron bolts with large iron washers were installed at each butt joint. Note that the bolts are not preventing the planks from sliding past one another—it is the butted connection that does this. Instead, the bolts act in tension, holding the planks in place and preventing them from spreading outward.

Inspection of the Tabernacle trusses shows that most of the butt connections in the main trusses over the central section of the building

Great Tabernacle Arches

have two bolts installed at each connection; but, as was noted above, many bolts were not installed, especially in the half arches. Where a bolt is missing, chord members have warped so that there is not an even transfer of forces across the cross section of planks. Half-inch-diameter wood pegs installed to aid in positioning the planks during construction are present at the butt joint, but they do not have sufficient tensile capacity to prevent warping of the wood planks when a bolt is missing.

Completed Shell

As the heavy construction phase ended, control of the building site shifted from Grow to Truman Angell, the Church’s architect. However, Grow continued as a foreman even after the main structural work was done and architectural elements were being installed. This arrangement highlights the fact that assigning credit for the design and construction of a large building to any single individual is a forced convention that does not tell us everything about the building or its history.29 As the shell of the Tabernacle was finished, Grow took a secondary role, while Angell took the lead.

Elwin C. Robison (who can be contacted via email at byustudies@byu.edu) received a BS in Civil Engineering from Brigham Young University and a MA and PhD in Architectural History from Cornell University. He is a professor in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design at Kent State University and is a professional engineer. Dr. Robison consults in historic building restoration and conservation. He is a coauthor of Architectural Technology up to the Scientific Revolution (MIT Press, 1993), and author of The First Mormon Temple: Design, Construction, and Historic Context of the Kirtland Temple (BYU Press, 1997).

W. Randall Dixon (who can be contacted via email at byustudies@byu.edu) received a bachelor’s degree in history and a master’s degree in public administration from BYU. He retired after a career as an archivist and historian with the LDS Church History Department. He has published several articles on Salt Lake City history, including “From Emigration Canyon to City Creek: Pioneer Trail and Campsites in the Salt Lake Valley in 1847,” Utah Historical Quarterly, Spring 1997.


Reviewed by David Dominguez

As an Evangelical who has resided in Utah County since 1989 and as a law professor at BYU for the past twenty-four years, I read with great interest Richard J. Mouw's latest book, *Talking with Mormons: An Invitation to Evangelicals.* I was pleased that the author, president of Fuller Theological Seminary, helped me sort out my thoughts on countless conversations with LDS colleagues, students, and neighbors concerning differences in our religious traditions and, even more importantly, provided a structure for more fruitful dialogue. I encourage anyone who cares about building bridges between and among Evangelicals and Mormons to take time to read and thoughtfully consider Mouw’s points.

That said, when I finished the book, I was left with the nagging feeling that while something very important was emphasized, something equally important was omitted. Mouw centers his discussion on the debate between Evangelicals and Mormons on theology (“Who is God? What is his nature?”) and soteriology (“What is salvation? What must we do to be saved?”). He gives thoughtful, concise explanations of what Evangelicals believe and why there can be no compromise on the basics of mainstream Christian doctrine. While those tenets are non-negotiable, Mouw stresses that there is still plenty of room for Evangelicals to learn more about our faith by listening to and learning from Mormons when they give account of their faith and hope in Jesus. I can vouch for this; I have not wavered in my conviction that I am saved by grace. The atoning work of the Savior on the cross is complete. I add nothing to effectuate my salvation. Still, as Mouw points out, while the Atonement is complete, we Evangelicals do not have a complete understanding of it. For me, these past twenty-four years have made it clear that faithful Mormons have helped me along the Way, the Truth, and
the Life, deepening my commitment to God as an ongoing “mystery discerning enterprise” (76). I stand with Mouw and his overall theme: remain “open to God-given truths” (77).

Now to what was overlooked. I find it troubling to read this book or any other treatment of Evangelical–Mormon relations that myopically focuses on “talking.” Consider what difference it would have made were the title “Walking with Mormons: An Invitation to Evangelicals . . . to Experience the Road to Emmaus” (see Luke 24:13–35).

The Emmaus Road teaches us to approach each other gently, with the utmost of care for each other’s well-being. We are called to follow Jesus’s example, matching each other stride for stride, doing all we can to catch up with the hope and despair we all experience in the practice of Christian faith. Only after we have traveled miles together and given each other time to tell the whole story can we open up the Word in the here and now, among real brothers and sisters, rather than engage in debates over abstract doctrine. Even then, conversation can only go so far to turn us away from error and point us in the right direction; we must break bread together for our eyes to be truly opened to the Word made flesh.

My daily life among the Mormons has been all about walking the Emmaus Road in Utah County and on the BYU campus for twenty-four years. I know its transformative power. Ah, but you ask, are you the Evangelical suggesting that you are Jesus and the lost disciples are Mormons? No; we are called by God to play both parts, each of us answering his prompting to chase after the other as an angel in disguise.

Which then takes us to the book’s most glaring omission: why is there no reference to—let alone analysis of—church building? Is it because Evangelicals are notorious for bearing false witness against the Body of Christ, arguing among ourselves over the smallest of theological differences and then splintering into thousands of tiny groups? (Evangelicals “joke” that we are the only army that kills its wounded.) More to the point, is it because this is Mormons’ strong suit, the arena in which Mormons turn the tables on Evangelicals and testify to unity and common purpose? We Evangelicals have plenty to learn from Mormons when it comes to building a church that heeds God’s call to “enlarge the place of your tent” (see Isaiah 54:2), a church that reaches out to young and old, tax collectors and Zealots, prostitutes and Samaritans, all over the world.

As I said, Mouw does a great job providing a workable structure for Mormons and Evangelicals to begin speaking to each other concerning
fine points of classical theology and soteriology, both matters of central importance to Jesus and his ministry. But equally important to Jesus was ecclesiology: “I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt. 16:18).

David Dominguez (who can be contacted via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is Professor of Law at Brigham Young University’s J. Reuben Clark Law School. He received a BA in religious studies from Yale in 1977 and graduated from law school at UC Berkeley in 1980. He has taught at BYU since 1989. His publications include “The Ecology of Cultural Justice in Legal Education: How Affirmative Action Can Become Race Neutral by 2028,” University of Oregon Law Review 88, no. 1 (2009), and “Community Lawyering in the Juvenile Cellblock: Creative Uses of Legal Problem Solving to Reconcile Competing Narratives on Prosecutorial Abuse, Juvenile Criminality, and Public Safety,” Journal of Dispute Resolution, 2007, no. 2.
Matthew Bowman is an up-and-coming young scholar of the generation now rising with the relatively new field of Mormon studies. Having completed his doctorate in American religious history at Georgetown University in 2011, he has nevertheless already been very visible for some time at academic conferences and in periodical literature of both Mormon and American religious histories. He has appeared on various public media sites, electronic and otherwise, as a commentator about Mormons and Mormonism, including discussions of his new book.¹

This book provides eight solid chapters, a brief introduction, and an even briefer conclusion, followed by four appendices, a bibliographic essay, endnotes, and an index. The chapters are arranged chronologically, with the first taking us to 1831, the second to 1839, the third to 1846, the fourth to 1877, the fifth to 1896, the sixth to 1945, the seventh to 1978, and the final chapter to 2011. The significance of this periodization will be readily apparent to many Mormon readers, and Bowman makes it clear enough to non-Mormon readers as well. He appropriately dedicates the book to Richard Bushman, who is not only his principal mentor but also was instrumental in connecting him with the publisher.

The author uses a strategy for his references (likely at the urging of his publisher) that makes the text read smoothly without interruptions from footnotes. The chapters are actually rather lightly footnoted (averaging usually about one note per page of text), and all the notes appear in a single section at the back of the book. The sixteen-page bibliographic essay preceding the notes thus carries the main burden of explaining the most important sources used by the author. The reader can thereby recognize that the author has relied mainly on secondary sources for the general story line and the major events and episodes of Mormon history. The chapter notes themselves cite mainly primary sources, but these citations function more to illustrate the story than to carry it. This is not intended as a criticism, for the author himself indicates that his book is largely a synthesis of the work of others, especially the first five chapters.

Within the nineteenth-century period, I thought that chapter 5, on the rise and fall of plural marriage in Utah, was an especially successful presentation. Through the theological treatises of Parley P. Pratt and others, the rationale offered for polygamy, with its emphasis on the eternal importance of complicated social networks, made this seemingly radical practice somewhat understandable.

The final three chapters, however, all of which deal with the twentieth century and beyond, display the most originality. Indeed, no earlier general histories have devoted such a large proportion of their treatments to this second half of Mormon history. Aside from the sheer quantity devoted to the more recent period, the book also has an important original argument in these final chapters—namely that the Church was strongly influenced by the Progressive movement so prominent in

its American surroundings during the first half of that century. Thomas Alexander, whose volume on that same period remains the standard text, occasionally acknowledges the parallels between Progressivism and developments within Mormonism. Yet Bowman goes further in using the convergence with American Progressivism as an underlying theme in the way that Mormon institutional life unfolded, whether in the theological rationalizations of B. H. Roberts, James E. Talmage, and John A. Widtsoe, or in the hard work, financial acumen, organizational efficiency, and wholesome living advocated by Heber J. Grant. Many earlier scholars have recognized the assimilation or “Americanization” of Mormons that occurred during this period, but Bowman points to Progressivism as the main inspiration for that assimilation (chapter 6).

Yet the second half of the twentieth century saw a turn away from Progressivism toward what Bowman calls “retrenchment Mormonism,” a concept he acknowledges in a reference to my 1994 book. The chief vehicle of this retrenchment was “Correlation,” which gives chapter 7 its name. As an organizational framework emphasizing simplification, efficiency, and centralized control in a rapidly growing church, Correlation might be seen as simply an extension and intensification of Progressive forms of governance, which Bowman sees also in corporate America more generally.

However, one of Correlation’s implications, ironically, was a certain skepticism toward the kind of rationalized theology of the earlier period and, by extension, a suspicion of intellectuals who engaged in it. The expansive theological thinking of Roberts, Talmage, and Widtsoe was eclipsed and largely displaced by the more cautious and circumspect doctrinal teachings about scripture, creation, and the supernatural promulgated by Joseph Fielding Smith, Bruce R. McConkie, Ezra Taft Benson, and others of similar thought. Of course, Correlation’s influence could be seen in many other aspects of church life as well, including some loss of autonomy for the auxiliaries, especially those traditionally run


3. While this assimilation was apparently a deliberate policy preference on the part of the LDS leadership, there was some resistance to it, and it was certainly not inevitable. For an interesting study in “what might have been” during this period, see Ethan R. Yorgason, *Transformation of the Mormon Culture Region* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003).

by women; a simplification of the missionary message and approach to emphasize behavior and commitment over theological persuasion; and more overt involvement in political campaigns wherever the Church saw crucial moral issues involved. Indeed, if correlation and retrenchment can be seen partly as an extension of the Progressive philosophy of efficient corporate governance, they must also be seen as a reaction against an increasingly secular and hedonistic American culture more generally. In any case, the chapter on Correlation and its consequences offers a treatment that is a satisfying combination of the succinct and the comprehensive.

Chapter 8 picks up after the 1978 revelation on priesthood policy and brings us down to the present. While acknowledging the important work of others on issues in the late twentieth-century Church, Bowman cites (291) Claudia Bushman’s *Contemporary Mormonism* as “most useful.” Although the title of this chapter indicates that it deals with the global Church, it does not drop the subject of Correlation introduced in the previous chapter. Correlation did not end in 1978 but continues with us still, and its accompanying wariness toward independent intellectuals lasted at least through the administration of President Benson. Furthermore, the discussion of the global Church in chapter 8 is not an account of the Church’s experiences in the various countries of the globe, but it does discuss somewhat the struggle of several departments at Church headquarters in Salt Lake City to deal with overseas growth, both logistically and culturally. The publisher made clear that the book was to be limited in scope to the American experience, so the author did not venture far beyond that limit. A much larger book would have been required for a truly global treatment.

Of course, that still leaves a lot to discuss about the Latter-day Saints in the U.S. itself, including the expansion of the Church nationwide, in large part through the dispersion of prominent members and families (including the Romneys); the ambivalent relationship between Mormons and Protestant Evangelicals; and the political exertions of the Church on behalf of traditional family and gender roles, especially through campaigns against the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and same-sex marriage. The chapter includes brief forays into the significance of independent cultural developments among Mormon intellectuals and artists of recent decades, including the “new Mormon history” introduced by

Leonard J. Arrington at the Church’s own historical department, the Mormon History Association, Book of Mormon scholarship, the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS), and the publication of Dialogue and Sunstone. The author acknowledges resistance from Church leadership to some of these developments, and this resistance eventually expressed itself in some highly publicized excommunications during the 1990s. The chapter closes on an upbeat and optimistic assessment of a future, in which the Church exhibits a new openness and transparency about its past, as well as a new appreciation for the religious truths and impulses in other faiths.

I noticed two other general features of the book that will likely increase its appeal to non-Mormon readers and to intellectually persuaded Mormons: For one, the book is quite candid and transparent about many of the more curious, troubling, and misunderstood features in Mormon history that have so often been passed over—for example, reports of Joseph Smith’s treasure-seeking background; accounts of his translation sessions involving simple dictation, without resort to the plates (but sometimes with a seer stone); the controversy around the Fanny Alger case; the secrecy and apparent deception, even of Emma, during the establishment of plural marriage in Nauvoo; the tragic saga of Emma’s eventual break with the main body of the Church; Mormon contributions to the violence in Missouri; the continuation of post-Manifesto polygamy by authorization of key Church leaders; the perceived dissembling by the Church President and some Apostles during the Smoot hearings; the slow and ambiguous decline in women’s authority to perform healing blessings; the dubious origins and periodic recurrence of the race issue; and the transformation of the proselytizing system from an emphasis on reason and persuasion to a program relying more on an extraordinary conversion event. Bowman’s treatment of all these issues is done with great discretion—revealing but not in any way salacious.

A second appealing feature of the book is its occasional citation of intellectual and artistic products, whether by Mormons or non-Mormons, to illustrate or symbolize important historical developments—for example, the doctrinal significance of the book Added Upon and its later connection to Saturday’s Warrior; Darryl F. Zanuck’s film Brigham Young and the popularity of the Tabernacle Choir as indicators of Mormon assimilation into the broader culture; conservative non-Mormon sources finding use in James E. Talmage’s Jesus the Christ and in Joseph Fielding Smith’s Man: His Origin and Destiny; the manifest resort to Mormon themes in the fiction of Orson Scott Card and Stephenie
Meyer, in the work of filmmakers such as Richard Dutcher, and in recent Broadway plays and musicals; and even in such popular intellectual ventures mentioned above, as well as the extensive bloggernacle.

All in all, this book is a pleasure to read. The prose communicates well and colorfully. It would be an excellent basic textbook for a course in Mormon studies at either the graduate or the undergraduate level. I expect it to enjoy a wide readership, partly because of the features I have discussed here, but also because it has the benefit of marketing by a well-known commercial publisher.

Armand L. Mauss (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Religious Studies, Washington State University, and more recently adjunct faculty in the School of Religion at the Claremont Graduate University. He is author or editor of several books in Mormon Studies, including *Shifting Borders and a Tattered Passport: Intellectual Journeys of a Mormon Academic* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2012).
Mormonism has had a difficult history with pulp fiction, from lurid magazine tales of Danite murders and kidnappings to Arthur Conan Doyle's casual depictions of forced polygamous marriage and international revenge in *A Study in Scarlet*. Sensationalism about poorly understood details of Mormon culture, doctrine, and practice has long been a mainstay of thrilling stories focused on exotic locales and adventurism more than factual accuracy.

Though Mormonism has generally fared poorly in popular genres, individual Mormons have quietly become a powerful force in those same genres. Authors like Zenna Henderson and Raymond F. Jones embraced the new genres of science fiction and fantasy in the 1940s and 1950s at about the same time Samuel W. Taylor introduced the world to "A Situation of Gravity," which became Disney's *The Absent-Minded Professor*. While not household names themselves, their stories were known around the world. Since then, authors like Orson Scott Card, Dave Wolverton, Brandon Sanderson, and Stephenie Meyer have become international bestsellers in science fiction, fantasy, and horror, with a veritable mob of next-gen authors such as Dan Wells, Shannon Hale, James Dashner, and others joining the fray.

Still, though Mormons are well represented in genre fiction, there has tended to be an essential disconnect between Mormonism as subject matter and Mormons as authors. While there is much room for imagination informed by Mormon thought, the specific trappings of Mormonism have largely been left behind in the broader popular market (though that is starting to change).

So it was with a mix of horror and fascination that I approached *Monsters and Mormons*, a hefty new anthology of pulp-style stories
explicitly based on the peculiar trappings of Mormon life, history, culture, and folklore.

Digression: Anthology as State of the Literary Art

Short story anthologies are oddly rare in Mormon literature. We publish plenty of single-author collections, but multi-author anthologies tend to be fewer and further between. As such, they tend to be viewed as manifestos of sorts, snapshots of the current state of the Mormon literary art—at least over the past two decades. From Eugene England’s *Bright Angels and Familiars* through M. Shayne Bell’s *Washed by a Wave of Wind* to Angela Hallstrom’s *Dispensation*, we look to these anthologies as signposts of our collective literary maturity and use them as introductions to notable names that we might not hear of otherwise.

That is not precisely what editors Wm Morris and Theric Jepson were trying to accomplish with *Monsters and Mormons*—or at least it was not their sole goal. In many ways, this anthology is an act of aggression, an almost antagonistic response to the abuses heaped on Mormonism by the pulps and other popular genres over the years. The editors stated it best in the original call for submissions: “We propose to recast, reclaim and simply mess with that tradition by making Mormon characters, settings and ideas the protagonists of genre-oriented stories . . . a project of cultural re-appropriation. But even more than that, we just want us all to have fun with the concept.”

In attempting to explicitly reappropriate Mormon things from the pulp genres, this anthology actually does function as a statement of both maturity and the state of the literary art, though not in traditional ways. Rather than focusing *stories* on the Mormon experience, the editors have focused the authors’ own imaginative extrapolation of the Mormon experience as a seed for creating stories.

In other words, overwrought and exaggerated stories in the pulp tradition told *by* us rather than *about* us; sensational stories with Mormons cast as heroes as well as villains; latent Mormon mysticism animating the phantasms of unique existential horror; and direct permission to mine Mormonism with the same reckless abandon that others have used to create exotic and unusual stories.

That level of comfort with creative reimagination of our institutions and practices speaks to a real kind of cultural maturity. These tales exist to explore and entertain, not to explain or proselytize. While many of these stories are somewhat less than literary masterpieces of theme, language, and allusion, they are all comfortable within their very Mormon skin. That is a (generally) good thing.

Cultural Reappropriation

By reappropriating the base materials of Mormon history, culture, and practice, this anthology attempts to actively expand the bounds of Mormon literature. As such, these stories aggressively push against not only the external abuse of our culture by outsiders, but the internal stasis of the literary assumptions and demands of our insiders. It invites us not to take ourselves too seriously and in the process opens up a whole new array of narrative possibilities.

The effect is that very little is out-of-bounds here—either in terms of subject matter or story structure and delivery—and more than a few familiar things were reimagined into very unfamiliar shapes (though considering their recent overuse, vampires were understandably discouraged). There are Mormons in space, Mormon zombie-killers, and Mormon demon-hunters. Porter Rockwell showed up as mythic/mystic figure in several stories, as did Gadianton robbers and a variety of ghosts. There were human, alien, supernatural, and superhuman antagonists. Polygamy shows up several times, and there is both noir detective fiction and an odd set of pioneer journal entries. There's even a Lovecraft pastiche.

Stories here caught me off guard more than once, and even when I struggled against my own suspension of disbelief to accept a core conceit, I found many of these stories powerful and affecting.

For example, the graphic story “Mormon Golem” by Steve Morrison offers a visually striking and emotionally powerful rendering of Joseph Smith creating a wooden golem to protect the Saints of Far West, Missouri. Though it flies in the face of everything I believe about Joseph Smith, prophetic calling, and priesthood power, the story is at once both utterly alien and deeply Mormon. It got all the details wrong, but it penetrated to an underlying defiance in the Mormon spirit that we will not always sit back and take the abuses heaped upon us by an angry mob. Such an odd juxtaposition is part of what makes the anthology work.

By daring to abuse the peculiarities of our culture as fodder for stories told with charity toward their Mormon characters, this anthology
successfully challenges both Mormons and non-Mormons to engage our experience at the level of theme, not just event. By recasting the familiar into fantastic settings, these stories ask us to imagine both the particulars and the potential consequences of some core beliefs.

The results are uneven at best. Some of these stories do little more than tell traditional tales with simple substitutions—consecrated oil for holy water, or missionaries preaching through the zombie apocalypse. On first approach, those stories frankly bored me; I wanted something new and uniquely Mormon added to the familiar tale. On further consideration, though, I appreciated the powerful desire of some authors to use specific people, places, or details from their explicitly Mormon experience in tales that are not in any way thematically Mormon.

As such, this anthology is neither Missionary School nor Deseret School fiction. It is Mormons cutting loose to tell stories however, for whomever, by whatever method they choose according to the dictates of their own conscience. It is an explicit and intentional effort to wake us up and challenge our static assumptions about Mormon fiction.

**Pearls of Great Price**

The best most of us can hope for in any anthology is to really like a few stories, to really hate a few, and to find the rest variably adequate. While I admit that I liked some of these much less than others, I didn't actually find any stinkers. Everything here was at least competently written and told, even when I just couldn't buy the core conceits or when I wanted to nitpick details.

But a few really stood out for me. Perhaps the most obvious is Eric James Stone’s story, “That Leviathan, Whom Thou Has Made,” which won the Nebula Award for short story in 2011—the sci-fi equivalent of an Academy Award voted on by fellow professional authors. It’s cleanly written and looks unflinchingly at questions of individual faith and commitment and the nature of God.

Another story that stood out for me was Moriah Jovan’s “Allow Me to Introduce Myself” that features some of the best pure storytelling, imagination, detail, and sense of wonder in the anthology. This is one of those stories whose core conceit (a Mormon monastic order) stuck deeply in my craw, but whose execution ranks among the better stories I’ve read in years.

Likewise, Dan Wells’s “The Mountain of the Lord” and Steven L. Peck’s “Let the Mountains Tremble for Adoniha Has Fallen” offered strong looks into Mormon communities facing existential threats from
both inside and outside. Both are longer stories that take the time to build interesting, complex worlds and equally compelling characters who struggle with basic hopes and desires.

Several stories featured strong writing and atmosphere, especially Erik Peterson’s “Bichos” and Scott M. Robert’s “Out of the Deep Have I Howled at Thee.” These are vivid, well-crafted stories that penetrate deep into the minds of their characters and reveal both hidden hopes and fears. I have already mentioned the graphic story “Mormon Golem,” by Steve Morrison.

All of the stories in this anthology met my expectations of quality and imagination, but for me these few were especially enjoyable.

**Good Report and Praise**

From the lurid cover art to the back cover blurbs, *Monsters and Mormons* makes its intentions abundantly clear. These are stories in the pulp tradition that will push some imaginative and aesthetic bounds. If you don’t want to read science fiction, fantasy, horror, detective, alternate history, or ghost stories that take some liberties with orthodox assumptions about Mormon ideas and practices, then there will be little here to entertain you.

But if you want an anthology designed to explicitly expand the bounds of Mormon literature in an act of aggressive cultural reappropriation from both external and internal critics and to assert a deep identity with underlying Mormon culture, there is much to appreciate here. The book represents a dramatic shift in how we can choose to think about Mormon literature. *Monsters and Mormons* accepts our peculiarities as a given and seeks simply to use them to inform a creative work, where Mormon-ness requires no reason for being except as defined within the story.

Scott R. Parkin (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is a writer, editor, publisher, essayist, and critic who has published stories in a wide variety of venues, including *Irreantum, LDS Entertainment, Marion Zimmer Bradley’s Fantasy Magazine, The Leading Edge, Galaxy,* and *BYU Studies* (where he won half the prizes in the magazine’s only fiction contest). He has taught writing at BYU, is a regular contributor to AMI’s *Dawning of a Brighter Day* blog, and recently completed a young adult fantasy novel.
Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.
(From Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s *A Psalm of Life*)

The biography of Henry Burkhardt is an inspiring story tied to a group of Church members caught up in the politics of Germany after World War II. Like a young David asked to face a Goliath of repressive national power that caused a fledgling people to fear the political force around them, Burkhardt led faithful Latter-day Saints for four decades in a manner reminiscent of early pioneers like Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Wilford Woodruff. Like each of these early faithful servants, Burkhardt became a leader at a young age, when as a missionary he was called in 1952 at the age of twenty-two to be a counselor in a mission presidency. His area was what we know as East Germany, which had been carved out in postwar Germany and occupied by Soviet armies. He was still serving as a temple president in that land—officially known as the German Democratic Republic (GDR)—in 1989 when the Berlin Wall fell and the Communist regime disintegrated and in 1990 when Germany unified once again.

Raymond Kuehne frames the history of Henry Burkhardt against the intriguing political background of a Communist nation. He tells the story of how the small Church community survived and eventually flourished under a power that was radically antithetical to people of faith. Burkhardt was a devoted man, relying on faith, prayer, scripture, and spiritual guidance, as well as the instructions he received from Church leaders. Church-state relations in the GDR were directly impacted by the quiet, consistent,
friendly, and cooperative manner in which he worked with political leaders. The relationship between LDS leaders and the government of the GDR eventually led to the building of the only temple ever constructed in a Communist state, an event that was extremely surprising since the Iron Curtain placed huge restrictions on travel, communication, and freedoms that many other members of the Church took for granted. The politics behind these church-state relations receive substantial attention throughout the book and justify the LDS Realpolitik phrase in the title.

This book is the third contribution by Raymond Kuehne unfolding the history of Latter-day Saints in East Germany. This book differs from his other works by focusing on the life of one Church leader. This attention to an individual role model—in this case a humble, serious-minded, and faithful servant of God—acts as an accessible passageway to the broader events and accomplishments of the East German Saints. Kuehne’s other book Mormons as Citizens of a Communist State and his article in Dialogue about the Freiberg Temple are based on his same extensive research. Yet somehow the story of a single Church leader involved in these remarkable events is more compelling than focusing on the temple, as in Kuehne’s previous article, or on the group of four thousand Church members, as highlighted in his previous book. I suppose readers tend to seek out individual heroes within important historical movements in order to be inspired in the face of their own challenges.

Kuehne based this documentary history largely on oral histories and on journal entries from Henry Burkhardt. Between 1989 and 1993, Church archivists gathered forty of these oral histories covering the time soon after the fall of the East German regime. In addition, Kuehne conducted seventy more oral interviews between 2003 and 2009. Helpful notations indicate the year in which the oral history quotations were recorded. Kuehne also used two microfilm collections from the Church History Library, including documents from the State Secretary for Church Affairs for the GDR (1950–90) and Stasi Files, which came from the 760 pages contained in the Stasi collection of reports on Burkhardt.

from the infamous East German secret police. The files were obtained by Henry Burkhardt in 2009 and are included in the Church History Library along with his personal journals. Another referenced document is an unpublished typescript by Burkhardt from 1983 on the building of the Freiberg Temple (“Wie es zum Bau des Freiberger Tempels kam,” translated as “Developments Leading to the Building of the Freiberg Temple”). Kuehne also uses excerpts about Burkhardt from President Thomas S. Monson’s book Faith Rewarded: A Personal Account of Prophetic Promises to the East German Saints.2

A documentary biography is a powerful means of presenting the factual context of a person’s life by carefully chosen excerpts from personal journals, oral interviews, and official documents. The reader should recognize, however, the limitations of this approach to telling a story. It is not comparable to other popular biographies in which the story is conveyed through beautifully constructed prose, with many portions of the narrative aided by the author’s creative and personal observations. Long quotations from scores of oral interviews and from lengthy journal entries of Henry Burkhardt himself result in an uneven literary style.

On the back cover of the book, the publisher promises that the book, in addition to the personal history of Henry Burkhardt, also presents “a case study of church-state relations in the GDR.” The work falls short in this respect because political historians looking for a helpful chronicle about the way the government dealt with religious organizations will not find information on how other religions in East Germany were treated. The LDS Church had such a small number of members, and the specific accomplishments produced through the relationship the government had with this one Church leader were unique, so it is hard to imagine that scholars can learn very much in terms of how this Communist system dealt with the predominant Catholic and Lutheran churches. The title of the original German publication (Henry Burkhardt—Ein Leben für die Kirche Jesu Christi der Heiligen der Letzten Tage in der DDR, which means A Life for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the GDR) does not mention the political theme of the biography and does not emphasize the Communist setting of the events described. The political context is especially interesting to English-speaking readers,

but it is not a primary purpose of the book to serve as a commentary on a Communist government’s relationship to churches in a larger context.

Regarding possible concerns that the documentary style opens up sensitive, personal information about persons associated with Henry Burkhardt, the author seems to have avoided many such issues. For example, the name of one of the Stasi informants who served as a branch president is never disclosed. The author deserves special appreciation for the excellent English translations he personally made of the full German book itself and of the journal and oral history compilations on which the book is based.

Kuehne explains that he was serving a temple mission with his wife in the Freiberg Temple when he first met Henry Burkhardt. A long discussion with former Temple President Burkhardt triggered the author’s long-term interest and extensive research, which led to his two books and article about the developments in East Germany during these Soviet and Communist eras. Latter-day Saints are familiar with stories about President Monson’s special relationship with Church members in this isolated country through the conference talks and the book published about his ministry there as a young Apostle. The blessing he pronounced became well known among the East German Saints, and many carried a copy of the amazing blessing with them because of the promises given in it. President Monson explains, “I stood at the pulpit with tear-filled eyes and a voice choked with emotion and made a promise to the people, ‘If you will remain true and faithful to the commandments of God, every blessing any member of the church enjoys in any other country will be yours’” (64). He repeated a similar set of promises in a dedicatory prayer that he pronounced on the land in 1975.

The political events in the country are interesting when seen from the perspective of LDS Church developments in Europe. The Soviet military occupation began in 1945, and the GDR was established in 1949. At this time, the Church operated in the area as the East German Mission. Burkhardt was a significant leader and official representative for the Church in all connections with the East German government from 1952 to 1990, because the government wanted to have dealings solely with a citizen of its nation.

Because of the knowledge that he was regularly under surveillance from the Stasi, Burkhardt learned to be very circumspect in his statements in both private conversations and public speeches. Once when he was asked if it bothered him to know that informants were
in regular attendance at Church, he explained that it was no worry for
him, and it could result in the conversion of a spy from the outside. He
also welcomed active members of the Church serving as informants
because, he reasoned, they would report events more accurately than
persons outside of the Church who did not understand its doctrines
and organization.

At first, Saints from Germany were able to attend the Swiss Temple
relatively freely. Soon after the temple was dedicated, for instance, newly-
weds Henry and Inge Burkhardt were sealed there. The Saints continued
attending the temple until the Berlin Wall went up in 1961. In response
to this, Burkhardt spoke at a conference in December 1961, emphasizing
that “the work of the Lord cannot suffer as a result of conditions
imposed by man. It will more or less depend on us, and how we carry
out our callings, whether the work of God will continue to go forward
with success in this country” (50).

Burkhardt’s journals indicate what a powerful desire Latter-day
Saints had to have access to the ordinances performed in temples. He
explained that over the initial two decades of isolation following the con-
struction of the Berlin Wall, he regularly carried requests from Church
members to government officials for visas so couples could travel to
the Swiss Temple for their eternal marriage sealings. The requests were
uniformly turned down, except for occasional permissions received for
elderly, retired couples.

Finally, in 1978, government officials suggested to Burkhardt that
the Church build a temple in their country rather than attempt to have
members travel. In March of that year, President Erich Honecker, head
of the East German government, announced a major change in the
GDR’s church policy in a speech titled “The Place of Christians and
Churches in the Socialistic Society.” Honecker explained, “Many oppor-
tunities are opening now and in the future for churches, as churches
within socialism, to work cooperatively toward the deepest of humanis-
tic goals” (83). The temple in Freiberg was announced in 1982, with the
the joy of the Saints who had never expected this event to occur in their
lifetimes: “Personal preparation for a temple visit had been made over
the years. Time and again they had been taught to so live as to be worthy
for a temple visit. They lived to that standard and saw the dedication
of the temple as fulfillment of the highest wishes of their hearts” (99).
Burkhardt, who personally “never believed that a temple could be built
in the GDR” (88), served as the first Freiberg Temple president.
Burkhardt received advice early in these decades from Elder Spencer W. Kimball and then later from Elder Thomas S. Monson. They advised him to work cooperatively with government officials with the goal of making friends with them. Early on, he questioned this approach because the government system seemed to be so opposed to the legitimate desires of the Latter-day Saints he represented. Looking back, he explained, “We always felt like we were standing with one foot in jail. But those years are past, and we did alright, in fact we did very well at the end” (31). Eventually, he gave heed to the directions he received from the Apostles, and he attributed the ultimate successes achieved to the friendly approach they firmly encouraged.

To help explain Burkhardt’s accomplishments in the Church, Kuehne includes a chapter called “His Leadership Style and Character” in which he relates a number of stories and descriptions about Burkhardt to illustrate traits commonly pointed out by those who knew him well. For example, Wolfgang Suess, a missionary in the GDR and later branch president of the Freiburg branch, commented, “Brother Burkhardt was very exact, very correct, very conscientious, and he took wonderful care of us as missionaries” (28). After a visit from Elder Spencer W. Kimball, the Apostle noted, “We were pleased indeed with President Burkhardt who seems to have judgment and wisdom beyond his years. He has such a sweet spirit and a splendid attitude, and I am sure he has done a great service and will be able in the future to do even a greater one” (44). President Monson described Burkhardt as “one of the most faithful Latter-day Saints I have ever met. Truly the Lord has raised him up to help provide for the saints in East Germany” (66). He also said, “It was a privilege to meet with this giant of the Lord who goes forward in directing our affairs behind the Iron Curtain without regard to any consequence to himself or his family” (68). In a 2008 interview, Ruth Schult stated, “He was a model for us, because he worked for the church his whole life. He sacrificed much time and much of his family life, but no one heard him complain, not even his wife. He never wanted to be pushed into the foreground, but preferred to stay in the background” (137).

Referring to himself, Burkhardt remarked in a 2008 oral interview, “If someone now were to say, ‘See all what you accomplished!’ that was not I, for I was only a tool and take no pride in it. Without help from above, I would not have been able to do anything” (123).

The primary beneficiaries of this book are all readers interested in discovering modern-day stories that inspire them to live the gospel in their daily lives even under duress. This book adds a human face to perhaps
one of the most difficult eras that any community of Latter-day Saints has faced in the last half century. Their experiences will inspire future generations in the same way that biblical, religious, and pioneer stories of determination, sacrifice, and faith in the face of hardship have stirred souls the world over.

James H. Backman (who can be contacted via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is the Stephen L Richards Professor of Law at Brigham Young University’s J. Reuben Clark Law School, where he has been teaching since May 1974. During a leave of absence in 1982–84, Backman served as European Area legal counsel in Frankfurt, Germany. He had the opportunity of traveling several times to meet with the Church architect and the building planners in Dresden, Germany, in the years leading up to the construction of the Freiberg Germany Temple. He attended the groundbreaking there in 1984. He had the opportunity to meet Henry Burkhardt several times during that time period.
I stayed in La‘ie last winter, a stone’s throw from the temple, which is within easy walking distance of Brigham Young University–Hawaii, which is next door to the Polynesian Cultural Center—all the major landmarks of the town within an easy ten-minute circuit. It is surprising to see how compact a place has earned so expansive a reputation. This book surprised me in the same way. There’s a lot going on in this history of the little town—Gathering to La‘ie traces how the sleepy village wrought dramatic influence on Hawaii, managed the miracle of melding diverse factions into a united community, exerted far-flung impact on the history of the Church.

President Hinckley, as an Apostle in 1981, underlined what visionary after visionary has affirmed about the significance of the locale when he stressed its disproportionate importance in the Lord’s work: “I never come to La‘ie that I don’t have a feeling that this place occupies some peculiar position in the plan of the Lord” (1). The feeling of condensed momentousness, of implicit significance, is as palpable in this brief history as it is on the quiet streets of La‘ie.

Riley Moffat serves as senior librarian at BYU–Hawaii. Fred Woods is Brigham Young University Professor of Church History, resident expert on gathering. Jeff Walker is currently a series manager of the Joseph Smith Papers Project, trustee and treasurer of Mormon Historic Sites Foundation, and managing editor of its journal, Mormon Historic Studies. They’re a competent team for documenting the historical impact of La‘ie, not least because they’ve accumulated among them considerable onsite familiarity with the subject.

In addition to those personal and professional qualifications for chronicling gatherings to La‘ie, the authors position themselves strategically to compile an accurate and thorough history by taking full
advantage of the archives and expertise of the Jonathan Napela Center for Hawaiian and Pacific Island Studies. Moffat and Woods and Walker manage a further advantage in their writing: they don’t allow their vested parochial interests to get in the way of their objectivity. This local history is more than a cheerleading session; it recounts with engaging frankness the town’s foibles and faux pas, its failures as well as its triumphs.

The book’s strength is also its weakness: diversity. It’s better at gathering than sorting—probably tries to do too many things at once. That’s a persistent temptation among Hawaii’s many appeals. My class of two dozen students at BYU–Hawaii was a rainbow of nine different nationalities, not counting ethnic variations of that remarkably variegated group we lump under the term Hawaiian—the La‘ie university deserves its reputation as “the most culturally diverse campus in the United States” (185). The hydra-headedness of diversity makes it hard to control. But its kaleidoscopic inclusiveness gives it both balance and range. Multiple authorship can be a liability—“a camel is a horse built by a committee.” Yet there are ways the triple perspective works well with the complexities of this project. Gathering to La‘ie mostly manages to weave disparate historical filaments into a coherent mural. A rainbow of visual vignettes contributes to that e pluribus unum amalgam of diversity—the volume is energized and enlivened, sometimes almost incarnated, by nearly three hundred photographs.

So the book is something of a catchall, but not catch-as-catch-can. The theme of gathering helps make its episodic anecdotes cohere. That motif—the town’s pivotal position as a long-term destination for cultural and spiritual commingling—braids the divergent strands of the La‘ie narrative, stringing disparate events into a linked lei. Recurrent gatherings are absorbed into a shared story in the same way the town itself has brought divergent groups and idiosyncratic individuals into communal closeness. Chronological portraits of La‘ie—from its early origins through its gathering phases to the visionary culmination of the temple and the university and the cultural center—simmer in a narrative stew that blends all sorts of La‘ie experience. That throw-everything-into-the-cauldron recipe makes for some interesting historical flavors, perhaps the most satisfying the sense of how much the past informs the present.

If you want to know more about La‘ie, this is the book for you. If you don’t care to know more, this could well make you care. If you think, as I thought, you know La‘ie well enough, these anecdotal annals will
persuade you otherwise. *Gathering to La‘ie* stimulates an appetite for the local history by setting out flavor after fresh flavor in its documentary smorgasbord:

- The roots of La‘ie as a place of peace can be traced to early origins as a “City of Refuge,” a haven protecting fugitives from such horrific threats as the death taboo (*kapu*) for allowing the shadow of the king to pass over you (2).
- Charles Murray Gibson, en route to his mission in Japan, stopped off in the La‘ie vicinity to scam newly democratic Saints into “a glorious little kingdom” (22).
- Missionaries Francis Hammond and William Cluff, in separate dream visitations, were informed by Brigham Young that La‘ie was “the chosen spot” (23) for Sandwich Islands gathering.
- La‘ie Saints were disfellowshipped en masse when they rebelled against directives to stop drinking *awa*—and, even more upsetting to them, to root up that lucrative cash crop altogether (35).
- A severely depressed King Kamehameha IV called for a blessing from Mormon elders. By the end of their ensuing seven-hour conversation, the king, joking with the elders, had evidently regained his will to live (53).
- Queen Kapiolani sent a request to the mission home to send an elder to baptize her. Unfortunately no elder showed up (57).
- Queen Liliuokalani, the last Hawaiian regent, was baptized in 1907. Her personal copy of the Book of Mormon can still be seen on her nightstand at the Iolani Palace (63), the building that features as police headquarters on *Hawaii Five-O*.
- George Q. Cannon was fêted to “hula-hula” dancing during a local conference (43).
- Joseph F. Smith was charmed by the La‘ie custom of untangling a handkerchief at the pulpit to wave out the contents of the “love-container, that the love may be dispensed to the congregation” (45).
- The Polynesian Cultural Center, most-visited paid tourist attraction in the Hawaiian Islands, mushroomed out of a neighborhood building-fund hukilau on the beach (142).

If that sort of thing intrigues you, this book will. *Gathering to La‘ie* isn’t the best evocation of place to come out of Hawaii. It doesn’t have the epic scope and grandeur of James Michener’s *Hawaii*. It lacks the
witty insight into Hawaiian psychology of Sara Vowell’s *Strange Fishes*. It can’t match the portrayals of lush beauty of Hawaiian landscape captured by any of the dozens of Hollywood films made in Oahu. It can’t boast the absorbing story line of Michael Crichton’s *Micro* or even of *Hawaii Five-O*. *Gathering to La’ie*, is, after all, a town history.

That’s not my favorite genre. I’ve worked on a few town histories and read more than I’d like. But this is by quite a bit the best local history I’ve seen. It is town history on steroids. It’s not just that the little town matters well beyond the borders of La’ie. It’s not just a matter of the book’s accuracy and thoroughness and objectivity. It’s not just that the theme of gathering moves it into the mainstream of Mormon history. *Gathering to La’ie* manages what town histories almost never manage: it’s not *Hawaii*, but it’s a good read.

For me the best thing about that good read, even better than the book’s lively skits of historic moments in La’ie, is the underlying narrative of the advent of a kinder, gentler God. Stern New England missionaries replace the violent native religion with their Calvinistic Bibles. That stiff-necked Congregationalist harshness provides in its turn fertile soil for the Book of Mormon and the blossoming of early Latter-day Saint missionaries like Joseph F. Smith and Samuel Woolley and such stalwart native converts as Jonathan Napela, people whose travails and tenacity nurtured La’ie into a garden spot for the faith. There are moments when observing La’ie bloom into its religious and cultural maturity through the viewfinder of this volume is as phenomenal as watching the time-lapse unfolding of a hibiscus.

If the struggle of this vibrant community from the “dry, dusty landscape of the City of Joseph” (30) to its present cultivation is a miracle, the maintaining of its native Hawaiian warmth through those growing pains is more of one. The book traces the influence of the Church on the growth of La’ie in all kinds of intriguing ways, from the warmly communal to the sublimely visionary to the amusing, even the inadvertently amusing, as with this testimony of the gospel of fertility: “The effects of the true gospel are manifest, for we can show, by statistics, a greater increase by births, according to the population, than in any other district” (31).

*Gathering to La’ie* says “aloha” to readers. It’s an open invitation to the historical and cultural and spiritual texture of a charming place. The book enthusiastically invites readers to participate in the La’ie experience. If you can get to La’ie by plane or boat or walking on the water,
you’ll want to gather there. If you can’t, the next best thing to being there may be this colorful compilation of the developing spirit of the little town on the north shore of Oahu that makes big waves.

Steven C. Walker (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is Professor of English at Brigham Young University. He received his PhD from Harvard University and specializes in modern British literature and the Bible as literature. He is the author of twelve books, including *Seven Ways of Looking at Susanna* (Provo, Utah: Center for the Study of Christian Values in Literature, 1984), *The Power of Tolkien’s Prose* (New York: Palgrave, 2009), and the forthcoming “Man Thinks, God Laughs”: *The Illuminating Humor of the Bible* (Cascade).
Herman Melville begins *Moby Dick* by noting the way humans seem almost magnetically attracted to water. “There is magic in it,” he writes. “Take almost any path you please, and ten to one it carries you down in a dale, and leaves you there by a pool in the stream.” George Handley would, no doubt, agree with this observation. His *Home Waters: A Year of Recompenses on the Provo River* is a gentle, slow, and deeply thoughtful book built on this special human relationship with water. Handley uses the Provo River as the locus for a series of contemplations on what it means to be a friend, father, husband, son, brother, grandson, and great-great-grandson in a particular landscape, as well as within a particular religion and community. But in the process of exploring this very specific river from its headwaters to its arrival at Utah Lake, Handley meanders through some unexpected tributaries. In the prologue to the book, Handley writes that “whenever I sat down to write about the watershed, I found myself increasingly unable to separate place from story, outdoor recreation from ecological and spiritual restoration, the present from the past, and, even against my will, the historical from the personal” (xv). The way those side channels become tangled is both the beauty and the strength of this book.

Many of us who have lived in a home with young children have shared a common experience. It usually begins as we walk into the kitchen to discover a child idly running water out of the tap for the simple joy of letting it pour through his or her fingers. The typical adult response to this scene is a mildly annoyed, “Quit wasting water.” But that command is usually met with a familiar question: “Where does water come from?” Or perhaps, “Why is water so important?” Handley’s book is a sustained and thorough answer to those innocent questions. And like most good answers, it brings up more questions. Some of the most touching of these
questions have to do with Handley’s relationship with his older brother, who committed suicide when Handley was a teenager. Handley’s exploration of the way this event changed his life, and continues to change it, is both tender and painfully honest. Handley predictably connects the untimely death of his brother to his relationships with his own family, but he also traces the way this death deepened his religious beliefs and informs his approach to the environment. Those turns are both unexpected and moving.

This book begins with a reverie on fly-fishing, and that is fitting. Norman Maclean established a precedent for using fly-fishing as a vehicle for discussing family relationships and untimely death, but Handley is, in some ways, after bigger fish. “Home waters” is a term used by those who fish, particularly those who fly-fish, to refer to those creeks and rivers that are known intimately. In home waters, a fisher knows every overhanging tree and bush, every turn of the stream, and every unseen boulder. But the idea of home waters paradoxically reminds us that however well we know a particular stretch of water, it will always retain the ability to surprise us. One of the things I cherish most about fly-fishing is the constant reminder it offers that I know far too little about the rivers I fish, or the fish I try to catch.

This is a sentiment with which Handley would agree. “Scarce beauty,” he writes, “is a gift, not a right. It merits love, not lamentation; love enough to make recreation a re-creation, a way of becoming unfamiliar again with the world, of working to blur the horizon line between heaven and earth” (189). Handley explores what it means to come home, if you will tolerate the reference to a John Denver song, to a place you’ve never been before. As someone raised primarily in the eastern United States, Handley’s move to Utah as an adult was a trip into the unknown. At the same time, his family roots, going back generations to some of the first Mormon pioneers, make him, simultaneously, deeply native. In his words, Utah is “native land but foreign, too” (201). “The upshot,” he writes, “is that I can’t walk a mile, buy milk at the local store, or sit at an elementary school play without seeing people I love, people I have known for decades, people I would trust with my children, enough to fill a room. It is a beautiful thing, really. But it isn’t hard to understand why, if the community isn’t careful, others might sense a conspiracy to lock them out” (44).

Handley’s treatment of fly-fishing is also fitting in terms of his approach to ecology. Anyone who has spent much time fly-fishing in creeks and rivers knows that it is an inherently conservative sport. You
can't force fish to bite, and the fish in small creeks are notoriously skittish, frightened by the smallest movement or the least shadow. That's why I spend at least some part of any fly-fishing trip to a small stream literally on my hands and knees. Handley would not miss the religious symbolism of that. Central to this book is Handley's well-reasoned and firm stance as a Mormon and Christian ecologist. In that context he makes a convincing argument that “ecological restoration is neither technophilia nor antihuman escapism. It is repentance plain and simple” (xiii). Near the beginning of the book he states bluntly that his “hope is to tap the potential of Mormonism to inspire better stewardship in the interest of all communities in the West” (xiv).

Since I moved to Utah County fifteen years ago, I've seen orchards, farmlands, and wild space steadily replaced by condos, shopping centers, and high-end homes. Apparently Handley has seen the same thing. He laments that as Mormons in Utah, “in the mad rush to display all the material signs of having arrived, to show that we can run with the big dogs, we can run roughshod over our advantages” (42). Like a prophet in the literal wilderness, he warns, “It is delusional, really, to place all hope in some act of God to wipe our human stains clean as long as we are unwilling to repent. While beauty and bounty are our most ancient desires, sometimes the recompenses of our own pollution are what we deserve” (89).

But Handley is no ecological prophet of doom. Writing as a deeply devout and religious environmentalist, he counters the ideals of radical environmentalism—the kind that (many assume) would gladly see humans wiped off the face of the planet—by comparing them to radical millennialism. He writes, “The more extreme and sometimes more vocal folks—doomsday environmentalists and militant millennialists—seem to be offering the same package of despair” (122). Handley counters this despair with the plea for a religious and humane approach to the environment. “We don't need less humanity,” he argues; “we need it more than ever” (133). To exemplify this believing environmentalism, Handley uses distinctly Mormon doctrines about the ultimate destiny of the Earth to tightly connect conservation and religion. The LDS way of seeing the world, he argues, represents “a philosophy of hope, hope that mundane, physical life, when properly cared for, might become the stuff of eternity” (121).

I thoroughly enjoyed this book, but like most reminiscences, Home Waters occasionally suffers from a little too much “navel-gazing.” And like a lot of first books, sometimes it bites off more than it can chew. But
these relatively minor problems are a small price to pay for a book that consistently offers refreshing insights and new ways of thinking about the world. Handley does not write the boisterous and strident prose of Edward Abbey, but he is always readable and reasonable. Readers who cherish the works of Wallace Stegner, Terry Tempest Williams, or Wendell Berry will definitely enjoy *Home Waters* and are likely to find a new author to watch. And readers who want to know what a Mormon environmentalist looks like need look no further.

Dennis Cutchins (who can be reached via email at byustudies@byu.edu) is Associate Professor of English at Brigham Young University. He received his PhD in American literature from Florida State University, and his publications include *Wild Games: Hunting and Fishing Traditions in North America*, which he edited with Eric Eliason (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 2009).

Karl Ricks Anderson has lived in Kirtland, Ohio, for more than forty years, and his studies and time there have made him one of the leading authorities on the Kirtland period of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In 1994, Elder Neal A. Maxwell of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles asked Anderson to write about the Christology of Kirtland. The Savior in Kirtland is the final product of Anderson's eighteen-year project.

As the title suggests, The Savior in Kirtland focuses on manifestations of Jesus Christ during the Kirtland period. The book begins with an explanation of how Christ prepared “the Ohio,” including how he spiritually prepared Sidney Rigdon, and then describes the extraordinary events after the Saints gathered there. The area of Kirtland was a place of intense adversity; however, it was also a place of intense spirituality, as Joseph Smith and others received countless Christocentric revelations during the construction of the Kirtland Temple. All of these preparatory events culminated in the “mother lode of Christology” on April 3, 1836, when Jesus and the prophets Moses, Elias, and Elijah appeared and bestowed essential priesthood keys. In addition to the Kirtland period of Joseph Smith’s day, Anderson relates his own personal experiences in an appendix describing the ways the Lord directed his work in restoring Kirtland in the twentieth century.

The book is extensively researched and would appeal to anyone interested in anecdotes from Church history. The research will be helpful to scholars, but the information is presented in such a way that it seems to be directed to lay students of the gospel. The work collects accounts from numerous figures in Church history and weaves their stories together into an informative narrative. Quotations and incidents are gathered from the usual sources, such as the Doctrine and Covenants and History of the Church, but they are also gathered from countless other sources and collections, including personal journals from early Church members who lived in Kirtland. The wide range of sources brings to light many testimonies and accounts that are not often heard in the Latter-day Saint community. Additionally, each chapter begins with original illustrations by Carma de Jong Anderson and Tyson Snow. Overall, The Savior in Kirtland provides an extensive body of Kirtland scholarship that brings refreshing insights into Church history.

—R. Mark Melville


In the foreword to the poetry anthology Fire in the Pasture, poet and BYU English professor Susan Elizabeth Howe explains that a poet’s desire is “to make readers see what they did not see before, to offer insight, to create empathy, to provoke thought, or to express beauty, soundness, depth” (xvii). Editor Tyler Chadwick, a poet and doctoral candidate in English at Idaho State University, has gathered into one substantial volume the work of eighty-two contemporary Mormon poets, and the majority succeed in conjuring the emotional, spiritual, and aesthetic rewards Howe describes.

This anthology is the first major collection of poetry by LDS writers since Eugene England and Dennis Clark’s Harvest: Contemporary Mormon Poems, published by Signature Books in 1989. In the over two decades since Harvest’s publication, a cadre of talented Mormon poets have published a growing
body of excellent work. Poets Lance Larson, Neil Aitken, and Timothy Liu are among many poets in the anthology who have garnered substantial attention in the wider literary world. *Fire in the Pasture* also includes the work of many up-and-coming new poets, as well as writers who are best known in Mormon literary circles.

Although the readership of poetry anthologies is not large, it is encouraging that *Fire in the Pasture* collects and preserves many of Mormonism’s most potent poetic voices from the early twenty-first century, making them available for generations to come. This volume would also be a quality addition to any literature class, Mormon or otherwise, especially at LDS schools. Although not all the poems in the anthology have overtly Mormon elements, many address ideas and issues at the core of our theology and culture. For those who erroneously believe that LDS poetry is primarily comprised of sentimental rhymed verses or charming couplets, this anthology is proof that the complexity and beauty of Mormon life can, and should, be rendered in powerful, sophisticated poetic expression.

—Angela Hallstrom


*Bountiful Harvest* is a collection of essays written and assembled in honor of S. Kent Brown, recently retired professor of ancient scripture and Near Eastern studies at Brigham Young University. An impressive array of colleagues, former students, teachers, admirers, and friends of Professor Brown have contributed to this handsome volume, resulting in twenty-one essays that are a worthy tribute to Brown’s legacy. The volume includes an introduction by the editors in well-deserved praise of Brown’s career and significant achievements, and also an appendix listing his many published works.

As the list of his writings attests, S. Kent Brown is recognized for the breadth of his interests and the diversity of his expertise, and as the editors put it, these essays “are something of a capsuleized summary of his career and interests” (xi). The topics covered include canonical and extracanonical texts; studies on Old and New Testament subjects; Mormon studies; Egyptian, Jewish, Islamic, early Christian, and Coptic studies; theological treatises; the Book of Mormon and Pearl of Great Price; the Dead Sea Scrolls; linguistic analyses; and archaeological findings.

The diversity of topics covered, combined with the high quality of academic scrutiny displayed, exemplifies an important aspect of LDS scholarship that should be cherished and preserved. As the academy continues to follow the trend of increasing specialization and compartmentalization, LDS scholars do well to follow Brown’s lead and engage in the type of intertextual and interdisciplinary studies that have proved to be of great value to the Latter-day Saint community.

*Bountiful Harvest* presents something of interest for almost all readers. Although most essays are written for an LDS audience, many will be of interest to a broader body of readers as well, including scholars in the various disciplines covered and also interested laypersons. The volume includes, for example, an article by Jacob Neusner, a renowned scholar of Jewish studies who is not LDS but whose work will be of interest to the Mormon community. Many will profit from the knowledge shared in this book, just as many have benefitted from the scholarship of the man whom it honors.

—David J. Larsen
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