



2012-12-17

Closing the Church University in 1894: Embracing or Accommodating Secularized Education

Brian William Ricks

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Ricks, Brian William, "Closing the Church University in 1894: Embracing or Accommodating Secularized Education" (2012). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 3894.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/3894>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Closing the Church University in 1894: Embracing or
Accommodating Secularized Education

Brian W. Ricks

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

A. LeGrand Richards, Chair
Scott E. Ferrin
E. Vance Randall
Clifford T. Mayes
Scott C. Esplin

Department of Education Leadership and Foundations
Brigham Young University
December 2012

Copyright © 2012 Brian W. Ricks

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Closing the Church University in 1894: Embracing or Accommodating Secularized Education

Brian W. Ricks

Department of Education Leadership and Foundations, BYU
Doctor of Philosophy

The late 1800s have been noted as a major transitional period for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. When the beleaguered pioneers first arrived in Utah they were isolated from the influence and expectations of the United States. During that time, leaders of the Church became influential in every aspect of life in Utah. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the period of isolation had come to an end. Nationally, the social norms had changed and religion was expected to stay in the churches and out of politics. Church leaders were faced with serious questions regarding what policies and practices could be altered without betraying doctrines and principles of the gospel. Education was at the forefront of this tension in Utah. Members of the Church tried to hold on to an integrated approach to education that incorporated both the spiritual and the secular. Others, however, adamantly opposed such an approach in public schools.

In 1892, the First Presidency announced a new educational institution that would become the administrative head of all Church schools: The University of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Willard Young became the President and James Talmage was placed over the science department. Talmage traveled to Europe to purchase the best scientific equipment. With the scientific apparatus and a new building the leaders of the Church hoped to persuade the youth of the Church to obtain higher education at home rather than traveling east to attend secularized universities.

The Church's first private university seemed destined to become a major influence in Utah education. However, after one successful semester, President Woodruff closed the school and donated over sixty thousand dollars to the University of Utah. The following research explores the history of the Church University and the circumstances surrounding its closure. The paper shows how a combination of the financial panic of 1893, the effort to obtain statehood, and a rare opportunity to quietly gain influence at the University of Utah factored into the decision to close the Church's first private university.

Keywords: Church University, Young University, Wilford Woodruff, Willard Young, James E. Talmage, Karl G. Maeser, Benjamin Cluff, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Private Education in Utah, Higher Education in Utah, Financial Panic of 1893, The Enabling Act, Separation of Church and State

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is an inherent risk when expressing gratitude at the end of any project of this nature. Every academic work is the result of countless people coming together to produce the final product. It is inevitable that someone will be left out while expressing appreciation. In this short space I wish to express gratitude to a few of those individuals that helped me throughout the overall research that went into this project, but at the same time I want to recognize that the overall project was aided by many more than those few individuals mentioned herein.

First, I need to acknowledge the valuable assistance from my chair, Professor A. LeGrand Richards. Our experience over the last two years has been helpful in both practical and symbolic ways. It is impossible to describe how his work and expertise on the life of Karl G. Maeser has helped me in my studies on the Church University and education in the late 1890s. In addition, as I have studied and written on the life of James E. Talmage, it has seemed almost like divine intervention to have an expert on the life of Karl Maeser mentor me just as Maeser mentored Talmage over one hundred years ago. I also express gratitude to my committee members: Vance Randall, Scott Ferrin, Clifford Mayes, and Scott Esplin. Their combined abilities and varied expertise helped me consider my research from different perspectives. I appreciate their encouragement and feedback throughout the process. This experience was a great example of how different perspectives and backgrounds can produce a better product.

All historical efforts build on the efforts of previous historians. There are numerous researchers and authors that have allowed this work to take shape. It would be inappropriate not to recognize their influence on my own research. Some of those

researchers include Ralph Chamberlin, Lynn Bennion, and John Moffitt who produced very important works in the area of Utah education generally and specifically. Another author that had a significant influence on my paper was Michael Quinn. Quinn is the only researcher to this point that has done any focused work on the Church University. I also wish to express my gratitude to the staff at the Church History Library, the L. Tom Perry Special Collections at BYU, and the Special Collections at the J. Willard Marriott Library at the University of Utah. Their vast knowledge of the collections related to this time period was a great help.

Most importantly, I need to express gratitude to my family. Taking on this project has required sacrifice, and no one has sacrificed more than my wife, Jessica. She has taken care of our five children mostly on her own while I have spent time researching, studying, and writing. She has been a widow to the Church University and has done it with a smile and encouraging words. My children have also endured the process. They have each offered countless prayers that "Dad will finish his dissertation quickly." We are all grateful that those prayers have finally been answered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE AND CONTENT.....	vi
Introduction	1
<i>Change in Policy and Practice</i>	1
<i>Factors behind the change</i>	3
<i>Statement of the problem</i>	5
Background.....	6
<i>Early Latter-day Saint educational efforts</i>	6
<i>A private academy system</i>	11
<i>The beginning of a new university</i>	15
<i>The proposed compromise</i>	19
Discussion	24
<i>Financial challenges combine</i>	24
<i>The push for statehood</i>	26
<i>Potential influence at the University of Utah</i>	28
Conclusion	32
Appendix A: Literature Review.....	40
Appendix B: Methodology	144
Appendix C: Why Start the Church University	159
Appendix D: The Church’s Financial Pinch.....	175
Appendix E: Effect of Closing the Church University	186
REFERENCES.....	199

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This work varies from the typical model of dissertations. The hybrid dissertation focuses on producing a journal-ready article to be submitted upon completion. This particular hybrid dissertation is a historical piece that deals with the Church University, a private institution operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the 1893-1894. As a historical work, the article itself follows the Chicago style of formatting in order to be in accordance with the requirements of the journal to which it will be submitted. The remainder of the research is formatted according to APA guidelines and based on the requirements of the College of Education at Brigham Young University.

The structure of the dissertation is unique. First, the reader will find the main article formatted as it will be submitted upon approval and completion. Then I provide a brief review of literature and historical overview of Latter-day Saint education in Utah. Next is a description of the historical methodology that was utilized in this project. Finally, the ensuing appendices provide necessary background that could not be included with the article itself.

Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have always had a unique view of education. The Church's theology holds that all truth comes from God and that one cannot separate truth from its author. Early leaders of the Church taught that there should not be any distinction between the secular and the spiritual with regards to education. There have been great histories written on the significant events related to Utah education, but none have adequately dealt with the Church University. The purpose of this paper and the following research is to clearly identify this particular school among so many others at the time and help the reader identify and distinguish the significance of the Church's decision to close it in 1894. Histories on the public

education in general, the University of Utah, and the Church academies will all be used to see the Church University more clearly over one hundred years after it was closed.

As stated above, the article itself followed Chicago formatting style, therefore the references for the article will be in the form of endnotes. The “dissertation references” at the end of the project, however, will represent any sources cited in the overall project including the literature review, methods section, and subject appendices.

The reader will recognize that the appendices do share some common ideas. This is the result of the intermingled nature of this topic. It was impossible to leave out certain ideas and still maintain a necessary flow to the appendix.

Closing the Church University: Embracing or Accommodating Secularized Education

Introduction

In 1894, the First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints announced that the Church's private university in Salt Lake City would close. As part of the announcement, the First Presidency encouraged members of the Church to shift their support to the state operated University of Utah. This was a major shift in policy and practice for the Church. Until this point, the Church had struggled to establish and maintain educational alternatives to public schools that removed the religious from the academic. Major changes in policy, such as this decision to move support to a state school, often leave questions regarding the motivation or purpose behind the new direction. It was a drastically different course for the Church.

Change in policy and practice. In 1888, President Wilford Woodruff issued a plea to Latter-day Saints for every stake in the Church to establish academies modeled after the Brigham Young Academy in Provo where students could be instructed from the pages of the Bible, Book of Mormon and other sacred texts. The schools were to be free from the influence of government officials who favored a secular curriculum. President Woodruff declared,

We feel that the time has arrived when the proper education of our children should be taken in hand by us as a people. Religious training is practically excluded from the District Schools. The perusal of books that we value as divine records is forbidden. Our children, if left to the training they receive in these schools, will grow up entirely ignorant of those principles of salvation for which the Latter-day Saints have made so many sacrifices. To permit this condition of things to exist among us would be criminal.¹

President Woodruff was not the first leader of the Church to attempt a system of education that incorporated both the spiritual and the temporal. Brigham Young and John Taylor both followed the precedent set by Joseph Smith of incorporating religious

doctrines into the secular setting. When the Latter-day Saints arrived in Salt Lake City, Brigham Young intended to place a great university at the head of the school system in Utah that would serve as the administrative authority for all other schools. It would become the “parent school” of the system. The original plan had the University of Deseret as that great administrative head, but because of its ties to the legislature, that plan had to be deserted as the nation moved towards more strict boundaries between church and state.

During the April 1892 General Conference the First Presidency presented the idea of a private university unfettered by the restrictive politicians. The school would be established in Salt Lake City as soon as possible. The members of the Church unanimously sustained the proposal and the work feverishly began to establish the Church University. It would be the Church’s first attempt at a private university.² The purpose of the Church University was to offer “instruction of the highest grade possible ... to both sexes in science, literature, art, mechanical pursuits, and in the principles of the Gospel as taught by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints... [and] make of its students and graduates worthy citizens and true followers of Jesus Christ.”³

The school’s first term was the fall of 1893. The term was relatively successful considering the economic circumstances and especially in comparison to the same academic term at the University of Utah. In January 1894, however, the First Presidency decided to close the Church University. The *Deseret News* carried the First Presidency’s official announcement regarding the closure on August 25, 1894. In the announcement, the First Presidency encouraged members of the Church to support the state university, saying, “We recommend to the Latter-day Saints that they faithfully devote their influence and energy, such as might have been claimed by the university of the Church, ... to the University of Utah.”⁴ The First Presidency then assured members of the

Church “that the moral influence of the University will prove of salutary effect, and that all due attention will be paid to training of students in the duties of true moral citizenship as well as in the study of purely *secular* instruction.”⁵ This final assurance is significant because it betrays the very concerns that all members of the Church, including the First Presidency, would have had regarding this state-operated school.

Factors behind the change. For years, leaders of the Church insisted that the spiritual could not be taken from the curriculum. In 1888, President Woodruff argued that it would be criminal to expose children to a purely secular education. Yet, by 1894, he encouraged parents to support an institution of higher education that offered “purely secular instruction.” In just six years, the attitude of President Woodruff seemed to change dramatically and yet this major shift has gone relatively unnoticed in spite of potentially significant implications regarding the educational policies and practices of the Church.⁶ Important questions arise with regards to President Woodruff’s shift. What led to such a significant change in policy? Did the change in educational policy represent a change in the Church’s doctrine on the nature of knowledge? If the shift was not doctrinal, what other influences explain the dramatic change in educational policy and practice during the late nineteenth century? In order to adequately address these questions, several contextual factors need to be considered.

The first factor was the national financial panic in 1893 that had a dramatic impact on the decision to close the Church University. Because the financial circumstances were so bleak, the Utah Territorial Legislature was considering a proposal that would move the University of Utah from Salt Lake to Logan and consolidate it with the federally-funded Agricultural College (now Utah State University). Under those circumstances, the Church University would have been the only university in Salt Lake. The anti-polygamy legislation of the previous decade had

disfranchised the Church and the Perpetual Emigrating Fund and the federal government had escheated money and buildings from the Church, which magnified the desperate national situation even more in Salt Lake. Financial reasoning, however, cannot answer all of the questions regarding the decision to close the school.

The second factor that influenced the decision to close the university was the drive for statehood. For decades, the Church had made numerous attempts to gain the relative autonomy of statehood. At the end of 1893 the Utah Territory was closer than it had ever been to gaining statehood. The U.S. House of Representatives had passed the Enabling Act, granting statehood to Utah, in December 1893. The Senate, however, would not vote on the bill until the summer of 1894. One of the significant issues standing between the territory and statehood had historically been the opposition to public education. Had the University of Utah been closed and the Church's own school succeeded, many in Washington D.C. may have been led to believe that the Church was still fighting a quiet battle against tax-funded education. Even this explanation, however, does not address every concern about the decision to change direction so abruptly.

Finally, the third factor that influenced President Woodruff to abandon the Church University and support the University of Utah was a rare opportunity for the Church to get a significant amount of influence within the state school. James E. Talmage was offered the post of President of the University of Utah, if the Church would close its own university. His role as President would allow him the ability to limit the damage of secular education at the University of Utah. In addition to being President, James Talmage became a member of the faculty because of a major endowment made by the Church to the University of Utah. Perhaps President

Woodruff considered Talmage's presence and authoritative role as sufficient insulation against the possible damage by the school's secularized curriculum.

Statement of the problem. The Church University provides an excellent case study for the Church's educational approach and transformations of that approach during the 1890s. It is important to know why the Church closed its University in an environment when it was set to gain a monopoly on higher education in Salt Lake City and how these several contextual issues factored into President Woodruff's decision. This case study evokes important questions regarding the Church's educational policies and practices during this major transitional period. Those questions include: What did it mean to the Church's educational policies and practices when the First Presidency abandoned its private university and, rather than directing needed funds to its own school system, provided financial support to the state-funded University of Utah? Did the change indicate a shift in the Church's basic epistemological stance on education or was it based on other factors that would explain this decision and its subsequent developments in Church education?

The Latter-day Saint doctrinal stance with regards to education framed the efforts to establish schools as they settled the Utah Territory. Church members had been taught that all knowledge came from God. They were not to compartmentalize the religious truths from the other academic subjects. For Latter-day Saints, it was not possible to separate the religious and the secular.⁷ Because of this stance, the First Presidency's decision to close its school and support the University of Utah becomes even more interesting. There is an apparent contradiction. Supporting an institution that would teach in practice that secular knowledge should be separated from religious knowledge seemed to defy a fundamental doctrine held by Latter-day Saints.⁸ In the very least, the decision to close the Church University represents a major deviation

from previous educational practices and induces the aforementioned questions. It is Latter-day Saint belief that doctrines by their nature must remain constant.⁹ The following pages address the question: If this change in policy and practice was not the result of a change in doctrine, then what other factors motivated the First Presidency's decision to so drastically change direction?

Background

Early Latter-day Saint educational efforts. When Brigham Young and Latter-day Saints arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, education was already a fixture in their theology.¹⁰ Therefore, one of the first things they did was lay the foundation for a system of schools headed by an institution of higher learning: The University of Deseret. The Salt Lake City charter authorized the City Council to organize the University of Deseret. As the governor of the territory, Brigham Young headed the initiative and modeled it after the Latter-day Saint University in Nauvoo, and the people largely supported his efforts.¹¹ The territorial legislature ratified the efforts and the early Utah school system was originated.

The administrative model. The Latter-day Saints established an educational model in Nauvoo with a clear organizational structure. The hierarchal order of schools in that structure placed the University of Nauvoo at the administrative head of the system. The leaders of the Church attempted to establish an educational system in Utah based on that model's organizational structure. The University of the City of Nauvoo, like the University of Deseret, originated as a part of the Nauvoo charter. Illinois Governor Thomas Carlin signed the charter on December 16, 1840. This particular charter has become famous for the amount of power it granted to the City Council.¹² "According to [the city] council minutes, the university was to be a self-governing entity that would provide educational opportunities for adults and children."¹³ Its Board of Regents

administered the lower levels of education and acted as overseers for all education within the city. The University of Nauvoo was the “parent” to schools of lower levels and all others were to become feeders to it. It also important to note that the University of Nauvoo was never intended to be solely for Latter-day Saints. It was open to those of all faiths and as such, it was not designed to be a private institution. It was funded by the legislature, which was a rather common practice in the country at the time. This was Brigham Young’s vision of what the University of Deseret would become in Utah.

Latter-day Saint philosophy on education. The administrative structure was not the only part of education that influenced the Latter-day Saints schools in Utah. According to Latter-day Saint scripture and leaders the ideal educational experience did not distinguish between the secular and the religious. President Young, for example, taught “every art and science known and studied by the children of men is comprised within the Gospel.”¹⁴ Religious truths are therefore found in geology, chemistry, mechanics, and every other subject because God is the author and disseminator of all truth. Latter-day Saints did not distinguish between spiritual knowledge and secular knowledge. Because all truth originates with God, it should be taught in that context with God as the author and the final say on what is or is not considered truth.

In a Latter-day Saint educational setting, lessons in math or any other topic should include spiritual truths in order for the educational experience to be complete. Brigham Young insisted that LDS doctrine become the foundation of all teaching in the church schools. When he gave Karl G. Maeser the reins of the Brigham Young Academy (BYA), he said, “Brother Maeser, I want you to remember that you ought not to teach even the alphabet or the multiplication tables without the Spirit of God. That is all. God bless you. Good-bye.”¹⁵

In 1892 the *Enquirer* published the following comments about the establishment of the BYA: "Thus the Academic ship of *true education* was launched upon the great ocean-mission of earth-life, with theology and the voice of revelation and inspiration for its foundation, theology for its organization, theology for its management, theology for its constant work and theology for its results."¹⁶ Religious education was not simply a topic or course of instruction for Latter-day Saints. Rather, religion was incorporated into every branch of education. On December 5, 1853, Brigham said, "If, on the Sabbath day, when we are assembled here to worship the Lord, one of the Elders should be prompted to give us a lecture on any branch of education with which he is acquainted, is it outside the pale of our religion? I think not... If any Elder shall give us a lecture upon astronomy, chemistry, or geology, our religion embraces it all... The truth that is in all the arts and sciences forms a part of our religion."¹⁷

The separation of church and state in the schools. The Latter-day Saint model for education did not account for the eventual shift in general American education from a non-denominational sectarian role to a purely secular role.¹⁸ Although the transition would take a significant part of the nineteenth century to complete, by the 1880s it had significantly changed how the school systems across the United States approached religious education.¹⁹ This new role, based on an interpretation of the First Amendment that separates Church and State, precluded the University of Deseret (later to become the University of Utah) from teaching a curriculum based on Latter-day Saint theology.

By the early 1780s the Bible had become perhaps the most popular reader in public and private schools. Horace Mann, often called the father of public education in the United States, was appointed to lead the Massachusetts Board of Education in 1837. Different religious groups in the state accused Mann of trying to introduce Unitarian doctrines into the education system of the state. "Mann held steadfastly to his position

that the common schools were neither irreligious nor nonreligious; they were nonsectarian."²⁰ Mann would not get his desire for nonsectarian fundamentals. Instead, the school systems took a secular, nonreligious route. In the 1860s Protestants and Catholics disagreed about what version of the Bible should be used in schools. The Cincinnati School Board removed the Bible altogether from the schools. In 1872, the Ohio Supreme Court upheld the school board's decision and removed the Bible from all public schools within the State of Ohio in *Minor v. Board of Education of Cincinnati*.²¹

The free school issue in Utah. The national battle over education eventually reached Salt Lake City. Local newspapers fanned the contentious flames. The major point of contention was the influence that leaders of the Church exerted on the schools of Utah. Initially, "the religious, social, and economic life of the people was directed by a hierarchical order of priesthood that emanated from the higher councils of the church."²² Various groups opposed this influence, although none were as vocal with their opposition as the editors of the *Salt Lake Tribune*. One hot topic in the realm of education for these individuals was the Church's lack of support for free schools. Free schools referred to a school system supported completely by the taxes of the people and controlled by the Territorial Legislature.

Trust was a key issue in the battle over free schools in Utah. Brigham was not against education; but he opposed an education system that was provided by the territorial government, in part, because he did not trust the individuals in the government that would administer the public schools. There were several reasons that Brigham Young did not trust the government. In the past, the federal government turned its back on the Latter-day Saints when they were being driven from state to state and eventually out of the United States altogether. The government had made promises regarding school trust lands, but, by 1874, the Territory had yet to see any benefit from

those lands. Brigham asked the Saints, “Has the Government given us the privilege of one acre of land to educate our children here? No. The school land is kept from us, and we get no benefit therefrom.”²³ Finally, Brigham Young doubted whether or not the tax dollar would actually reach the schoolhouse. He said, “In aiding and blessing the poor I do not believe in allowing my charities to go through the hands of a set of robbers who pocket nine-tenths themselves, and give one-tenth to the poor.”²⁴ Instead, Brigham Young taught self-sufficiency and independence from the interference of the government.

Brigham Young, and other leaders of the Church, vocally opposed the free school movement in the newspaper and in General Conference. On April 6, 1877, Brigham Young said:

Many of you may have heard what certain journalists have had to say about Brigham Young being opposed to free schools. I am opposed to free education as much as I am opposed to taking away property from one man and giving it to another who knows not how to take care of it. But when you come to the fact, I will venture to say that I school ten children to every one that those do who complain so much of me. I now pay the school fees of a number of children who are either orphans or sons and daughters of poor people. ... I am for the real act of *doing* and not *saying*. Would I encourage free schools by taxation? No!²⁵

The editors of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, however, accused Church leadership of crushing the movement in order to subject the people to the Church’s tyrannical manipulation.²⁶ In response to Brigham Young’s obstruction to the free school system, the *Tribune* published comments by dissidents like John Chislett. Responding to comments Brigham Young made in the April 1873 General Conference, Chislett said, “Of course I did not expect a man like you who cannot write a correct sentence in his mother tongue, and hardly spell half-a-dozen consecutive words correctly, to approve the proposition. Besides, free schools and priestcraft seldom go together, and as you are a chief in the latter business, of course you cannot be expected to foster the former.”²⁷

Problems between Brigham Young and the *Salt Lake Tribune* predated the Church University by fifteen to twenty years and contextual issues changed drastically from the 1870s to the 1890s.²⁸ Nevertheless, any study dealing with the Church University must recognize the impact of the forces that opposed President Young's vision of education in Utah. Those that opposed the leadership of the Church saw public education as a way to commandeer power from the Church and this affected subsequent Church education policy. Buchanan summarized the educational conflict this way: "Quite simply, a major reason for the development of these Mormon private schools was that public schools were viewed as no longer sensitive to the values of the Mormon community."²⁹ Buchanan pointed out that the struggle over public education in Utah evolved out of "three distinct approaches to schooling": Latter-day Saint parochial schools, private schools operated by other faiths, and the Latter-day Saint private academy system.

A private academy system. In the 1850s, President Young may not have anticipated the problems of tying the University of Deseret to the legislature. Two decades later, however, he was aware of the efforts to secularize public education. In July 1870 he said, "The Christian world is actually coming to a point that they will dismiss the Bible from their schools."³⁰ In response to this movement to remove scriptures from the classroom, Brigham Young deeded three properties for academies in the 1870s: one in Provo, another in Logan and a third in Salt Lake. Each deed established a Board of Trustees and clearly stated that the specific purpose for the property was to establish private academies where the religious would be taught in the classroom along with the academic. Brigham Young Academy was established on the Provo property in 1875 and Brigham Young College was established on the property in

Logan in 1877, but when Brigham Young died there was still no academy on the Salt Lake property.

These Latter-day Saint schools were designed to continue the approach to education that unified the secular and the spiritual. Latter-day Saint leaders overseeing the schools did not tolerate the compartmentalization of knowledge. Richards explained the Latter-day Saint perspective of the time: “To attempt to represent knowledge separated from its religious foundation would be to amputate it from its final meaning and purpose. Therefore, adopting the typical standards of the common school would be fostering a false doctrine, at least by implication.”³¹ Could The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints pursue its doctrinally founded desire for education in a public system that separated what Church leaders felt was inseparable? It seems like Brigham Young clearly believed that this would not be possible.

As the push for secular education increased its intensity and the non-LDS sectarian schools gained strength, John Taylor, Brigham Young’s successor as President of the Church, continued the effort to establish private academies. President Taylor knew that the Church could not pursue a fully integrated spiritual education in a public system that first separated secular and religious and then kept the religious out of the classroom. He believed the separation of religious and secular put the youth at risk of losing critical perspective. President Taylor said in March 1886: “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, 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.”³²

No school in Salt Lake. In spite of rapid progress in Provo and Logan, the Board of Trustees over the property that Brigham deeded for an LDS academy in Salt Lake did not initially pursue any action to establish a school. There was confusion when Brigham Young passed away regarding what property belonged to the Young estate and what belonged to the Church. The deed for the Salt Lake property was at the center of the issue and became involved in a legal case between the Young heirs and the Church. Finally the controversy settled in October 1879 when the property was left in the hands of the original trustees.³³

Willard Young, a member of the original Board of Trustees, began to revitalize his father's desire in the 1880s. On September 23, 1883, President John Taylor permitted Willard to move forward with his efforts, but did not offer any financial support from the Church. The same day, Willard Young received orders from the military to report for duty in Portland, Oregon. Before leaving for his military post, Willard Young sold some of his personal property and then donated it to the purpose of the academy that he hoped would be established.³⁴

An interesting note is that just three years later, William Dougall and Karl Maeser suggested that the Church start an academy in Salt Lake. The First Presidency gave a hearty endorsement of the idea and the Salt Lake Stake Academy was created, but not on the property deeded by Brigham Young and not under the supervision of the Board of Trustees established by that deed. The school continued to grow and became the LDS College, and eventually grew into the LDS Business College of today.³⁵

Search for an administrative head. Willard Young's efforts to act on his father's instructions remained fruitless until President Wilford Woodruff became the President of the Church and the chairman of the General Church Board of Education. Following a plan proposed by Karl Maeser, the General Superintendent of the Church Schools,

President Wilford Woodruff furthered the efforts Presidents Young and Taylor had made in educating Latter-day Saint children away from the intrusive influence of the government. President Woodruff asked members of the Church to establish academies in every Stake in the Church because “religious training [was] practically excluded from the district schools.” He warned the members of the Church, “Our children, if left to the training they receive in these schools, will grow up entirely ignorant of those principles of salvation for which the Latter-day Saints have made so many sacrifices.”³⁶ President Woodruff continued by asking members to start a school system where “the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants can be used as textbooks, and where the principles of our religion may form part of the teaching of the schools.”³⁷

According to the previous model of education in Nauvoo and the early days in Salt Lake City, President Woodruff and the Board of Education became desirous to identify one institution as the academic and administrative head of the Church School system. The effort to establish the University of Deseret as that institution failed because of its ties to the legislature. It is clear that, at least at this point in the history of the Church, the leaders were unwilling to participate in an educational system that compartmentalized education separating the religious from everything else. In the late 1880s, there was talk of creating a private university that would compete with the universities in the East.

In 1889, Karl G. Maeser spoke to the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education on behalf of the General Board of Education. He urged them to establish a university as a next possible step in the Church’s educational system.³⁸ Brother Maeser hoped to provide an alternative to Latter-day Saints attending secular universities in the East. George Q. Cannon also expressed the desire to see at least one Church school “obviate the necessity for our young men going East to complete their education.”³⁹ The initial

idea was to make LDS College that school, but the vision soon outgrew the existing school.⁴⁰

In multiple journal entries during May 1890, James E. Talmage, principal of the LDS College, mentioned conversations with general authorities regarding the anticipated future of the LDS College. He had been told that the leaders of the Church intended to build a “commodious building as soon as possible and then to place the College on a higher plane.”⁴¹ The only remaining issue: obtaining a site for the building. President Woodruff had written to Willard Young as early as 1888 inquiring about the possibility of using the property deeded for an academy in the Eighteenth Ward for the Salt Lake Stake Academy.⁴² This move seems to have been along the lines of what Karl Maeser and James Talmage anticipated for the academy. President Woodruff and the First Presidency, however, decided to start from the ground up with a completely new institution.

The beginning of a new university. By early 1890, the First Presidency decided not to use the LDS College as the head of its educational system. Rather, the focus would be on a new school. On May 1, 1890, the First Presidency contacted Willard Young by mail. In the letter they asked him to return to Salt Lake to be the President of a brand new Church institution. This new institution would compete with the universities in the East and become the administrative head for all of the Church schools.⁴³ In September 1890, an article in the *Deseret News* anticipated this new school and its role in the Church School System: “We expect to see a central Church college erected in this city, to which pupils will come from the most advanced schools in the Territory, to complete their education and from which they may graduate with the highest university honors.”⁴⁴ It is obvious that the Board of Education had selected the Church University to fill the role of “Parent School” for all church academies as well as

overseeing the Church's Normal Schools. The *Deseret News* announced that the school would be the "head of the Latter-day Saints School system."⁴⁵

A *Millennial Star* article announced the organization of "Young University" on June 29, 1891. The article explained to the public that the school was to be built on the two and a half acre lot in the Eighteenth Ward that Brigham Young had originally deeded for an academy. The purpose of the school was to provide an "institution of learning for both sexes, with all the powers and accessories essential and fitting a university of high standard." Willard Young was named the President and George Q. Cannon, First Counselor in the First Presidency, was named Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Other officers included George Reynolds, secretary; H. S. Young, treasurer; Wilford Woodruff, chairman of the finance committee; and Joseph F. Smith, chairman of the committee on the by-laws.⁴⁶

Willard Young immediately set out to get a building on the property set aside for a Church school now nearly twenty years earlier. He sought out Bruce Price, an architect from New York, to have him design a building for the property in the Eighteenth Ward. The Board of Trustees for the Church University expressed their desire for the schools edifices to be "first class."⁴⁷ Price submitted plans for a building, but nothing was ever done. The plans to have Mr. Price design the building never materialized. There does not appear to be any existing record that details why the building was never built.

Efforts to establish a campus. For six months, Willard Young was the only person working full-time on the establishment of the University. That changed, however, on January 11, 1892. James E. Talmage was released from his duties as the principal at the LDS College and was assigned to help Young organize the University. Quinn noted, "The choice of James E. Talmage as co-founder was an important one for Young

University because of Talmage's eminence as a Utah educator and his unswerving determination to establish the university."⁴⁸ Although he was saddened to leave the LDS College and its students, Talmage felt a sense of relief when he had performed his last official duty as the principal.⁴⁹ He was then free to focus his attention on the new school. According to the minutes of the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education, the purpose of releasing Talmage was to set him over the scientific department at the new Church University.⁵⁰ Dr. Talmage wasted no time in gathering the best equipment possible for the science courses he would teach.

Because nothing had emerged from Willard Young's exchange with Mr. Price, the Board of Education decided to build a temporary edifice on grounds belonging to the LDS College in Salt Lake City on First North until something more permanent could be built on the Eighteenth Ward property. The Salt Lake Literary and Scientific Association had already initiated plans to build an edifice aimed at housing the Deseret Museum on this campus. Classrooms were added to the plans and a first rate building was erected. During the construction, Talmage spent the summer of 1892 securing scientific apparatus from the eastern states and as far away as Germany and France.⁵¹ Talmage returned and quickly set up these important and valuable apparatus in anticipation of the first academic semester. A *Deseret News* reporter visited the new building and detailed its functions. The reporter was "surprised and delighted at the beauty, utility, and withal the consistent simplicity of the structure and the grandeur of its most thorough equipment."⁵²

Measures to open the first semester. As a result of the national financial panic of 1893, James Talmage's journal records that the General Board of Education planned to temporarily suspend the first semester of the Church University. Talmage wrote, "This is a great disappointment; our building is practically ready, most of the needed

apparatus is secure and in place, and hopes had been entertained of opening the institution within a few weeks of the present.”⁵³ A couple of weeks later, Talmage met with a committee organized by the General Board of Education designed to determine how to utilize the University building during the year if there were no classes held. Talmage suggested several ideas to keep the school open. First, only Chemistry and Natural Philosophy would be offered and Talmage would assume all of the teaching responsibilities. Next, the LDS College would be given the opportunity to use some of the classrooms in the newly finished Church University building. Then, LDS College students would be allowed to take courses free of charge. Finally, a series of public lectures would be offered at the Church University.⁵⁴ The Board accepted Talmage’s plan and classes started September 25, 1893. The announcement for the 1893-1894 school year explained:

The work that will be undertaken this year will, necessarily, be limited. It will consist in a series of public popular lectures, on scientific and kindred subjects, which will be delivered in the main lecture room of the new building; and, more especially, in regular class work in theoretical and practical chemistry and in theoretical and experimental natural philosophy. Full courses of study, leading to the Bachelor of Science, will, it is expected, be established in the near future. It is intended that the work done this year in chemistry and natural philosophy shall be that which hereafter, will be required for the first year’s work, in regular course, in these subjects.⁵⁵

When the Church University actually got off the ground, the *Deseret News* wrote, “There is little doubt now that the university will grow rapidly and have a prosperous career.”⁵⁶ To increase the reach of the school, James Talmage offered night classes beginning in January 1894. Classes included chemistry, natural philosophy, and “light science.”⁵⁷ The actual attendance was not recorded, but the turnout for both the chemistry and natural philosophy classes was so great that it was immediately decided to move the instruction to the large lecture hall.⁵⁸ The success of the night classes seemed to promise a long tenure for the Church University in Salt Lake City.⁵⁹

The proposed compromise. While the Church University seemed poised for longevity, the University of Utah was in serious trouble. The Legislature was looking for a way to make ends meet and something had to be cut in order for the budget to work. In 1892, the appropriations per student at the University of Utah totaled \$144.82 per academic year. Just two years later, that was cut to \$48.77 per student in the midst of the hard economic times.⁶⁰ The Territorial Legislature considered consolidating the University of Utah with the Agricultural College in Logan. The Agricultural College was federally financed through a land grant. It made more sense, therefore, to many members of the legislature to close the school in Salt Lake, even though Salt Lake was more central to the larger population in the territory.

In response to the desperate situation, Professor Joseph Kingsbury, acting-President of the University of Utah, looked to the Church for help. On January 25, 1894, Kingsbury, together with Professor William M. Stewart, met with President Wilford Woodruff. Professor Kingsbury suggested that both the Church and the University of Utah would benefit if the Church closed its university in Salt Lake City. They pled with President Woodruff to close the Church University. Dr. Talmage was present at the meeting, and his journal offers the most comprehensive account of what Kingsbury and Stewart said to sell their proposed compromise.

According to Talmage's journal, Professor Kingsbury offered several justifications for how the compromise would benefit both the state school and the Church. First, the Church would be able to concentrate its efforts on its academies. Second, there were not enough students in Utah for two top-tier universities. Third, Professor Kingsbury argued that the competition between the schools would hurt both institutions. Fourth, he proposed that James E. Talmage could become the President, which would provide a favorable influence from the Mormon Church. Fifth, Kingsbury

believed the Church should consider the compromise because it was likely that more Mormon professors would be hired in the ensuing years as a result of Dr. Talmage's presence. And finally, auxiliary organizations for theology could be established under the watchful eye of Talmage and others. Talmage reflected on the proposal to close the Church University. He wrote, "This is an unlooked for, though a very important question."⁶¹

The initial response. The compromise was simple. In summary, the Church was to close its Church University and encourage members to support the state school, which would provide a desperately needed boost to its enrollment. The Board of Regents would appoint James E. Talmage President of the University of Utah, which would provide the Church with a substantial influence within the State University. At that time the leaders of the Church advised him to reject the opportunity and move forward with the Church University.

In addition to the First Presidency's reluctance to shift focus from the Church University, Talmage had also been unenthusiastic with regards to the position at the University of Utah. He felt like he would have to scale back his educational energies in the different sciences and even religion. Just a few days before Kingsbury's proposal to President Woodruff, Talmage was approached to see if he would accept such an appointment. He went to the leading council of the Church and was told to stay with the Church University. Relieved, Talmage recorded that he had no personal desire to hold a high position in a public school system. He said, "It would mean much loss to me; the loss of freedom of speech, of liberty of action in teaching. I fear that my tongue would be bound, my energies crippled."⁶² While recognizing that the administrative duties would encroach on his research, Talmage's concern about "freedom of speech,"

suggested that he acknowledged the limitations on what he would be able to teach at a secular institution.

When Professor Kingsbury left the office, President Woodruff went to meet the members of the Quorum of the Twelve and President Joseph F. Smith of the First Presidency. Talmage wrote, "The brethren took this proposition under advisement referring it to a Council Meeting of the Presidency and Twelve held this afternoon in the Temple. Later in the day I was called to the President's office and there informed that no decision had yet been reached: that a telegram would be sent at once to Prest. [sic] Geo. Q. Cannon over in New York, and his opinion would be learned within a few days. In the mean time we can only wait."⁶³

The final decision. A few days later, President Woodruff called Kingsbury, Stewart, and Talmage to his office and announced that the First Presidency had decided to accept the offer and would cease operations at the Church University. In addition, the Church made an endowment to the state school, which consisted of property, buildings, and scientific equipment worth \$60,000. The first \$15,000 of this was donated by allowing the state school to occupy the classroom and laboratories recently furnished for the Church's own school, which had only been used for two semesters. Two years later, the remaining \$45,000 was considered fulfilled when the Church deeded the building and the property that it sat on to the University of Utah.⁶⁴

The First Presidency issued an official announcement in the *Deseret News* on August 25, 1894, that pronounced the closure of the Church University. The announcement explained that the "existence of two institutions in the same city with many courses in common, rendered the paralleling of work, and the consequent duplication of expenditure, absolutely unavoidable."⁶⁵ In a community struggling with the financial issues of 1893, this kind of duplication might be treacherous to both

institutions. The First Presidency encouraged the members of the Church to “devote their influence and energy, such as might have been claimed by the university of the Church, had wisdom dictated the continuance of that institution, to the University of Utah.”⁶⁶

Ramifications for other Church schools. Two days after the official announcement came out in the *Deseret News*, Karl G. Maeser, who had just returned from a six-month mission to California, was asked to speak on the First Presidency’s decision to close the Church University in a special meeting in the tabernacle. Following his remarks, Elder Franklin D. Richards stood and confirmed Brother Maeser’s explanation.⁶⁷ A month later, the *Deseret News* published a letter by Maeser explaining that the academies were to become feeders to the State University and that the curriculum of the church schools should reflect such intentions.⁶⁸

This idea of “feeder schools” created a new problem for the Church Academies in Logan, Salt Lake, and Provo. James E. Talmage, now President of the University of Utah, lobbied that no church institution be allowed to offer college-level courses. In fact the entire Board of Examiners seemed to agree, at least to some extent, with restricting what degrees and courses the Academies offered and aiming those courses to prepare students for the first year at the state school. The minutes of an April 7, 1894 meeting of the Board include comments by Professor J. H. Paul from the Brigham Young College, and Professor Benjamin Cluff from the BYA.

Prof. Paul suggested that in the light of present circumstances, which seemed to indicate the discontinuance of the Church University, it would be well to prepare the courses in the Stake Academies to lead to the Freshman Year of the University of Utah.

On motion of Prof. Cluff, it was decided to recommend to the General Board the issuance of letters of recommendation to Church Schools of academic grade, that they form their courses to meet the requirements for entrance to the University of Utah and that these schools refrain from paralleling work done in

University branches. However, this was not to be considered to apply to Normal work [teacher preparation].⁶⁹

The consequences of the compromise, however, may not have been fully anticipated by the Board members. It appears from the April 7, 1894 meeting of the General Board of Education that Professors Cluff and Paul, from BYA and BYC, fully supported the idea of Church schools assuming the role of “feeders” for the University of Utah, but they did not suppose that such a role would prohibit them from continuing to offer college credit at their institutions. In October, 1894, Cluff made it clear that he did not envision the BYA being limited to a simple feeder school for the state university; in fact, he wanted to expand their collegiate offerings even beyond what they had done in the past. All of the schools had been authorized to offer collegiate level courses when the Church University was being organized. The question remains whether or not that would have stopped once the Church University was operating at full capacity.⁷⁰

As the Superintendent of Church Education, Karl G. Maeser was thrown into the middle of the contest and was forced into the role of mediator. Following an interview with Cluff, Maeser wrote a letter to George Reynolds that Cluff felt “irreconcilable to the whole movement in regard to the BYA and the University, and declares that he sooner will resign, if he cannot see it any clearer than he does now.”⁷¹ Dr. Maeser seemed to be the voice of moderation. Maeser did not believe the agreement between President Woodruff and Professor Kingsbury should limit work that was being done at these academies before the creation of the Church University, but that it should prohibit their expansion. Maeser wrote to Reynolds expressing his belief that “a conservative medium between the extremes represented by Profs. Talmage and Cluff respectively must be found.”⁷²

Discussion

It is difficult, 118 years later, to identify exactly why President Woodruff accepted the Kingsbury compromise to close the Church University. President Woodruff did not comment on the thought process leading to the decision in his journal; while others may have commented on it, there is no record (at least that is accessible) that definitively answers the question. Likewise, those who were there found it difficult to clearly establish his reasons/motivations. Considering the past with the benefit of hindsight, we can identify some factors that definitely had a significant role in President Woodruff's decision.

Closing the Church University was not something that the First Presidency had considered openly before Kingsbury made his offer. In fact, just days earlier the First Presidency had affirmed to James Talmage their intentions to see the Church University succeed. The decision to support the University of Utah drastically opposed almost everything that the Church had ever done with regards to education. The nature of such a change requires a close examination of the external factors that may have led up to this major departure from previous dictates. Careful consideration points out that there is not one simple answer to the question of why. Rather, there are several issues that all converged on the Church in the 1890s and led to the decision to accommodate and support a state-funded school that compartmentalized education and disregarded the spiritual all together. This section posits that three factors influenced President Wilford Woodruff's decision to close the Church University. The section details historical events that do not relate specifically to the Church University, but provide the contextual information necessary to support the hypothesis for this paper.

Financial challenges combine. During this embryonic stage of the new Church University, the Church faced a multi-faceted financial challenge. The Supreme Court

had affirmed the constitutionality of the Edmunds-Tucker Act in May 1890. The result was the disenfranchisement of the Church and the Perpetual Emigrating Fund and the seizure of Church properties, which severely disabled the Church financially. The Supreme Court also upheld the enforcement of the 1860 law that limited the Church to \$50,000 in assets. This decision provided a major boost for public education in Utah, because all escheated property was to be used for the purposes of public education. President Woodruff wrote in his journal on September 25, 1890, "I have arrived at a point in the history of my life as the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints where I am under the necessity of acting for the Temporal Salvation of the Church."⁷³ He then recorded in his journal the Manifesto, prohibiting future plural marriages. It was the first step towards the Church's integration with the United States but did not bring an end to the financial difficulties.

Then, just three years later, the West experienced a severe financial crisis, described by Ronald Walker as "among the most disastrous in American history."⁷⁴ In the middle of the panic, James Talmage wrote, "I have never known a stronger current of financial difficulty than seems now to have swept over the land."⁷⁵ Americans were losing their jobs at an alarming rate and those that did not lose their jobs watched their paychecks shrink by up to ten percent. As the money in the East evaporated, the banks in the West, which were typically short on cash, began to collapse.⁷⁶

Elder Franklin D. Richards recorded in his journal that the Quorum of the Twelve and the First Presidency met to deliberate the serious financial situation of the Church in April 1893.⁷⁷ June 1893 brought a run on Utah banks. On July 1, two banks in Provo collapsed. The Bank of Commerce in Salt Lake only avoided bankruptcy because it received last minute aid from the bankers' clearinghouse.⁷⁸ President Woodruff may

have experienced déjà vu remembering the troubles of Kirtland Safety Society as he watched the Utah banks teeter on the brink of bankruptcy.⁷⁹

The financial panic intensified the struggles already affecting the Church as a result of the Edmunds Tucker Act. Walker pointed out that as a result of the panic, Latter-day Saints realized that their efforts to isolate themselves from the rest of the nation were no longer realistic. Instead, the Church of Jesus Christ was forced to change its perspective and throw its lot in with the rest of the United States when such national issues arose. This experience accelerated, according to Walker, the Church's efforts to change its public image and align itself financially with the rest of the country.⁸⁰

The dire situation of the Church in the 1890s might cause some to declare that finances were the only reason why the Church decided to close its school. It is clear that President Woodruff was concerned with finances at the time and those concerns were almost certainly an influence in his decision to close the school. However, this reason cannot attribute for everything. If the Church were solely considering finances, how does one explain the decision to give sixty thousand dollars to the state school? The buildings and equipment were already on the campus of the LDS College. Certainly that school could have used the facilities that were so valuable. If finances had been the sole motivation for the decision to close the Church University, then why not keep the apparatus and the buildings for your own schools? The donation to the University of Utah raises the question: What else can help explain the willingness to accommodate the public approach to education when it had been so vehemently opposed in the past?

The push for statehood. Joseph Kingsbury's proposition put President Woodruff in a very delicate position. The Church strongly desired Utah statehood. It had been trying to achieve this goal for over four decades. On December 13, 1893, the United States House of Representatives passed the bill that would finally grant Utah statehood.

The bill, however, had not yet passed the Senate. Education was an underlying issue throughout the battle for statehood. Biber claimed, "Mormons from the 1850s until the 1890s had generally refused to support the public school system in Utah, because of concerns that a secular, territorial public school system would lead to non-Mormon control of the education system."⁸¹ That opposition to public schools caused serious tension between Church leaders and those that opposed the Church's influence in social issues such as education and economics.

The competition between public and private schools was an issue in other parts of the United States. Randall wrote, "The continued presence of private schools alongside state schools was a source [of] genuine irritation and concern for common school advocates and social reformers. These private schools represented a threat to their efforts at restructuring society because of the differing visions of humankind and society that were taught. There were potential, if not actual, sources of educational, ideological, and social heresy."⁸² This was certainly the case in Utah, and had been for several decades. The tension was even more extreme in Utah because the leaders of the Church had been so successful at rejecting a public school system based solely on taxes for so long.

There were individuals that felt like educational compromise was necessary to obtain statehood. Statehood had been an issue for too long to discount its influence on President Woodruff and the First Presidency. For the first time since the original pioneers reached the Salt Lake Valley, statehood was finally a realistic probability. Congress may have inferred continued resistance on the part of the Church had the First Presidency refused Professor Kingsbury's proposition. That inference could have hindered the goal of becoming a State and more importantly, the opportunity to elect their local leaders. Arrington commented on how the leaders of the Church handled

challenges to the relationship between the Church and the acceptable national culture. He attributed President Woodruff's successful navigation of political relationships in the 1890's to "minimal adjustment and pragmatic compromise."⁸³ When the Enabling Act was passed in July 1894, it required the State to prohibit polygamy forever and provide a public school system "free from sectarian control."⁸⁴ This requirement for separation of Church and State in the schools is very similar to the Blaine Amendment language that had found its way into the constitutions of other states that had been accepted into the Union just before Utah.

The Church school system stemmed from Brigham Young's anticipation of how the national trend of secularized schools might affect the Church's efforts to educate according to what it considered a more complete and whole model of education. The Church University, however, was created at a crossroads in the history of the Church. Isolation was ending and accommodation with the national culture was taking root. President Woodruff had issued the Manifesto and the image of the Church was slowly changing. The decision to close the University may have been seen as a tipping point for the congressional vote regarding Utah's bid for statehood that eventually was granted just a couple of months later. Closing the Church University sent a strong message that the Church was willing to support public education even at the sacrifice of some of its own interests. Even this answer, however, does not completely address concerns about the change. If leaving youth to learn in a secular system was considered "criminal" in 1888, what made it more tolerable in 1894?

Potential influence at the University of Utah. James E. Talmage was perhaps the most important piece of the compromise that led to closing the Church University. His presence at the University provided the leaders of the Church, as well as the members, peace of mind regarding the direction of the secular institution. Getting someone of

faith in a position of influence is another explanation as to why the Church would donate over sixty thousand dollars to the University of Utah in a financially difficult time and why it was willing to abandon the view that submitting youth to secularized education was criminal. The decision to close the Church University allowed leaders to redirect funds and to demonstrate support for a public school system as required for statehood. Yet, the presence of James Talmage, as well as other Latter-day Saint faculty members, could minimize the damage that a secularized curriculum might have on the testimony of the youth.

The sixty thousand dollar donation to the University of Utah granted the Church the privilege of creating a new department and naming the chair for that department. The Church created a chair of Geology and then placed James E. Talmage in that position. So for three years, James Talmage received a salary as both the President and the Geology Chair. He held the latter position for thirteen years. He requested several times, starting in 1903, that the First Presidency allow him to resign from the position in the Geology chair, and yet his requests were denied at least three times.⁸⁵

Talmage's influence as president and professor at the University of Utah was important because he would be able to guide decisions regarding curriculum and faculty. There were some very significant individuals that were hired during his 3 years as President, including Joseph F. Merrill, Byron Cummings, and Richard R. Lyman. In addition to these personnel additions, President Talmage oversaw the growth in the University's scholarly offering as well. From 1894 to 1897 the University added a Department of Philosophy, Department of History and Civics, Department of Mines, and a Department of Economics and Sociology.

Dr. Talmage's tenure at the head of the state school was short-lived. In 1897, the Legislature "put a ceiling on salaries that could be paid at the [University of Utah]."⁸⁶

The maximum combined salaries an individual could receive from their work at the University was set at \$2500. Talmage's salary for serving as the Geology Chair was \$2,400 a year. He determined not to do the work as President for a mere \$100 per year and therefore resigned from the presidential post he held only three years.⁸⁷ Joseph Kingsbury took his place as president and remained in that position for nineteen years.⁸⁸

The General Church Board of Education held a special meeting on June 25, 1901, to consider the balance between supporting the University of Utah and providing collegiate credit at its own academies.⁸⁹ Talmage was still present on the faculty at the University of Utah, but his influence was limited once he stepped down as President. The meeting focused on whether or not the Church academies should be satisfied with the role as feeders for the state university or whether the Church would be better served by offering collegiate credit at its academies. Church President Lorenzo Snow opened the discussion, pleading with them not to limit their consideration to the interests of their own institutions alone, but of "the whole interests of the Church of God."⁹⁰ President Snow had a letter from President Woodruff and the First Presidency written at the time the Church decided to support the state university. Members of the Church from the academies as well as the University of Utah attended the meeting and openly discussed their views. Some views favored an expansion of the church schools and others pushed for an even more restricted role.

The real insight of this meeting regarding the Church University decision is found in President Snow's comments. He had listened carefully to all participants. He then reminded the group about President Woodruff's reasons for supporting the University of Utah in 1894. According to President Snow, one reason for the decision was to overcome the prejudices of honorable men who had believed that church

members “were opposed to this nation.” The Church needed to show its willingness to obey the laws of the land and to support public education. This comment strongly supports the idea that Statehood played on President Woodruff’s mind as he contemplated the possibility of closing the Church University.

President Snow also felt the need to “gain an influence in the gentile world as far as we possibly can,” but his greatest fear was that the Church “could not keep control of the [state] institution and in that event all our efforts in its support would be lost.” He continued, “If we can get one institution in the State *we can control*, and can make it a grand university, equal to any in the United States, I think it would be something to be proud of.”⁹¹ Having a stalwart member of the Church in a position of leadership at the University of Utah in 1894 provided the First Presidency with a sense of ease with regards to sending Latter-day Saint students to the school and may have even given some sense of control at the state school. The Church’s influence was substantially diminished when Dr. Talmage resigned and hence the fact that the Board of Education revisited the issue in 1901.

There is another reason why Talmage was so important to the compromise between President Woodruff and Professor Kingsbury. If the wrong Latter-day Saint is given the charge of the state university, it may have been overly suspicious to those in Washington D.C. If the compromise was seen as the Church's attempt to exert influence over a state-operated institution, the efforts to obtain statehood could have been in vain. James E. Talmage was one of the very few Latter-day Saints that had the ability to meet the expectations of both members of the Church and those opposed to Church involvement. By this time, Talmage had established himself and Utah firmly on the map of science at a global level.⁹² The selection of Talmage seems even more precise in the face of the fact that Willard Young was the President of the Church University. It is

likely that son of Brigham Young would have raised too many eyebrows in Washington D.C. and put the vote for statehood in jeopardy.

Conclusion

It is clear that the decision to close the Church University did not represent a shift in the Church's educational epistemology. During the early twentieth century, the Church expanded its school system and converted BYA into Brigham Young University and continued to support a model of teaching that integrated the secular and religious. Financial restrictions limited the number of schools the Church could operate and thereby the number of students that had the opportunity to participate in an integrated experience. Families that lived too far away from schools found it more sensible to send their children to the district schools, especially when those schools were taught by faithful LDS teachers. As the financial difficulties of the 1890s subsided, the Church again moved to establish academies throughout Latter-day Saint communities including Mexico and Canada.

The decision to support the University of Utah in 1894 was a major step toward demonstrating the Church's willingness to adopt the national model of education, even though the model implicitly supported a compartmentalization of knowledge contrary to Church doctrine. The inclusive model originally sought by the Church was not completely abandoned, but because of financial, geographic, and nationally imposed limitations, the policies and practices regarding a state-supported, secular education changed during this crucial time in Church history.⁹³ The change in policy was evidence that the Church had begun accommodating multiple models of education rather than exclusively supporting one over another.

This historical study educes a number of questions for Latter-day Saints regarding the proper relationship of religious education in the context of higher learning. Can a secular education, supplemented by religious training, provide a proper view of the LDS doctrine of knowledge? Has accommodating nationally accepted views of education taught, at least implicitly, that knowledge can and should be compartmentalized? What have the epistemological and cultural consequences been among the members of the Church over one hundred years later? Is there empirical evidence that those who receive a compartmentalized educational experience remain as religiously faithful as those receiving a more integrated education?

The closing of the Church University provides a powerful example of the Church's response to the practical demands of the time and setting as well as its careful budgeting of limited resources. One could easily argue that were resources limitless, the Church might still be providing education to all youth in all parts of the world. The timing of the decision is so critical because of its place among other major changes that led to the Church's place in the national scene as it emerged from its isolated existence in the mountains of Utah. Since this time period, the Church has continued to be sensitive to the external community wherein it participates as an active member. Perhaps the most telling part of this story is the members' adherence to the voice of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. That confidence, for the majority of the Latter-day Saints, is demonstrated today as the leaders continue to declare what can and cannot be accommodated.

¹ James R. Clark, ed. *Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1965), 3:168.

² The University of Deseret, although started by the leaders of the Church in 1850, was technically a public institution based on its ties to the Territorial Legislature. The Church intended to influence the nature of the school through the strong Latter-day Saint presence on Board of Regents, in the Territorial Government, and on the faculty. Originally, there was little national pressure to secularize the non-sectarian, but still Christian, curriculum. As the national acceptance of a completely secular education became popular, the Church's role with the University of Deseret was dramatically curtailed.

³ *Millennial Star*, June 29, 1891, p. 415.

⁴ *Deseret Weekly News*, August 25, 1894.

⁵ *Ibid.* Emphasis added.

⁶ For a focused study on the Church Academy system during this time period see Scott C. Esplin, "Education in Transition: Church and State Relationships in Utah Education, 1888-1933" (Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 2006). See also D. Michael Quinn, "The Brief Career of Young University at Salt Lake City," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1973).

⁷ See Appendix II for an account of the history of education in Utah and the Church's epistemological stance on education.

⁸ In 1885, John R. Park was summoned to court in a case regarding the separation of Church and State in the classroom. At the time he was the President of the University of Deseret. He testified that "no religion was ever taught in my school" (*Deseret Weekly News*, January 14, 1885).

⁹ President Gordon B. Hinckley taught, "The truths of this gospel are everlasting and eternal. Philosophies change. Customs change. Culture changes. But with all these changes, there are gospel fundamentals that have never changed and never will change" (Gordon B. Hinckley, "Stand True and Faithful," *Ensign*, May 1996, p.). Even more recently President Dieter F. Uchtdorf taught, "Procedures, programs, policies, and patterns of organization are helpful for our spiritual progress here on earth, but let's not forget that they are subject to change" (Dieter F. Uchtdorf, "Christlike Attributes—The Wind Beneath Our Wings," *Ensign*, November, 2005).

¹⁰ Joseph Smith the Prophet declared "every man and woman should seek the Lord for wisdom, that they might get knowledge from Him who is the fountain of knowledge" (see George A. Smith, *Deseret News: Semi-Weekly*, November 29, 1870, 2). On another occasion Joseph Smith wrote, "The first fundamental principle of our holy religion is, that we believe that we have a right to embrace all, and every item of truth..." (quoted in *Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith*, [Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2007], 262).

¹¹ Joseph Fielding Smith, *Essentials in Church History* (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1922).

¹² Susan Easton Black, Harvey B. Black, and Sarah Allen, *University of the City of Nauvoo: 1841-1845* (Wilmington, DE: World Vital Records, Inc., 2008). John C. Bennett was elected the mayor of Nauvoo and he immediately pushed for the establishment of the school. On February 3, 1841—just two days after being elected—Mayor Bennett and the new City Council passed the specific ordinance that officially created the school (see

Donald Q. Cannon, "Joseph Smith and the University of Nauvoo," in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, The Man*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1993), 287.

¹³ Susan Easton Black, "The University of Nauvoo, 1841-45," *The Religious Educator* 10, no. 3 (2009): 192.

¹⁴ Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1974). 13:148.

¹⁵ Reinhard Maeser, *Karl G. Maeser* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1928). 29.

¹⁶ *Enquirer*, March 3, 1892.

¹⁷ *Journal of Discourses*: 1:334.

¹⁸ Cremin, *American Education: The Republican Experience*.

¹⁹ *Deseret Weekly News*, January 14, 1885.

²⁰ R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953). 273.

²¹ Scott A. Merriman, *Religion and the Law in America: An Encyclopedia of Personal Belief and Public Policy* (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2007).

²² John Clifton Moffitt, *The History of Public Education in Utah* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1946). 31.

²³ *Journal of Discourses*: 16:18.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 18:357.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Salt Lake Tribune*, "About Free Schools," February 18, 1875, p. 1.

²⁷ *Salt Lake Tribune*, Apr 9, 1873. Brigham Young had said, I understand that the other night there was a school meeting in one of the wards of this city, and a part there – a poor miserable apostate – said, 'We want a free school, and we want to have the name of establishing the first free school in Utah.' To call a person a poor miserable apostate may seem like a harsh word; but what shall we call a man who talks about free schools and who would have all the people taxed to support them, and yet would take his rifle and threaten to shoot the man who had the collection of the ordinary light taxes levied in this Territory – taxes which are lighter than any levied in any other portion of the country? We have no other schools but free schools here – our schools are all free" (*Journal of Discourses*: 16:20).

²⁸ The animosity between the *Tribune* and the Church seemed to ebb and flow over the decades. The 1890's seemed to be calm compared to the two previous decades. This may have been a result of the Church's accommodations in its push to get Utah admitted to the Union as a state and the headway the government had made in getting the Free School Act passed in 1890.

²⁹ Frederick S. Buchanan, "Mormon Response to Secular Education," *Religious Education* 81, no. 4 (1986): 645.

³⁰ Brigham Young, *Discourses of Brigham Young*, ed. John A. Widtsoe (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1946). 258.

³¹ A. Legrand Richards, Unpublished Biography of Karl G. Maeser

³² Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:59.

³³ Quinn, "The Brief Career of Young University at Salt Lake City," 71.

³⁴ Willard Young, Personal Journal, September 25, 1883.

³⁵ It is important to emphasize that this school was always a separate entity from the Church University. They have been confused in the past by historians.

³⁶ Orson F. Whitney, *History of Utah*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake, Utah: G.Q. Cannon, 1904). 3:685.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1889-1891, (Church History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) March 21, 1889, 22-23.

³⁹ General Board of Education Meeting Minutes, 1888-1902, UA 1376, box 1, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, April 9, 1889.

⁴⁰ The LDS College was originally called the Salt Lake Stake Academy and was started in the Salt Lake Stake by President John Taylor. It was not built upon the property deeded by Brigham Young in the Eighteenth Ward. This school is often confused for the Church University.

⁴¹ Talmage Journals, May 1, 1890.

⁴² Woodruff to Young, June 8, 1888, General Church Board of Education Letterbook, June 1888—March 1899, LDS Department of Education Collection, 6-7.

⁴³ Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, and Joseph F. Smith to Willard Young, May 1, 1890 quoted in Quinn, "The Brief Career of Young University at Salt Lake City," 76.

⁴⁴ *Deseret Weekly News*, September 6, 1890.

⁴⁵ *Deseret Weekly News*, September 9, 1893.

⁴⁶ The Board of Trustees included the following individuals: John W. Young, Hyrum S. Young, Willard Young, Joseph D. C. Young, George Reynolds, LeGrande Young, Richard W. Young, Wilford Woodruff, Karl G. Maeser, George Q. Cannon, Orson F. Whitney, Joseph F. Smith, Spencer Clawson, Lorenzo Snow, Moses Thatcher, James E. Talmage, James Sharp, Francis Lyman, Thomas W. Jennings, John Henry Smith, Heber J. Grant, Abraham H. Cannon, Maria Y. Dougall, and Priscilla P. Jennings. Notice that a majority of these individuals are either descendants of Brigham Young or members of the First Presidency or Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.

⁴⁷ Minutes Board of Trustees, July 7, 1891, Young University Papers.

⁴⁸ Quinn, "The Brief Career of Young University at Salt Lake City."

⁴⁹ James E. Talmage, Personal Journals, January 11, 1892.

⁵⁰ Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, January 6, 1892

⁵¹ *Deseret Weekly News*, August 6, 1892.

⁵² *Deseret Weekly News*, July 9, 1892.

⁵³ James E. Talmage, Journals, August 11, 1893.

⁵⁴ James E. Talmage, Journals, August 26, 1893.

⁵⁵ "Announcement of the Church University for the year 1893-4," ed. The University of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City, Utah 1893).

⁵⁶ *Deseret Weekly News*, October 7, 1893, p. 27.

⁵⁷ Talmage Journals, January 15, 1894.

⁵⁸ Talmage Journals, January 17, 1894.

⁵⁹ It is important to note that although Willard Done was the principal at the LDS College, Willard Young, as the President of the Church University, was given a supervisory role over the LDS College during the first year (see *Deseret Weekly News*, August 6, 1892). This provides even more evidence of the First Presidency's intention to make the Church University the administrative head of all Church Academies, and greater indication of their plan for this school to succeed. Yet, in just a matter of months, the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve decided to permanently close the Church University.

⁶⁰ Chamberlin, *The University of Utah*, 201.

⁶¹ James E. Talmage Personal Journals, January 25, 1894.

⁶² James E. Talmage, *Personal Journals*, January 23, 1894. An unnamed faculty member of the University of Utah asked Talmage if he would take the position of President of the state school if it were offered. According to the faculty member, the Chancellor of the University of Utah had assigned the visit. Talmage went to the First Presidency. The First Presidency called a meeting with the Twelve and together the two quorums and Talmage discussed the offer. In the end, the council decided that Talmage should continue with the Church University.

⁶³ James E. Talmage *Journals*, January 25, 1894.

⁶⁴ President George Q. Cannon was in New York at the time, and so was not able to express his feelings on the matter. President Woodruff contacted President Cannon by telegram to get his reaction to the proposal. There is no accessible record of how President Cannon responded to President Woodruff's telegram. Another important piece to this puzzle that would shed valuable light is the President of the Church University, Willard Young. Unfortunately, his journals do not provide any insight to his thoughts regarding the proposal and the subsequent acceptance. As a result, much of the information for this major decision relies on the personal records of James E. Talmage.

⁶⁵ *Deseret Weekly News*, August 25, 1894.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Franklin D. Richards, *Journals*, August 27, 1894.

⁶⁸ *Deseret Weekly News*, September 22, 1894.

⁶⁹ Board of Examiners Minutes, April 7, 1894, 1889-1919 / CR 102 14, (Church History Library, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah). See Appendix IV for a conversation on how the debate over Normal Schools following the compromise affected the Academies.

⁷⁰ Minutes of the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education, June 16, 1892, CR 346 9 (Church History Library, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah).

⁷¹ Karl G. Maeser to George Reynolds, September 21, 1894. UA 1094.

⁷² Karl G. Maeser to George Reynolds, December 12, 1894. Just twelve days later Maeser describe a movement of the academy principals (BYA, BYC, and LDS College) to remove James E. Talmage from the Church Board of Examiners. They felt that because of his position on the issue of awarding degrees and teaching certificates, as well as his position at the University of Utah, that he could not carry out those duties with an open and fair mind and work in the best interests of the church academies (KGM to GR, December 24, 1894). Maeser expressed these concerns to President Woodruff in a letter dated December 29, 1894.

⁷³ Wilford Woodruff, *Wilford Woodruff's Journals: 1833-1898 Typescript*, ed. Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1985). 9:113-14. The Edmunds Tucker Act affected the Church's income. George Q. Cannon stated, "The seizure of the Church property had a very marked effect upon the income [of the church], very many members of the Church fearing to give what they otherwise would lest further seizures might take place" (*Deseret Weekly News*, July 14, 1888). Gibbons noted, "The escheatment of the properties of the Church had robbed it of most of its assets, fixed and liquid. But it had not reduced the expenses of operation. Indeed, it had increased expenses because of the rentals the Church had to pay for the use of its own facilities, and because of the heavy fees of the receivers" (Francis M Gibbons, *Wilford Woodruff: Wondrous Worker, Prophet of God* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1988). 367). In 1891, President Wilford Woodruff wrote, "We are passing through a great financial Difficulty.

The Lord only can help us out of it" (Woodruff, *Wilford Woodruff's Journals: 1833-1898 Typescript*).

⁷⁴ Ronald W. Walker, "Crisis in Zion: Heber J. Grant and the Panic of 1893," *BYU Studies* 43, no. 1 (2004): 258.

⁷⁵ James E. Talmage Journals, July 31, 1893.

⁷⁶ Thomas P. Kane, *The Romance and Tragedy of Banking: Problems and Incidents of Government Supervision of National Banks* (New York: The Bankers Publishing Co., 1922), 200. Two examples of banks failing in the United States were Columbia National Bank and Chemical National Bank, both in Chicago and both failed in 1893. Each bank held capital stock of \$1,000,000 and, at the time of their failure, liabilities totally \$2.6 and \$2.9 million respectively.

⁷⁷ Franklin D. Richards, Personal Journals, April 24 & 25, 1893.

⁷⁸ Walker, "Crisis in Zion," 269.

⁷⁹ In January 1837, Joseph Smith and other members of the Church established the "Kirtland Safety Society" in response to the Ohio Legislature's refusal to grant a state charter to authorize them to establish a bank in Kirtland. Joseph Smith and others felt like a bank was a pivotal element to the growth of the city. The Safety Society was a private attempt at a lending institution in Kirtland, but the lack of political authority created a fatal weakness and eventually led to its collapse. Other banks in the area refused to accept the Society's notes as legal tender because of the lack of charter. Another problem was that the Society did not have sufficient specie (hard funds to back their notes such as gold or silver); instead, it relied on land as the financial capital. The enemies of the Church secured enough of the Kirtland Safety Society notes to create a run on the bank and demanded that the payments be made in specie. The bank suspended payments in January and then failed months later because of the recession that and was affecting the entire United States. "Some of J[oseph] S[mith]'s closest associates became disaffected. Prominent among the dissenters were J[oseph] S[mith]'s former secretary Warren Parrish, several apostles, a number of the members of the Quorum of the Seventy, and the Three Witnesses to the Book of Mormon plates. Their discontent escalated from dismay with J[oseph] S[mith]'s financial leadership to rejection of his religious leadership" (Jessee, Dean C., Mark Ashurst-McGee, and Richard L. Jensen, eds. *Journals, Volume 1: 1832-1839*. Vol. 1 of the Journals series of The Joseph Smith Papers, edited by Dean C. Jessee, Ronald K. Esplin, and Richard Lyman Bushman. [Salt Lake City: Church Historian's Press, 2008], 227).

⁸⁰ Walker, "Crisis in Zion," 257.

⁸¹ Eric Biber, "The Price of Admission: Causes, Effects, and Patterns of Conditions Imposed on States Entering the Union," *The American Journal of Legal History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 153.

⁸² E. Vance Randall, *Private Schools and Public Power: A Case for Pluralism* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1994). 34-35.

⁸³ Leonard J. Arrington, "Crisis in Identity: Mormon Responses in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in *Mormonism and American Culture*, ed. Marvin S. Hill and James B. Allen (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1972), 169.

⁸⁴ Utah Enabling Act 3. Utah was not the only state required to provide public schools free from sectarian influences. Congress started requiring it of states admitted in 1889 including Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

⁸⁵ John R. Talmage, *The Talmage Story* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, Inc., 1972). 166.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁸⁷ Joseph Horne Jeppson, "The Secularization of the University of Utah to 1920" (University of California, 1973), 119-20.

⁸⁸ Ralph V. Chamberlin, *The University of Utah: A History of Its First Hundred Years, 1850 to 1950* (Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press, 1960). 340.

⁸⁹ Leading up to this meeting there had been some exchange between professors at Brigham Young Academy in Provo and other academies regarding the need for the Church Schools to expand or remain true to its current course. This exchange explains President Snow's opening remarks assuring that each person would get a chance to explain their point of view and requesting that the men in attendance look for the good of the whole rather than simply speaking in the interests of the individual schools (see *Deseret Weekly News*, June 14 and 17, 1901).

⁹⁰ Minutes, June 25, 1901

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

⁹² Brian W. Ricks, "James E. Talmage and the Nature of the Godhead: The Gradual Unfolding of Latter-day Saint Theology" (Brigham Young University, 2007), 36-37.

⁹³ In 1996, President Gordon B. Hinckley said, "The world is changing, and it is so very important that we equip ourselves to move with that change." He continued, "The truths of this gospel are everlasting and eternal. Philosophies change. Customs change. Culture changes. But with all these changes, there are gospel fundamentals that have never changed and never will change" (Gordon B. Hinckley, "Stand True and Faithful," *Ensign*, May 1996, p.). Even more recently President Dieter F. Uchtdorf taught, "Procedures, programs, policies, and patterns of organization are helpful for our spiritual progress here on earth, but let's not forget that they are subject to change" (Dieter F. Uchtdorf, "Christlike Attributes—The Wind Beneath Our Wings," *Ensign*, November, 2005).

Appendix A: Literature Review

Educational Roots in Utah

In 1847 the Latter-day Saints found a refuge in the high desert mountains. Although the pioneers had finally found a place of peace, they had sacrificed the infrastructure of the organized states they had left behind. They built Nauvoo from the swamps of Illinois, but they had relied on state government and support. In Utah there would be no support. Initially, the Salt Lake Basin was not even in the United States. This review will outline the first attempts to establish schools in Utah, the divisive nature of the newspapers on education, and the establishment of the Church University.

In order to understand why the First Presidency decided to close the Church University, it is necessary to understand the Church's attitude towards education and the early attempts to start a full educational system in Utah. "A life of Caesar presupposes a knowledge of Roman roads and Roman weapons in the first century B.C., to which must be added the awareness of incommensurables, such as Roman character, superstition, *gravitas*, and so on" (Barzun & Graff, 2004, p. 123) Likewise, any paper dealing with the social situation in Salt Lake City during the late 1800s must account for several "incommensurables" due to the complex nature of the time period. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate a sufficient understanding and comprehension of those factors to make an astute commentary on insights the Church University provides to the LDS Church's shift in educational philosophy during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The educational roots for Latter-day Saints lay in the early practices and teachings of Joseph Smith, the first President of the Church. After the murder of Joseph

Smith, subsequent leaders of the Church struggled to establish an all-inclusive approach to education that made no distinction between theological and secular knowledge. Knowledge was knowledge. Truth was truth. All truth and knowledge emanated from God. Joseph Smith continually urged Latter-day Saints to seek the truths that come from God. He taught that people “might get knowledge from [God] who is the fountain of knowledge” and that “He shall give unto you knowledge by His Holy Spirit” (J. Smith, 1949, pp. 266-268). According to President Brigham Young (1997), when individuals have the Holy Ghost, “they will know things that are, that will be, and that have been. They will understand things in heaven, things on the earth, and things under the earth, things of time and things of eternity” (p. 68).

Once the idea of a secularized approach to schooling gained favor in public schools, the Latter-day Saint’s approach to education that incorporated a religious foundation was unacceptable in public schools. This, however, did not dissuade the Latter-day Saints or their leaders and they started a private education system in Salt Lake City so that the young members of the Church would not be subjected to the secularized education under the control of the territorial legislature. The two school systems fostered a serious competitive spirit that often led to hard feelings and angry citizens on both sides of the issue. The roots of the Church University were entangled with the intense competition and confrontation with those that favored and sought a completely tax-funded school system featuring a secularized, non-Mormon curriculum.

Educational Pioneers in Utah. Before looking at the education system in Utah it may be beneficial to briefly outline what brought the Latter-day Saints to Utah in the first place. Before settling in Utah, mobs had forced the Latter-day Saints out of their homes in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. Local and federal governments had done nothing to protect the people from the religious bigotry. Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the

President and the Patriarch of the Church, were murdered at Carthage, Illinois, while in the protection of government officials. Members of the Church began to mistrust the government even more than before. This mistrust continued in Salt Lake and played into territorial education issues. The Church's trek west in the late 1840s was an effort to find a place where its members could worship their God "according to the dictates of [their] own conscience" (Articles of Faith 11).

As the first group of Latter-day Saints reached the Salt Lake Valley, it is reported that Brigham Young, by then the president of the Church, remarked, "It is enough. This is the right place" (*Deseret News*, 1880). It was not, however, what many may have envisioned as "Zion." "Utah was regarded as a waste land by trappers and frontiersmen" in 1847 (Moffitt, 1946, p. 29). Wallace Stegner (1970), an American frontier historian, described it. He said,

[It was a] desert more vegetationless, more indubitably hot and dry, and more terrible than any desert in North America except possibly Death Valley... Its rivers run nowhere but into the ground; its lakes are probably salty or brackish; its rainfall is negligible and its scenery depressing to all but the few who have lived in it long enough to acquire a new set of values about scenery. Its snake population is large and its human population is small. Its climate shows extremes of temperature that would tire out anything but a very strong thermometer. (p. 44)

Irrigation, coupled with dry farming, allowed the Latter-day Saints to flourish in the inhospitable country. Water, however, was not all that the Salt Lake Valley lacked. Education had been central to the Latter-day Saint way of life since the Church's early days in Kirtland, Ohio (Esplin, 2006). Joseph Fielding Smith, then the historian of the Church and later the tenth president of the Church, wrote, "The education of the youth

of the Church was a matter which received constant attention, nor was there anything that was considered of greater importance" (J. F. Smith, 1922, p. 571). In order to continue its focus on education the Church had to discover a form of intellectual irrigation and educational dry farming to meet their needs in the barren mountains of Utah.

Detailing the first common schools. The early efforts of the Latter-day Saints to establish a sufficient education system have been thoroughly documented. *Mormonism and Education*, by Milton L. Bennion (1939), and *The History of Public Education in Utah*, by John Clifton Moffitt (1946), for example, both provide important backgrounds to the Latter-day Saint perspective on education starting in Ohio and Missouri, and then moving through to the practical application of doctrinal teachings in the Utah school system. Both provide important details on the steps that eventually led to the public school law in the 1890s. A particular strength of Moffitt's book is its in-depth analysis of the multiple types of schools established in Utah. There are, however, some accuracy concerns with Bennion's book with regards to the Church University. These errors in an otherwise well-researched study on Mormon education, underscore the need for the main article.

Moffitt's book details the path Utah schools traveled towards the public school system. Following a brief review of the free school movement in the United States, Moffitt (1946) declared,

When [the Latter-day Saints] arrived in the Salt Lake Valley just before the mid-point of the century, these migrants were so poverty stricken that they were unable to provide publicly financed schools—even if they had selected this as their choice. They were at once confronted with the necessity of providing a shelter to protect themselves from the burning rays of the sun and the cold of

winter that was soon to follow... The task of providing food and shelter, therefore, took most of their energy. Under such conditions, education was of necessity forgotten until community life and a supporting economy were established. True to their traditions, however, it was not long before schools were in operation. (p. 101)

Regardless of Moffitt's claim that education was forgotten, he provided evidence to the contrary within the very same chapter. He emphasized that the Saints immediately established common schools wherever the Latter-day Saints settled even with only the most basic of resources. "The Mormons arrived in Salt Lake Valley in mid-summer, 1847, and schools were established during that first season. In the initial stages these were but temporary plans of providing a very elementary form of education and some religious instruction" (Moffitt, 1946, p. 10). Even in those rugged circumstances, education was never forgotten. George A. Smith was teaching out of a wagon in Iron County before the residents had permanent homes. He recorded these experiences in his journal. "My scholars assembled round the camp fire, freezing one side and roasting the other, listened earnestly to my lecture on English Grammar" (G. A. Smith, 1851, February 27). Similar passages were very common in Cannon's records during those early days in Utah.

Establishing the Salt Lake charter. The formal effort to establish education in Utah started with the Salt Lake City charter. The pioneers set the foundation for public education when they first arrived in the valley. When the Latter-day Saints left Nauvoo and came west, it was common practice for the public schools to incorporate Christian tenets in the everyday curriculum. In fact, it is generally accepted that the public education system in the United States at that time was considered a non-secular, Christian system. Although specific dogmas were avoided, Christian morals were

regularly taught from the Bible. While the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was establishing itself in Utah, the rest of the United States experienced a reform movement in education that altered the way religion was presented in schools. When the leaders of the Church set up the initial structure for education in Utah they planned on including religious teachings in the curriculum. Because religious instruction had been generally accepted across the country, the Latter-day Saints did not foresee any problem with plans to follow that pattern for religious education integrated in public schools.

The Salt Lake City charter authorized the organization of the University of Deseret. Although the efforts were largely supported by the people and ratified by the territorial government, Brigham Young headed the initiative (J. F. Smith, 1922). At the time, Brigham Young was also the President of the Church. Education in general was a priority to the Prophet-Governor. He insisted that the people should willingly sacrifice whatever necessary to send their children to school. Even the adults in the territory were encouraged to educate themselves. In his mind, education was the tool that would distinguish the Latter-day Saints in Utah from other people in the world (B. Young, 1881).

Starting higher education. The vision for education in Utah was not only focused on the elementary schools. Leaders of the Church envisioned every level of education in Utah so as to provide the people every opportunity to educate themselves in a manner equal to those in the East. The first attempt at higher education in Utah was the University of Deseret. This school played a significant role in the establishment and the closing of the Church University. The university was an important piece in every level of education in Utah, as it was intended to become the administrative head for every public school in the territory.

M. Lynn Bennion (1939) described the pivotal place the University of Deseret held in the community as well as its religious foundation:

One cannot complete even a cursory study of the founding of the University of Deseret without seeing clearly that the founders were motivated in their efforts by religious impulses...Without this powerful motivating force that actuated all Mormon educational endeavors, it is doubtful if the university would have been established within the century. (pp. 96-97)

Eventually, the public opinion combined with national intervention prohibited the Church from teaching theologically founded truths in the public schools, including the University of Deseret. When this happened, the Church looked to private schools as the solution.

The most extensive work on the University of Deseret is Ralph Chamberlin's (1960) *The University of Utah: A History of Its First Hundred Years, 1850-1950*. The book documents the early days of the University of Deseret and its important role in Utah public education. Chamberlin's book maps many of the important checkpoints in Utah's history on its way to a free (fully tax-funded) educational system through the reference lens of the University of Utah. There are limitations, however, to the usefulness of Chamberlin's work with regard to the Church University. Anything that does not pertain directly to the University of Utah is glossed over. Any volume covering one hundred years of history requires pinpoint focus and precludes any tangential wanderings, such as the issues dealing with the Church's private university.

Chamberlin's work is still a very important piece to any study of the Church University because it provides an important look into the financial struggles facing the University of Utah and brings to light the desperate position of Professor Joseph Kingsbury and the entire University of Utah faculty during the 1890s. Such an

understanding provides greater appreciation for the poor bargaining position of the University of Utah. In the face of such a weak competitor, the Church still decided to close its university rather than trying to establish a monopoly on higher education in Salt Lake City. The book helps illustrate the situation when the paths of the two schools collided and only the state school survived.

The University of the City of Nauvoo. As the leaders of the Church set up the University of Deseret, they did not have to start from scratch. The University of Deseret was modeled after the Latter-day Saint University in Nauvoo. Like the University of Deseret, the University of the City of Nauvoo was included as a part of the Nauvoo charter, which was signed by Illinois Governor Thomas Carlin on December 16, 1840. This particular charter has become famous for the amount of power it granted to the City Council (Black, Black, & Allen, 2008). John C. Bennett was elected the mayor of Nauvoo and he immediately pushed for the establishment of the school. Bennett had a major role in writing the charter as well as the political pandering that pushed it through the Illinois Legislature. On February 3, 1841—just two days after being elected—Mayor Bennett and the new City Council passed the specific ordinance that officially created the school (Cannon, 1993).

The school in Nauvoo departed from the typical New England style of education. The City Council placed the University at the head of all education in Nauvoo. This position was a major similarity between it and the University of Deseret. The Board of Regents held administrative responsibilities over even the common, or elementary, schools in the city (Esplin, 2006). This idea of an institutional head was an important part of the Salt Lake model of education in the 1850s. When the Church could no longer consider the University of Deseret a viable option to fill that role, the absence of such an

institutional overseer provided an additional motivating factor to creating the Church University in the 1890s.

Donald Q. Cannon (1993) considered Joseph Smith to be the driving force behind the school in Nauvoo. Cannon's article "Joseph Smith and the University of Nauvoo" provided background information to some of those most closely connected with the University of Nauvoo, including John C. Bennett, Orson Pratt, and Orson Spencer. In that article, he also described courses taught and the books used in the courses as well as the efforts to establish a campus for the school. Courses at the University included: mathematics (algebra, trigonometry, and many others), astronomy, chemistry, philosophy, English literature, language, rhetoric, Church history, science of music, the art of sacred signing, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (Cannon, 1993).

The school was intended to be much more than just a normal university in Nauvoo. It reached those of different faiths, ages, and interests. It was open to all faiths, and included Christian teachings that were standard in the American public education system of the time period. The University not only impacted young students in Nauvoo. The citizens of all ages benefited as well. "According to council minutes, the university was to be a self-governing entity that would provide educational opportunities for adults and children" (Black, 2009, p. 192). Non-school related intellectual activities were held at the school for various reasons and purposes. A subscription library was also proposed and started, although it was never fully developed before the Latter-day Saints were forced out of the city.

The University of Nauvoo has not been the subject of enormous amounts of study. Considering the limited resources that deal with this particular school, "The University of Nauvoo, 1841-45," written by Susan Easton Black (Black, 2009), is another important resource with regards to the University of Nauvoo and its administrative

structure and operation. The 2009 article utilized what Black referred to as new sources of information that brought to light “little-known facts about the University of Nauvoo... [and] unique properties and greater clarity to our understanding of the role of the university” (Black, 2009, p. 189).

Black detailed the divisions in levels of education in Nauvoo: common, seminary, and university. The common schools consisted of grades one through eight. Seminary education included grades nine through twelve. The university level was the higher education, or collegiate level, of today. The Board of Regents of the University of Nauvoo held the reins of every level of education throughout the city. Initially, the city council held this authority, but it quickly passed that authority to the Board of Regents. In her article, Susan Easton Black provided many intricate details regarding the schooling system in Nauvoo, including the popular method of using colored certificates to motivate students to perform in the face of unpleasant teaching techniques and scarcity of resource. It is a valuable contribution to understanding the Church’s method of educating the public in the 1840s, but also becomes helpful in understanding how the system in Illinois influenced the school system in Utah.

The purpose of the University of Nauvoo. The First Presidency of the Church declared their vision for the University of Nauvoo. The school was established to “teach [their] children wisdom...in all the knowledge and learning, in the arts, sciences, and learned professions” (J. Smith, 1951, p. 4:269). The official announcement stated, “We hope to make this institution one of the great lights of the world, and by and through it to diffuse that kind of knowledge which will be of practicable utility, and for the public good, and also for private and individual happiness” (J. Smith, 1951, p. 4:269).

Joseph Smith (1951) touched on the issue of education in his inaugural address as Mayor of Nauvoo on February 3, 1841. He said,

The modern mode of education is an example in point. Children are so instructed as to acquire a smattering of everything, and as a matter of consequence, they know nothing properly. Seminaries and academies deal out their moral and natural philosophy, their geometry, trigonometry, and astronomy, their chemistry, botany, and mineralogy, until the mind of the pupil becomes a chaos; and, like the stomach when it is overloaded with a variety of food, it digests nothing, but converts the superabundant nutriment to poison. This mode of education answers one purpose—it enables people to seem learned; and seemingly, by a great many, is thought all sufficient. Thus we are schooled in quackery, and are early taught to regard showy and superficial attainments as most desirable. ... Young people are taught to use a variety of hard terms, which they understand but imperfectly—to repeat lessons which they are unable to apply—to astonish their grandmothers with a display of their parrot-like acquisitions; but their mental energies are clogged and torpified with a variety of learned lumber, most of which is discarded from the brain long before its possessor knows how to use it. This is the quackery of education. (pp. 4:289-290)

To avoid the “quackery” of education, the Board of Regents were to provide a more “utilitarian” education. Joseph Smith (1951) continued, “Education should always be of a purely practical character, for such, and such alone, is calculated to perfect the happiness and prosperity of our fellow-citizens” (pp. 4:290-291). The curriculum at the University of Nauvoo never awarded students an academic degree (although Orson Pratt was presented an honorary master of arts degree) before mobs forced them from the city. The efforts in Nauvoo, however, were not lost when the Saints left their city on the river. The influence of the school reached across the plains to the heart of the Rocky Mountains. Black (2009) wrote, “For the westward bound Latter-day Saints, the

University of Nauvoo had a long-lasting effect. The university became a reference point, an inspiration for future educational goals” (p. 202). Cannon (1993) also made a direct connection between two Utah universities and the University of Nauvoo. He wrote, “In the early years in Utah, the church founded two institutions of higher learning which were based on the University of Nauvoo. The University of Deseret... [and] Brigham Young University, formerly Brigham Young Academy” (p. 298). Cannon does not, however, even address the Church University which actually fit the model better than BYU. He failed to recognize the fact that the University of Deseret and the Church University followed the organizational model of community education through hierarchical institutions like Joseph Smith had organized in Nauvoo. The Church University was meant to oversee all other levels of education and was intended to become an institution of higher education almost a decade before BYA became BYU.

Following the model of Nauvoo education. Brigham Young ensured that the education model Joseph Smith established in Nauvoo continued in Utah. It was not just the administrative style that came west, but the utilitarian mission of schools as well.

When the Brigham Young College opened in Logan, President Brigham Young said,

About one-third the time of each student should be given to the institution in actual work on the farm, in dairies, or shops, for its maintenance. . . After graduation each student should be equipped free with a set of tools for his particular trade, a team and wagon, farming implements, made at the institution, about five hundred dollars worth, so he can start right out producing results.

(cited in Bennion, 1939, p. 158)

The model differed from the traditional education found in Europe at the time, which focused on the liberal arts. The Latter-day Saints, however, were not alone in thinking that education needed a more practical approach. In 1842, Francis Wayland,

President of Brown University, requested the faculty to expand its vision so that the curriculum would “fill the educational needs . . . of merchants, farmers, and manufactures” (Wayland, 1961, p. 334). Wayland envisioned classes offering a more practical approach in these areas of study.

Orson Spencer was another reason for the similarities between the University of Deseret and the University of Nauvoo. Orson Spencer joined the LDS Church in 1840 and moved to Nauvoo where he employed his educational background to assist the school system. He was appointed Chancellor of the Board of Regents and became a faculty member at the University of Nauvoo. Spencer and his family came west with the Latter-day Saints and he became the first Chancellor of the University of Deseret Board of Regents (Cannon, 1993). Orson Spencer served as the Chancellor until he was called to serve a mission. He never returned to Utah, as he died in the mission field. Orson Pratt, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles took his place.

Setting up the parent school. The University of Deseret was called the “Parent School” because, like its ancestral school in Nauvoo, it held an administrative responsibility over all the other schools in Utah. Almost immediately, the Board set to organizing common schools in various parts of the Territory. The University also educated older youth in high school subjects as well as trained future teachers. The role and responsibility of teacher training became a very important part of the educational debates for the next fifty years. Moffitt wrote, “An important objective of the University of Deseret was to incorporate a system of teacher education” (Moffitt, 1946, p. 13). Teacher training was important because in Utah, the University would set the standard for those teachers that would be teaching in the common schools throughout the Territory. Local newspapers emphasized teacher training, encouraging any who wished to teach to “be in attendance at this school, so that they may see and hear the right way,

and go and do likewise" (*Deseret News*, 1851, February 22). Another newspaper article declared,

The object of the Parent School is to qualify teachers for the District or Ward Schools, and then, for a higher order of schools . . . that there may be uniformity in the method of teaching throughout Deseret... We recommend every man who has any design ever to keep a school, to enter the parent school, and prosecute his studies in such a manner as to prepare him for his intended labors. (*Deseret News*, 1850, November 16)

The University of Deseret was established to set up the model of teaching and determine the standard for teaching throughout the Territory. As the administrative head, this was an obvious responsibility. The University of Deseret, however, would not endure long enough to fulfill that role. Instead, economics and survival forced an early demise to the school.

Closing the University of Deseret. In 1852 the Legislature closed the University of Deseret because it could not pay the appropriated \$5,000 per year. Perhaps the Territorial Legislature felt it was sufficient that the school had satisfied its most critical role in establishing common schools throughout the Territory. The school remained closed for fifteen years due to the lack of support from the community and legislature. The issue of funding public schools became the major point of controversy in the argument for "free schools" twenty years later shortly after the school reopened. The argument centered on the debate about who should fund the education of Utah's children. This argument really became a heated issue in the 1860s and 1870s and continued until the "Free School Act" of 1890 when public schools were guaranteed a tax base to finance their operation.

Regents stay active. Although the school was officially closed, the spirit of the University continued during this time of inactivity. The Regents were still appointed and spent most of their time in administrative roles for the common schools throughout the Territory. The men selected building sites, oversaw the hiring of teachers and selected the textbooks for the common schools throughout the Territory (Chamberlin, 1960). Some of their official activities as Regents offer evidence that there was little distinction, if any, made between their roles as religious leaders and civic leaders.

As Regents, they attended various church meetings and delivered sermons in local wards regarding parents' duties in relation to the education of the children. The first Board of Regents included William I. Appleby, John M. Bernhisel, Robert L. Campbell, Albert Carrington, William W. Phelps, Orson Pratt, Zerubbabel Snow, Elias Smith, Samuel W. Richards, Daniel Spencer, Daniel H. Wells and Hosea Stout. Many of these men held prominent positions in the Church while they served as Regents. Although some of the Regents held general positions of authority in the Church, they were visiting local wards under the auspices of the Board of Regents, not under the position they held in the Church at that time. Orson Pratt, for example, was a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Zerubabbel Snow was a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy. Daniel Spencer served as the Stake President during his time on the Board. Other men were called to fill important roles later in life. Albert Carrington, for example, was later called to fill a vacancy in the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Ralph Chamberlin (1960) believed this inevitably led to religion becoming a major part of educational curriculum in Utah. He wrote:

Since in Utah during the pioneer era the population was of one faith, the ablest men were leaders of the Church while they also filled the important posts in civic and political life. The Regents were men occupying high positions in the

Mormon Church. It was inevitable that the education in which they believed was one which combined with the common subjects of a general education instruction in religion and theology, and education which, while elevating the individual, would make him a more faithful and competent agent in the 'upbuilding of the Kingdom of God on earth.' (pp. 32-33)

The dual-role of churchman and educator eventually caused problems in Salt Lake City. Robert Campbell, for example, became the Territorial Superintendent of Schools and was berated without restraint by the *Salt Lake Tribune* for being Brigham Young's puppet and executing the Prophet's will (*Salt Lake Tribune*, 1873).

Teachers lack training. In spite of the educational efforts being made with common schools in Utah during the 1850s and 1860s, teacher training was not being funded. The lack of teacher training became obvious and a point of political debate (Chamberlin, 1960). Governor Brigham Young criticized the lack of teacher training throughout the territory in an address to the Legislature on December 11, 1855. He said, "In more than one instance we have known of persons being employed as teachers, who had no other qualification excepting that they were out of employ" (*Deseret News*, December 26, 1855). This was part of a push to get the Legislature to appropriate funds to reopen the Normal school for teacher training, but the attempt failed and teacher training continued to be neglected.

Territorial Superintendent of Schools Robert L. Campbell issued a plea for the Legislature to open a Normal School. In a report to the Legislature he wrote,

The Superintendent urges upon the Legislative Assembly the importance of establishing and maintaining a Normal School in which the youth of the Territory can be qualified for acting in the important sphere of school teacher. There is not anything connected with the educational interests of the Territory

which demands attention more than this. (*Journals of the Legislative Assembly*, 1869, p. 177)

This plea, however, would not be answered until 1970 when the Legislature decided to reopen the University of Deseret. The timing was significant because it was after the railroad had arrived in Utah and that significant event brought with it a major change to the demographics of the Utah territory. The isolation that the Latter-day Saints had enjoyed for so long had come to an end. Although non-Latter-day Saints had been settling in Utah for several years, the railroad marked the official end to the Church's isolation from the United States.

End of Latter-day Saint Isolation. The non-LDS faction of Utah—the group most often credited with combatting the influence of the Church in Salt Lake—migrated to Utah in larger numbers when the railroad was finished in 1869. Church matters could no longer be handled through the elected offices and the religious influence in public offices would not be tolerated. These non-Mormon settlers were not the only group that opposed LDS-influence in economic and educational issues. In 1866 the Territorial Legislature took over responsibility for the common schools and by 1868 the remaining authoritative privileges of the Board of Regents were basically abolished. These were attempts by the new federally appointed, non-Latter-day Saint governors and dissatisfied citizens in Salt Lake and other areas to establish free schools by separating the public school system from any tie that it might have had to the Church. This change was pivotal to the advancement of higher education and (Bennion, 1939, p. 145) teacher training in Utah because it allowed the Regents to focus on their responsibility at the university level rather than common schools.

Opposing Brigham Young and his religious approach to education. When the Latter-day Saints first arrived in Salt Lake Brigham Young did not find much

opposition. There were only the faithful that had chosen to follow him across the plains of Iowa, Nebraska and Wyoming. When Utah became a territory, Brigham Young was appointed the first territorial governor and as such, there was not another man in Utah that wielded as much power as the Prophet-Governor. He influenced everything in the new territory, and in the beginning, there was little concern because the demographic consisted almost entirely of faithful Latter-day Saints. As time passed, however, there were those that fell away from the faith and others that settled in Utah that did not share Brigham's theological views and they began to resent his powerful influence in the community.

Apostate Latter-day Saints became outspoken opponents to what they saw as President Brigham Young's theocratic rule of the territory (Chamberlin, 1960). These individuals began to voice their objections in the *Utah Magazine* and eventually the *Salt Lake Tribune*. More will be said about these two important publications in a later section. The apostates and the non-Latter-day Saints demanded a new educational plan for Utah stating that the Church had too much influence in the early system. The introduction of more and more citizens that supported a stronger separation of Church and State presented a problem for the way the Latter-day Saints had become accustomed to living in Utah during the first ten to fifteen years of their experience in the new Territory.

As long as the Mormons lived in comparative isolation they were free to make religion the core of their educational program. With the influx of the Gentiles into Utah beginning about 1860, legislation was demanded which prohibited sectarian instruction in the public schools. Furthermore, other churches, as early as 1867, began a crusade through free and well taught mission schools to reclaim young Mormons from the faith of their parents. These factors furnished an

urgent stimulus to the Saints to establish academies in as many settlements as their finances would permit.

At the time, there was not an effective school law in Utah to establish tax-funded public schools. There were a few schools that received some assistance from the Territorial Legislature and others scattered through various counties that were funded by some minimal form of taxation. These “district schools” were the focus of attention from time to time in the newspapers. Occasionally, the schools were held up as exemplary and a desired standard for a Territory wide mandatory law. Other times, however, those that opposed the Latter-day Saint influence in education, and really society in general, alleged that the Church was using the public schools to teach sectarian doctrines in the classroom.

Reviving the University of Deseret. By 1869, the Territorial Legislature had stripped the Board of Regents of their influence in the common schools. This became an important move for higher education in Utah because it provided an opportunity for them to focus on their responsibilities in that area. As such, the Board of Regents voted to reorganize and reopen the University of Deseret in 1869. John R. Park was selected to be the principal and he received annual salary of \$1,600 (Moffitt, 1946). According to Chamberlain (1960), “never did occasion and the man for it more happily meet” (p. 62). The *Deseret News* announced Dr. Park’s appointment and his intention to offer two courses of study: Normal and Collegiate. The Normal School offered courses in English, Mathematics, Commercial Business, and Natural Sciences. The purpose of this program was to prepare teachers for the classroom. The Collegiate courses included, in addition to the Normal School courses, “the German and French languages, the higher Mathematics, the Latin and Greek, with the Classics generally” (*Deseret News*, 1869,

March 5). Dr. Park introduced a more European style of education, departing from Brigham Young and Joseph Smith's utilitarian vision.

President Park and the University had to walk a very difficult line between "not Mormon," but "not infidel" so that the school might appeal to both groups in the valley. The perceived connections between the University of Deseret and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, however, continued to cause problems for the school over the next two decades. Who really held the reins of the school in Salt Lake: the Church or the State? One of the reasons for the suspicion was the name of the University. "Deseret" is a name that comes from the Book of Mormon and means "honey bee." It had been the suggested name of the Territory when the Saints first arrived in the Valley and the anticipated name of the State if Congress had accepted the first application for admission into the Union. Unfortunately, even though ties had been cut years earlier, the name associated the school with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints regardless of who was in control.

Eli Murray was appointed the Governor of Utah in 1880 by President Rutherford Hayes. Murray was openly anti-Mormon and, as such, supported the Liberal Party. In 1882, Governor Murray vetoed \$40,000 that had been appropriated to the University of Deseret by the Territorial Legislature for construction of a university building on Union Square. The construction had already started, based on the assumption that the Legislature would appropriate the needed funds. The actions of the governor, however, were unforeseen and construction had to stop. Murray then vetoed another \$15,000 that had been appropriated for eighty students in the Normal School. Two years later, the governor vetoed another legislative appropriation of \$50,000 meant to pay debts accrued by the University of Deseret and to finish the building that sat partially constructed. As a result, several classes had to be held in the unfinished University

Building. Another gubernatorial veto in 1886 denied an appropriation of \$60,000 (Chamberlin, 1960). Murray's vetoes totaled over \$160,000 from 1882 to 1886.

The perceived association with the Church, more in name than anything else, was a major reason for the vetoes. Of Governor Murray's three stated reasons for vetoing the appropriations, the second and third dealt with the Church's influence. Chamberlin (1960) recorded Governor Murray's explanation for his actions:

The Governor gave three reasons for his vetoes of appropriations to the University. The first, that the appropriation would carry the demands upon the Territorial treasury beyond the revenue provided by existing law... The second objection raised was that the University was a Mormon school in which, it was implied, the tenets of the Mormon Church were taught... The third reason given by the Governor for his veto was that the members of the Board of Regents had not been rightly appointed and that, therefore, their acts and the institution they governed were illegal. (pp. 124-125)

A new name. Finally, in 1892, Governor Arthur L. Thomas authorized a name change to break the perceived association. The change had been encouraged for several years in an attempt to associate the University with the territory and distance it from its religious founders. On February 17 the name of the University of Deseret was officially changed to the University of Utah (Chamberlin, 1960). Less than a month after the name change, the Church considered using the name "University of Deseret" for its own private university in Salt Lake (the Church University), but then decided against it (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938*).

Competing with other faiths in education. Across the United States a major change was taking place in public education. Much of it started with the battle between Catholic and Protestant citizens trying to work out what was appropriate for a public

school and what should be left to the Sunday meetings. What had once been non-sectarian, and non-offensive, to communities dominated by Protestants, seemed anti-Catholic and inappropriate. The use of the King James Version of the Bible, for example, was highly offensive to Catholic families, and the State of Ohio declared the practice of citing verses from any bible to be unconstitutional. Communities could not agree on a non-sectarian approach, and so schools were forced to take a secular approach.

Once non-sectarian education became non-religious education in the United States, and more specifically in Utah, the Church started its own academies and seminaries. Overall, the Latter-day Saints created more than forty schools throughout the Rocky Mountain region alone from 1875 to 1911. The exact number of schools is hard to pin down because so many of the existing records from wards are inconclusive regarding how many started and closed each year. These academies provided most of the education to many of the Mormon youth from 1875 to 1891 (Bennion, 1939). The Latter-day Saint academies were evidence that the inclusive educational philosophy that secular and theological training should be joined continued into the 1880s.

“By 1880, the campaign to establish ‘Christian’ schools was in full swing. From the scattered records available, it is evident that the Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and to a lesser extent the Episcopalians and the Baptists, poured money in relatively large sums into the enterprise” (Dwyer, 1971, p. 165). Protestant proselytizing efforts to convert the Latter-day Saints had been relatively unsuccessful in Utah. “[Protestants] believed that the teachers could get a foothold where the preacher would not be given a hearing” (Hood, 1905, p. 3). In 1873, St Mark’s school, which was started by the first Episcopalian missionaries in 1867, had one of the finest educational buildings in the Territory. The Catholics opened an academy called Saint Mary-of-the-Assumption on September 6, 1875. There were only nine or ten Catholic families in Salt

Lake, but nevertheless, after the first week the school had one hundred students and many of those were Latter-day Saint youth whose parents sent them there because of the improved educational opportunities. The fact that in many cases the schools were free made them even more attractive to Latter-day Saint parents (Dwyer, 1971). By 1884 there were almost 6,000 students attending 79 sectarian schools of non-Mormon denominations. The enrollment of Latter-day Saint youth in these schools caused concern for the leaders of the Church. William Berrett (1988) wrote,

These schools were portrayed as the wedge to pry Latter-day Saint youth from the faith of their parents. When the Latter-day Saint communities became aware of the real objective of the denominational schools, resentment arose; the breach between members and non-members became even more pronounced.

Nevertheless, thousands of Latter-day Saints continued to send their youth to these schools to take advantage of the superior free education. (p. 15)

It is apparent that the leaders of the church were right to worry. These schools were not simply aimed at providing a solid education to young, Latter-day Saint students in Utah. It was the same tactic that Protestants used in the east against the Catholics (Gordon, 2002). Apostle Moses Thatcher noted the similarities between the Catholic effort to educate young Catholics and the efforts of the Latter-day Saints. The *Daily Herald* reported the April 1892 general conference address of Elder Thatcher. They summarized his talk with these words:

[Elder Thatcher] desired to call to the fact that, in this respect [efforts to educate youth] the Latter-day Saints were not unlike the Roman Catholics throughout this nation. They paid taxes which the state legislature appropriated to various

states of the Union for the support of the state universities and schools. (*Daily Herald*, 1892, April 5)

The Catholic fight over schools in the East. When faced with the option of sending Catholic children to Protestant schools, Bishop John Hughes, from St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, said, "We will not send our children where they will be trained up without religion, lose respect for their parents and the faith of their fathers, and come out turning up their noses at the name of Catholic" (*School: The Story of American Public Education*, 2001, p. 36). The Catholics, however, were not being asked to send their children to schools that lacked religion. The schools were non-denominational, but still held a strong Protestant flavor, and that was what the Catholics opposed. Father Richard Shaw, a Catholic church historian, wrote, "Irish Catholic children were being expected to attend schools where ... textbooks and the entire slant of the teaching was very much anti-Irish and very much anti-Catholic" (*School: The Story of American Public Education*, 2001, p. 33).

Latter-day Saint response to other sectarian schools. The Latter-day Saints, like the Catholics, opposed the secularized attacks on their religion and recognized the danger that this type of education presented the youth of the Church. The efforts to persuade parents away from these new schools was printed in the *Deseret News* and shares a strong resemblance to the thoughts of leaders from the Catholic Church in other parts of the country. One Latter-day Saint leader wrote:

The latest schemes for the disintegration of the [Church] contains more of the elements of subtlety and craft than any that have preceded it. And, therefore, it is fraught with greater danger. It should be watched, exposed and counteracted! It is designed by the same persistent enemy—the Evil One, but comes in a skillfully planned disguise. Its voice is gentle and it is clad in sheep's clothing. But the wolf

is under the apparel of peace, all the same, and the object in view is destruction. What is it? This. The enticing away from the "Mormon" fold, of some of the tender lambs of the flock, who are guileless of evil and suspicionless [sic] of harm. And to accomplish it with consent and assistance of their dams and sires who are old enough and experienced enough to know better. Pulling the wool over their eyes is one of the main features of the plot... The means employed to effect this are schools... Now, the danger lies in this. That the object in view, as avowed by those persons in private conversations is the leading away of "Mormon" children into the bonds of sectarianism, and the most careful means are employed to accomplish this without startling the children or offending or opening the eyes of their deluded parents. (*Deseret News*, October 2, 1878)

Politicians applauded these religions for what they were trying to accomplish in Utah through the education system. It seemed like the whole country was out to get the Latter-day Saints and to end their period of peace in Utah. Education was not the only way to exercise influence over the Church. In fact, it was probably the least effective, because members of the Church had other options. That would not be the case with the political efforts to influence the Latter-day Saints in Utah.

Federal interference through politics. Politicians in Washington D.C., however, did more than just applaud those that funded the more typical non-Latter-day Saint sectarian schools in Utah. They took actions that led to more direct ways of interfering with the Church's influence in Utah. The federal government continually appointed politicians and judges that were not Latter-day Saints and not sympathetic to their efforts to build up Zion.

Opposition from non-Latter-day Saint officials. The effort control Utah through appointed positions was successful in the sense that leaders of the Church were no

longer able to influence the purse of the territory and a governor had power to veto anything that a Latter-day Saint back legislature might try to approve. The appointed positions overcame the massive majority the Latter-day Saints enjoyed in Utah. The 1880 census showed roughly 144,000 residing in the Utah Territory. Of those, 120,283 considered themselves Latter-day Saints. Regardless of being grossly outnumbered, the Liberal Party actually held a significant sway. In every elected office, the Liberal candidates were typically on the wrong side of one-sided contests. President John Taylor (1881), however, pointed out that even though only 10% of the citizens were not LDS, that same 10% of the population held “nearly every position of influence and emolument” (pp. 23:47-48). This was due to the fact that federally appointed positions nearly always went to non-LDS individuals. At times, these individuals were selected because of their outspoken opposition to the Latter-day Saints.

Federal officials used legislation to wrestle even more control of the Utah Territory out of the hands of Latter-day Saints, although—and likely because—they were such a strong majority. The *Salt Lake Tribune* described the battle as one “between two forms of government, theocratic and republican” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, August 2, 1883, p. 2). It was one of the tactics of the *Tribune* to draw attention to the influence that the Latter-day Saint leaders held in political matters such as education. Dwyer believed that Governor Stephen S. Harding actually instigated the 1862 bill that gave United States Marshals power to set up juries and that he did so specifically in order to hamper the influence of leaders in the courtrooms. The irony is that the federal government and those they appointed became guilty of the very thing they were accusing the Latter-day Saints of doing—interfering with government issues based on religious bias.

It was not uncommon for these federal appointees to create more problems for the members of the Church by tainting the view of those in Washington, D.C., against

them with outlandish or over-exaggerated stories of rebellion against the nation and its leaders. One example was Governor Harding, who was originally from Indiana.

Governor Harding wrote a letter to Frederick W. Seward, the United States Assistant Secretary of State, which included the following accusation:

I do not desire to create any unnecessary alarm, still, I deem it my duty to say to the President, that political matters in Utah are far from being quiet. There is that peculiar element of disloyalty and religious fanaticism, which would at first opportunity develop [sic] itself, and specially if it was believed that the Federal Government was powerless to inflict punishment. No individual, outside of this Territory, can form a true opinion of the state of society here. ... [Brigham Young] is aiming, if not at universal empire in this continent, at least, in this Territory... He is at this time manufacturing shells and solid shot, cartridges, and a new weapon, partly battle-ax, partly a lance, for what purpose may be readily imagined... That this man intends to strike, if the opportunity [sic] shall present itself favorable, is certain. ... To find a traitor at heart, you have only, with fewest exceptions, to find a Mormon. (cited in Dwyer, 1971)

News from Salt Lake reached national attention in one of a few types. Eastern newspapers placed sources in Utah to report on local happenings. Newspaper stories from Salt Lake itself were another source of information. Typically, those local sources were just as tainted against the Latter-day Saints as the federally appointed officials. This inaccurate source of dealings in Utah caused a problem with the federal funding for the Utah Territory. Federal funding was also one of the major issues in the fight for tax-based education. Decisions respecting federal appointees and funding of territorial needs would have been largely based on information gathered from these sources. The

result was that major funding decisions were based on inaccurate, slanderous, and misleading information and this created delays in receiving promised funds.

Brigham Young's problems with government. Brigham Young criticized the federal government for not keeping promises regarding land grants for schools and stated this as a reason citizens of Utah could not trust a government-funded school system. The United States Congress passed the Morrill Act in 1860 that, among other things, established a way for states and territories to set up land grant schools. In 1874, Brigham Young (1974) asked the Saints, "Has the Government given us the privilege of one acre of land to educate our children here? No. The school land is kept from us, and we get no benefit therefrom" (*Journal of Discourses*, p. 16:18).

Brigham Young also disliked the idea of giving the government control over decisions that could be made within the Territory. He told members of the Church at a General Conference in 1867,

I suppose it will not be long before they will want to dictate in some other places, and say how much shall be raised for schools and so forth; and I suppose it will be but a little while before some of those officious characters will determine the number of beans that brother Kimball and I shall have in our porridge, and whether they shall be white or black. (*Journal of Discourses*, p. 11:374)

These types of comments only provided more ammunition for those taking aim at his influence.

Eli Murray was appointed Governor in 1880 when President Hayes felt that the previous Governor had been too congenial with some of the Mormon leaders. Governor Murray would prove to be exactly what President Hayes expected: an enemy to the Latter-day Saints. "Duly installed in office, Governor Murray made no attempt to disguise his antipathy to all things Mormon, and correspondingly, his overt support of

the Liberal party” (Dwyer, 1971, p. 138). Like Harding, Governor Murray also expressed concern to Federal officers of an eminent threat of rebellion in Salt Lake by members of the Church. When Henry Collin, a deputy U.S. marshal, was shot, reportedly by a group of young Mormons, Governor Murray telegraphed President Cleveland, saying, “The Territory was on the brink of revolt and that martial law was imperative” (cited in Dwyer, 1971, p. 146). These attempts to stir up the national attitude against the Church, not to mention the previously stated vetoes related to the University of Deseret, eventually added to the turmoil that brought about the extremely severe legislation aimed at stopping the Latter-day Saint practice of polygamy.

Intervening in polygamy. Utah played a major role in the constitutional reshaping of the United States in the mid to late 1800s. The Republican Party tied polygamy to the issue of slavery and then nicknamed the two practices the “twin relics of barbarism.” The Party gained a political advantage over the pro-slavery Democrats from the South. The Democrats had to struggle to distance the practice of owning slaves from the practice of having more than one wife. For the Republicans, however, “It was far less controversial to condemn Mormon patriarchs in Congress than to condemn slave-owning patriarchs” (Gordon, 2002, p. 55). Christopher Clausen, an expert in the field of religion and culture, referred to the battle over polygamy in the Utah Territory as the “greatest struggle between tolerance and conformity to the majority’s mores” (Clausen, 2007, p. 26).

National officials, as well as Americans in general, were suspicious of the Mormons because of polygamy. Anti-polygamist novelists took advantage of the national sentiment in their attempts to sell books and make a profit. False accounts in the popular novels fanned the flames of suspicion regarding the behaviors and intentions of the Latter-day Saints in the minds of the leading political leaders. Many

portrayed polygamy as the ultimate challenge to the American way of life and warned that the practice could single-handedly “topple the whole structure” (Gordon, 2002, p. 40). Fictitious stories and novels were dictating the attitude and, ultimately, some decisions in the Congress. It would be the equivalent of the national leaders today making important decisions related to domestic policy on the content of certain newsstand papers known for their fictitious concoctions on the lives of current Hollywood stars or other important figures.

Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act. The first official legislation aimed the practice of polygamy was authored by Justin Morrill, a Congressman from Virginia. Morrill felt the practice of polygamy in Utah reduced women in status below the brute animal. He urged Congress to liberate women from that oppressive situation in Utah. Morrill sponsored the first important anti-polygamy law, the Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act. President Lincoln signed it into law in 1862 (Gordon, 2002). The Act was meant to “punish and prevent the Practice of Polygamy in the Territories of the United States and other Places, and disapproving and annulling certain Acts of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah” (United States, 1860, p. 501). The law also limited churches and non-profit organizations to \$50,000 of real estate in the territories. In spite of the law, President Lincoln did not give the bill the necessary support to enforce its policy. This changed in 1874.

George Reynolds, the private secretary to Brigham Young, was indicted for bigamy in 1875 under the Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act. He was sentenced to two years hard labor. He argued to the Supreme Court that his indictment should be overturned based on the fact that the belief in polygamy was a religious conviction. In writing the majority opinion for the Court, Chief Justice Waite distinguished the line between what a state can and can't do with regards to religion. “It is time enough for the rightful

purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order” (Gaustad, 1999). Waite added,

In these two sentences is found the true distinction between what properly belongs to the church and what to the state... Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice? ... So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government could exist only in name under such circumstances. (Reynolds v. United States, 1878)

Acts of 1882 and of 1887. Politicians increased the pressure on the Church in the 1880s. President Hayes visited Salt Lake City in September 1880 with his family. On December 6, President Hayes addressed the nation and gave a resounding rebuke of Mormonism. He asked Congress to reconstruct the government in the Territory of Utah and that any person who practiced or upheld polygamy be banned from holding public office, from acting as a juror, and from voting in public elections. President Hayes concluded his comments on Mormonism by saying, “If thorough measures are adopted, it is believed, within a few years the evils which now affect Utah will be eradicated, and the Territory will in good time be one of the most prosperous and attractive of the new States of the Union” (Richardson, p. 10:4458).

The United States Congress passed the Edmunds Act in 1882. Senator George F. Edmunds of Virginia authored the bill. The act made bigamous or unlawful cohabitation illegal. The Act also required that wives in polygamous relationships testify against their husband (Staver, 2004). Members felt that the law was applied only to the Latter-day Saints. Biographer Francis Gibbons recorded one account of U.S. officials breaking the letter of the law as set forth in the Edmunds Act but averting prosecution and the reaction of President Joseph F. Smith, then a member of the First Presidency living in Hawaii to avoid arrest under the more stringent legislation.

Joseph [F. Smith] had spent January 5 reading the December Deseret News, whose pages told the titillating story of the arrest of three prominent gentile officials, Samuel H. Lewis, assistant U.S. prosecuting attorney; Oscar C. Vandercook, deputy marshal; and C.E. Pearson, U.S. commissioner, who were charged with "lewd and lascivious cohabitation." The facts, as they unfolded in court, showed that the three officials had been found and arrested in a house of prostitution. The investigator who gathered the evidence was B. Y. Hampton, a member of the [LDS] Church. Haled before C. S. Zane, one who stood in the front rank of the gentile judges who rigidly applied the Edmunds Act against Mormon polygamists, the charges, filed against the embarrassed three under a city ordinance, were dismissed because, the judge ruled, their misconduct occurred secretly, and not openly, as he interpreted the ordinance to require. (Francis M. Gibbons, 1984, p. 154)

The Congress followed the Edmunds Act with another legislative action that intensified the assault. The Edmunds-Tucker Act of 1887 became law on February 19, 1887, without the signature of the President of the United States, Grover Cleveland. Until this time, the anti-polygamy legislation coming from Washington focused on the

individuals, and especially the men. Early anti-polygamy laws set Mormon women up as the victim. By the late 1880s Congress saw women as part of the problem and permitted federal agents to prosecute them. “Almost 200 women were indicted between 1887 and 1890” (Gordon, 2002, p. 181) under the Edmunds-Tucker Act, although very few of them were ever actually prosecuted.

The 1887 bill took a powerful swing at the Church as an entity. First, it enforced the provisions from the 1862 Morrill Act that prevented any non-profit organization from holding more than \$50,000 in real estate. Section thirteen of the Edmunds-Tucker Act allowed the Federal Government to “escheat to the United States Government the property of corporations” found in violation of the Morrill Act (*Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints v. United States*, 1890). It dissolved the corporation of the LDS Church and the Perpetual Emigration Fund and authorized the Federal Government to confiscate LDS Church property not used explicitly as a “church, parsonage, or burial ground” (Campbell, 1990, p. 168). Any funds seized by the government were required to be used for the territorial schools. Additionally, the legislation made the position of territorial superintendent of schools an appointed position rather than an elected one thus removing the power from the overwhelmingly LDS majority to elect someone of their choice. Prominent men in the Church had typically filled the position until this time. This provision insured that men free from the Church’s leash would receive the appointment from this time forward. The federal legislation became an overwhelming burden to the Church, but gave a boost to the public education system whose biggest concern was funding. The active pursuit of polygamists drove many of the most prominent men in the Church into hiding. John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, and Joseph F. Smith, just to name a few, fled Salt Lake City hiding in locations as close as Draper and Provo and as far away as Hawaii. It is

difficult to estimate how the loss of regular guidance from their leaders would have impacted the members of the Church.

The Edmunds-Tucker Act and Education in Utah. The Edmunds-Tucker Act was the final political blow that completed a major shift of power in the government of Utah. Education was explicitly affected by the anti-polygamy legislation. The bill gave the territorial governor the power to appoint all boards of trustees of all territorial institutions—including the University of Deseret. Once the power to appoint these key individuals was placed in the hands of non-Latter-day Saints those that openly opposed Brigham Young were given charge over the University of Deseret. This shift resulted in Robert Harkness, a non-Mormon, replacing Orson F. Whitney, as chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University. Orson F. Whitney became a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in 1906. The Edmunds-Tucker Act successfully removed whatever direct LDS influence that still persisted from public education in Utah. The Mormons that stayed on the board were not in accord with the Church leaders at the time (McBride, 1952). The act went so far as to abolish the office of Territorial Superintendent of District Schools, replacing it with an appointed commissioner empowered to “prohibit the use in any district school of any book of a sectarian character or otherwise unsuitable” (Buchanan, 1982, p. 441). Jeppson suggested that the Edmunds-Tucker Act was the step that eventually broke the Church’s influence on the University of Utah and provided for the eventual secularization of the school (Jeppson, 1973).

According to Frederick Buchanan, the elections regarding the Board of Regents, and other positions in the Utah educational system, were really a question as to “whether the ‘insiders’ or ‘outsiders’ should control school policies in Utah’s capital

city” (Buchanan, 1996, p. 1). This was the question that fueled the animosity over education when the Church decided to open the Church University.

Tax supported education started officially in 1890. “With a Liberal majority in control of the board, it should not be surprising that 89 of the 101 teachers hired in 1890 were non-Mormon” (Buchanan, 1996, p. 37). Earlier, in the history of Utah, non-Latter-day Saints complained that there was a religious test keeping non-Mormons from being hired in Utah. In 1890, there may have been the same test that evoked the opposite result—keeping the Mormon teachers from being hired in the new system. The Latter-day Saint community worried that the non-Mormon teachers would turn their children away from their faith in the Church, but the financial strain to operate its own system soon became overwhelming.

Battle for Statehood. Another critical piece to the contextual puzzle regarding the decision to close the Church University was the desire to attain statehood. The decision to close the Church University and support the state-funded University of Utah demonstrated to federal officials that the Church was no longer competing against the territorial educational system. At the time, most states entering the Union were asked to include statements guaranteeing public education in the new State's constitution. Until the 1890s, the Church's opposition to public schools had been evidence of separatist attitude and that caused the federal government concern about giving such individuals the powers that come with being a state, which will be set forth below. Citizens of the Utah Territory attempted to gain statehood multiple times starting in 1849 at the very first political convention held in Utah. Another Convention convened in March 1856, but the resulting petition for statehood was denied again. A third attempt to become a state was carried to Washington D.C. during the winter of 1860-1861, but that attempt met the same fate as the previous two. Finally, after several

other tries, Utah was admitted into the Union. The forces counteracting each other with regard to Utah statehood endured a major battle at both the national and the local levels (Whitney, 1908).

Fighting for or against Statehood. Not everyone wanted Utah to become a state. Orson F. Whitney (1908) provided his definitions of state government versus territorial governments in his book *The Making of a State*. He wrote,

A Territory differs from a State as childhood differs from manhood. One is dependent; the other, independent. In a State the people elect their own officers, and are therefore said to govern themselves. In a Territory the chief executive and judicial officers are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and are often strangers to the people among whom they are sent. (p. 46)

Therein lied the reason why Utah was not admitted after so many attempts to join the Union. The rest of the United States, the political leaders specifically, did not trust the citizens of Utah to govern itself appropriately. To admit Utah to the Union prematurely would likely prevent the nation from ever being able to stomp out the practice of polygamy. Those that fought against admitting Utah as a State were concerned that if Utah became a state it would become impossible to root out the Church's influence in political, economic, and educational issues. Eric Biber (2004) explained, "Because Utah had not yet become a state, Congress could leave it as a territory, with strict federal control over its internal affairs, until it had changed its ways." Once Utah became a State, Congress would lose the authority to appoint political, judicial, or educational figures in Utah. Biber continued,

Public pressure, particularly from Eastern Protestant churches, grew for federal officials to eliminate what Easterners perceived to be the barbaric practice of

polygamy from Utah; these churches also objected to what they saw as the hierarchical nature of the Mormon church, and its deep involvement in politics. A growing Gentile population in Utah also complained about the perceived suffocating hold the Mormon church had on the political, economic, and social life of the territory. (pp. 150-151)

Opponents to statehood from within Utah “argued that if given full self-government, the Mormon Church would completely control the state government, protect polygamy, and oppress its political and religious opponents” (p. 155). Biber (2004) also pointed out that “the plenary power of Congress over the territories meant that Congress could use legislation to suppress polygamy and even the Mormon Church itself” (p. 155).

Multiple attempts at statehood had resulted in repeated rejections from Congress, but not everyone in the territory wanted to become a state: at least not yet. In 1882, John T. Caine was elected to be the delegate to the Congress. He submitted yet another request for admission to the Union. The *Salt Lake Tribune* expressed its desire that the territory not become a state until the issues of polygamy and church political influence were settled.

All the Gentiles ask of you is that you give up these two baneful features of your creed—polygamy and church rule. They ask for it for your own sakes. Both are illegal, and both tend directly to woman’s dishonor and man’s degradation.

Were they abandoned, Utah would within a year, be a State. Is the request so unreasonable? (*The Salt Lake Tribune*, 1883, April 4, p. 4)

It was obvious why members of the Church tirelessly sought for admission to the Union and why opponents to the Church leadership equally fought to delay it.

Caine submitted another request in 1888, but it sat with the House for a full year without attention. When it finally reached the Committee on Territories, Franklin S. Richards testified that the Latter-day Saints were willing “to prohibit and punish polygamy” and that “no evidence can be offered that in Utah church and state are united, or that a hierarchy dominates civil affairs” (cited in Stout, 1967, pp. 1:344-345). It is clear from the testimony that citizens seeking statehood were well aware of the issues impeding them from attaining their goal. The bill, however, died with the House and would not be revisited again until 1893.

Adopting the Blaine Amendments. Congress had made it routine to encourage new additions to the Union to include provisions for public education in their constitutions. These statements were known as the Blaine Amendments. The interesting thing about the Blaine Amendments is that they may have been the most successful failed legislation of all time. In this controversial setting, Representative James G. Blaine from Maine proposed an amendment to the Constitution. President Ulysses S. Grant made the initial arguments for an amendment similar to Blaine’s proposal. In his final State of the Union address, President Grant called for an amendment “prohibiting the granting of any school funds, or school taxes, or any part thereof . . . for the benefit or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination” (Record, 1875, pp. 174-175). On December 14, 1875—just one week later—Representative Blaine proposed the amendment that read:

No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any

religious sect, nor shall any money so raised or lands so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations. (Record, 1875, p. 205)

As mentioned before, sectarian educational issues were issues with the Catholics and Protestants in the East. The non-sectarian public schools in the east attempted to use Christian principles without delving into the specific dogmas and creeds. They used the Protestant King James Version of the Bible in the classroom and taught the Christian principles with a Protestant slant. Catholics were very opposed to this practice. Similar to the Latter-day Saints, the Catholic Church started private parochial schools where students could be protected from the non-sectarian—but still Protestant—public schools. The Catholic Church began applying for tax dollars to fund the parochial schools and to fight the Protestant bias. In 1872, these efforts resulted in successfully removing the King James Bible from schools in Ohio. Anti-Catholic groups began to push for compulsory schooling laws to require all children to attend public schools. These groups also banded together to preserve the Protestant influence in the public schools.

Toby J. Heytens (2000) summarized the result of congressional discussions regarding the Blaine Amendments. He wrote, “Ultimately, the proposal fell short of the required two-thirds supermajority vote, with 28 members in favor, 16 opposed and 27 absent. It was almost a perfect party-line vote” (Heytens, 2000, p. 133). The failure to amend the Constitution was not, however, the end of the Blaine Amendments. As states, such as Utah, were admitted state constitutions included language very similar to the Blaine Amendments. “In fact, Congress required that several prospective states include such provisions in their constitutions as a condition for admission to the Union” (p. 134). The Blaine Amendments had a significant influence on the final bill that

brought Utah into the Union, and the decision to close the Church University may have been the evidence that the Church would comply.

Final hurdles to statehood. Another major obstacle that stood between Utah and statehood was the fact that Latter-day Saints had strongly favored the Democratic Party—largely because the Republican Party had been mostly responsible for the vicious attacks on the Church’s practice of polygamy. The move to statehood, however, had to navigate Republican waters. George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, both counselors in the First Presidency, aligned with the Republicans. George Q. Cannon believed that it was a lack of courage on the part of some Democrats that had cost Utah statehood in President Grover Cleveland’s first trip to the White House. Additionally, James S. Clarkson, a Republican from Iowa, helped the Church get loans that assisted with the rebuilding process following the federal government’s escheatment of Church properties and funds. President George Q. Cannon proposed the idea to dissolve the People’s Party in June, 1890. The People’s Party was the political party that garnered the support of most Latter-day Saint’s in Salt Lake and throughout the Utah Territory. It was neither Republican nor Democrat. It was Latter-day Saint. At the time of Cannon’s suggestion, it had become evident that the party would face of certain defeat in the local elections through what James Talmage referred to in his journal as the “criminal actions of their opponents” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, June 26, 1890). He referred to actions aimed at keeping Latter-day Saints from voting, including erasing names from voting registers and refusing to nationalize Latter-day Saints that had immigrated to Utah, and allowing individuals from other areas to vote in Salt Lake under falsified identities.

However, the majority in that 1890 meeting expressed the desire to maintain the People’s Party for the time. A major turning point in the push for statehood occurred just a year later when the People’s Party was dissolved on June 10, 1891 and members of

the party—mostly members of the Church—filed off to either the Republican or Democratic parties (Larson & Poll, 1989).

Throughout the battle for statehood, there was the underlying issue of education. Education was one of the areas that non-Latter-day Saints felt the Church exercised an illegal influence on the public issues. “Mormons from the 1850’s until the 1890’s had generally refused to support the public school system in Utah, because of concerns that a secular, territorial public school system would lead to non-Mormon control of the education system” (Biber, 2004, p. 153). As the Church began to participate in the public school system these fears were lessened, even though the academies continued to operate throughout the territory. This accommodation of the public education system, or at least the cessation of openly fighting against it, helped open the way for Congress to admit Utah to the Union. However, the timing of the decision to close the Church University is so interesting related to the vote that finally granted Utah statehood that it must be at least considered a possible factor in the Senate’s vote to approve the new state.

On December 13, 1893, the bill for statehood passed the House of Representatives with only five dissenting votes. The Senate then passed “Utah’s Enabling Act” in July, 1894, and President Cleveland signed the bill just a couple of days later on July 16, 1894. “When she joined the Union Utah was already more populous than five of her sister states. Of her people, eight out of ten were American-born and nearly nine out of ten were Latter-day Saints” (Larson & Poll, 1989, p. 397). The Enabling Act required that the State prohibit polygamy forever and provide a public school system free from influence of any sectarian group. The Church made changes to transform its relationship with the federal government in order to clear away the last of the obstacles to Utah’s statehood.

Summary

The rulings in *Reynolds* and *Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* created the bookends of a very important time for the Supreme Court and the history of the United States as a whole (Gordon, 2002). These rulings gave credence and finalized authority to the Legislative bills aimed at stopping polygamy. The disenfranchised status of the Church enhanced financial challenges of maintaining the private academies. The establishment of a general tax-funded public education system placed a double burden on families sending their children to a Church sponsored school. The national financial panic intensified this financial burden that, with all the other factors pressing upon the Church Board of Education, moved the leaders of the Church, and eventually the members of the Church, to accept what they considered to be a lesser form of education that separated secular and spiritual. Although this type of education does represent a deviation from the Church's epistemological stance, it may not necessarily signal a change in the epistemology itself.

Larson and Poll (1989) contend, "When Utah's star was added to the national flag on January 4, 1896, the new state was moving rapidly away from her pioneer beginnings toward the social, economic, and political diversity that would characterize her history in the twentieth century" (p. 387). The question is how deep was the transition. It was not necessary for Latter-day Saints to abandon deep-seated beliefs in order to recognize the need for accommodations in the new, national situation in Utah.

The Religious Battle of Words Through the Newspaper Wars

As the previous section explained, a major shift in demographics really altered the way that the Latter-day Saints wanted to operate in Utah. Initially, they had been very happy holding a monopoly on the political, economic, and social influence through their leaders. This condition, however, had to change as more and more people

moved to Utah that did not share the Latter-day Saint view on theology and therefore differed also in their view of social issues as well.

Major differences in new demographics. As more and more individuals moved to Salt Lake City in the late nineteenth century the strife began to accrue. Eventually the area became a hotbed of contention and mistrust. In the 1870's the local newspapers ignited the initial flames and then fanned the heated contention as the blaze grew to national intensity. Initially, "the religious, social, and economic life of the people was directed by an hierarchical order of priesthood that emanated from the higher councils of the church" (Moffitt, 1946, p. 31). Describing the animosity in Salt Lake between faithful Latter-day Saints and groups made up of apostates and non-Mormons could fill volumes and deals with issues of economics, politics, education, and religion. Each topic would require multiple works to adequately detail the intricacies of Salt Lake during the time period of interest. The purpose of this overview, therefore, is not to provide an in depth analysis of any given aspect. Rather, the following contains a broad overview of certain issues that complicated the educational environment in Salt Lake. This overview provides a snapshot of the complex environment surrounding the establishment of the Church University and its role during a pivotal moment in the history of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and Utah public education.

As time passed, changing demographics in Utah during the 1870s significantly influenced the status quo of Utah politics and the attempts to gain statehood. Federal attempts to stop polygamy were another major influence in the battle over education in Utah during the late 1800s. The doctrine and practice of polygamy itself will not be dealt with at any point in this work. The purpose of this review is to clearly demonstrate sufficient understanding of the context leading up to the 1890s when the Church opened and closed the Church University.

Establishing the views on the frontier. Each of the many papers in Salt Lake City during the late nineteenth century chose a side and played a role in stirring the contentious pot of controversy. It was the nature of selling papers. Alter (1938) described the typical early newspaper editor in Utah. “[An editor] usually considered himself a weakling if he did not stand positively and aggressively for or against something, monitoring the thoughts and actions of the community with the dignity and severity of a Dictator” (p. 9). Leukel (2001) wrote, “*The Wave* [the community paper in the area during the late nineteenth century] not only informs on perspective of religion and education in Provo Valley [today’s Heber Valley] just before the turn of the century, but may actually have had a role in shaping that perspective” (pp. 214-215).

The *Tribune* adequately summarized the self-assumed role of any newspaper during the era:

Americans are a newspaper reading people, and it is impossible to exaggerate the influence of the press as one of the great educational forces. Thousands of men immersed in business, from year to year, never ... look into a book, but a part of each day is . . . devoted to reading the newspaper... No true American can pass the day without consulting a newspaper—even though poverty compel him to borrow his neighbor’s. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, Nov. 12, 1882, p. 3)

When the members of the Church settled in the territory of Utah there were no other settlers in the area. As a result, the Latter-day Saints set up shop and their religion became a major part of the society and nobody was concerned because it was exactly what they had been looking for: a Zion-like society. As time passed on, the Church’s authority strengthened. The inclusive pattern of the Church to assert its influence in public matters as well as spiritual caused very little concern for most people in the

territory. There were those, however, that did not agree with the Church's unmatched and unchecked control over economic and social issues.

Influencing economic issues. If the leaders of the Church had limited themselves to commenting on and directing the affairs of the Sunday worship there would have likely been much less controversy. When the Church arrived in Salt Lake, however, because there was no other influence, Brigham Young and other Church leaders stepped into significant social roles in addition to their religious functions. As a result, President Young became Governor Young and began creating and passing laws that affected economic and social policy throughout the territory. When the people adhere to the Latter-day Saint theology, there is no problem in such a situation. Settlers came to Utah that held other theological beliefs and others in the community strayed from the Church. These individuals began to see a conflict of interests as legislation that they felt was theologically tainted made its way to the legislature. Brigham Young's influence in the Church made it difficult for any member of the Church to disagree with him and, according to agitators, this was not democratic or American.

The Mormons established a theocracy in which the state and church were unified with the church predominating. Democratic institutions were mere forms as the hierarchical church was the only effective political organization, and it excluded non-Mormons. In economic life, Mormon cooperative institutions were enormously successful, but they represented a challenge to the prevailing free-market ethos and also excluded non-Mormons. Finally, and not least important, the Mormons were energetic missionaries, effectively proselytizing and organizing in the United States and Europe and winning recruits, many of whom emigrated to Utah. This missionary activity both challenged Western liberal

civilization on its own ground and promised growth and larger power for the Mormons in Utah. (Campbell, 1990, p. 167)

Historians, like Bruce A. Campbell, have attributed the increasing hostility and tension to the growing number of non-Mormons living in Salt Lake and surrounding areas. John Moffitt (1946), for example, pointed out that non-LDS “newcomers were unwilling to subject their children’s educational welfare [in general] to the existing influence of the Church leaders” (p. 51). The railroad and the non-Latter-day Saints migration to Utah may mark the official end of isolation for the church, but it was not the beginning of opposition to the political influence of the Church in Salt Lake City.

Finding internal opposition. The opposition in Utah was not, as some researchers have suggested, all from the outside. There were those already living in Salt Lake City that opposed Brigham Young’s encroachment in political issues, and many of them were members of the Church. This group consisted of apostates that had left the Church and remained in Salt Lake City for business or family reasons. These men and women, along with settlers of other faiths, insisted that the influence of Brigham Young be constrained to the religious affairs specifically associated with the worship of Latter-day Saints. As a result, a major tension developed in Salt Lake City over economics, education, and almost anything else that was not explicitly related to the spiritual experience of the Latter-day Saints. Unfortunately, it has been too easy for some researchers to simply write off the conflict as Latter-day Saints versus non-Latter-day Saints.

The conflict, however, was not present in every Utah community. In Heber Valley, for example, just thirty or forty miles from Salt Lake, members of the Church and non-members worked together in their “brotherhood” of the community. William Aird, a Heber resident and member of the Church, left the Church in the 1860’s when

the First Presidency asked him to take a second wife. The Aird's could not accept the practice and were baptized into the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. William was baptized in 1874 and his wife followed him into the waters of a new faith in 1877. Their sons, Henry and John, became very influential as an educator and doctor in Heber although they carried the stigma of *Gentile*.

What polarized the groups in Salt Lake when apostates and members in Heber seemed to get along? Like all social issues, this is a complex issue. One possible factor may be how long Church leaders in Salt Lake tried to keep secular and spiritual unified. For these men, there were no separate categories for religion, politics, education, economics, and entertainment. Life was not made up of temporal and spiritual things for the Latter-day Saints. According to Leukel (2001), Heber Valley residents accepted a separation of secular and spiritual as early as the 1860s.

The role of newspapers. The tug-of-war over how much religion and religious leaders should influence Monday through Saturday led to slanderous statements and extreme exaggerations regarding the lack of moral fiber of those that opposed Brigham Young and the basic intelligence of those that supported him. But why would such animosity between the two groups exist in Salt Lake City and not in Heber Valley just 45 miles away? The weapon of choice during this time period was words and the vehicle was almost always the newspapers and the pulpits. Salt Lake City featured something that Heber Valley did not: an antagonistic newspaper that openly contradicted the edicts of the Church leaders. Heber Valley residents were not forced to decide between two newspapers whose editorials and articles carried such a strong slant in favor of or so decidedly against the leaders of the Church. There were several newspapers in Salt Lake that participated in the back and forth over the years, but two

specifically became the most prominent in the feud: *The Salt Lake Tribune* and *The Deseret Evening News*.

Church infringements on the territory. Early in the history of the Territory, when Brigham Young served as the governor, the members of the Church found themselves in a difficult situation. Brigham Young the Governor was also Brigham Young the Prophet. Bennion (1939) suggested that this combination of offices made political disagreement almost impossible for Latter-day Saints with regards to any policy or practice in the school system because contradicting Governor Young could have been interpreted as contradicting Prophet Young. The problem did not go away when Brigham Young was replaced as Governor. Although he was not the governor, Young preached on matters that to individuals in the community were very temporal in nature and unrelated to the business of the Church, such as how the members of the Church ought to carry out business ventures and how they should vote on political or economic issues. "As in many, if not most, American cities in the nineteenth century, Salt Lake City used party ballots rather than secret ballots, so church leaders, if they wished could keep tabs on who voted for whom and what" (Alexander & Allen, 1984, pp. 49-50). As a result, members of the Church definitely felt the pressure to follow the Prophet's counsel in political, economic and educational issues. President Young was, without question, the most influential individual in Utah, and his heavy involvement with social issues caused problems for those that did not belong to the Church as well as those that wished to leave the Mormon Church without leaving Utah. It was impossible at the time for such individuals to participate in any normal social or political event without bumping into the authority of Brigham Young and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

This major influence was even felt in the schools, which cause great concern for the parents that did not want their children under the tutelage of someone bent by the Latter-day Saint view. Esplin (2011) wrote:

Church leaders acted as economic and societal gatekeepers, influencing settlement patterns, private enterprise, and political thought. Their influence extended into education—public in name because the schools served the general populace but private in practice since ecclesiastical leaders held keys to the joint church and schoolhouse doors and hired the teachers. From the smallest school in Utah’s rural south to the largest school in Salt Lake City, all public education in Utah was Mormon. (p. 87)

Godbe, Harrison, and Tullidge come together. Three dissatisfied members of the Church became the genesis of the anti-Mormon voice in the community: William S. Godbe, Elias Harrison, and Edward Tullidge. The *Salt Lake Tribune* became the flash point for many contentious battles in the valley over the next several decades. William Godbe had been a close friend to Brigham Young. According to the *Salt Lake Herald*, Brigham Young was quoted as saying on more than one occasion, “I loved William S. Godbe” (*Salt Lake Herald*, 1902, p. 8). The two, however, did not see eye to eye in political and economic arenas. These differences, are significant to the background of the Church University because they eventually led to the newspaper wars between the *Tribune* and *Deseret News*, which were the vehicles used in the vicious exchanges over “free schools” and who should control public education.

Beginning of the problems with Godbe. Many of the problems between Brigham Young and William Godbe started in 1863. Young called Godbe and three other Latter-day Saint businessmen to his office. President Young hoped to form an alliance between Latter-day Saint businesses that would eventually force the non-LDS businesses out of

the valley. According to President Young's plan, Latter-day Saint owned business would lower their costs to a point that non-Latter-day Saint owned businesses could not compete. Members would be encouraged to only purchase from those businesses that were a part of the alliance, or co-op. William Godbe had responded positively to previous assignments from the Prophet, this time, however, he refused (Walker, 2009).

Six months later Brigham made another proposal to the same group. This time he planned to eliminate non-LDS merchants that took Utah grains to the Montana mines. Although the records of the meeting portray the group of merchants as indifferent, the proposal was eventually accepted and Godbe became one the directors (*Documentary History of the Church*, pp. March 3, 1866, 1170). Ron Walker (2009) suggested that the indifference was "likely [because] the merchants felt that Young was once more meddling with economic affairs that were best left to them" (p. 41).

Brigham Young eventually started the mercantile co-op to manage prices in Salt Lake in the mid-1860s. He believed the association of Latter-day Saint businesses would force merchants to maintain a reasonable profit margin and drive uncompromising merchants out of business. Church leaders encouraged Latter-day Saints to refuse shopping in those businesses that did not belong to the co-op. His efforts were viewed by many to be biased against those of other faiths. Brigham Young, however, felt like it was simply aimed at any merchant, regardless of religious preference, that maintained wickedly high profit margins at the expense of struggling settlers. In April 1869, Brigham Young explained his rationale for the effort. "It gives to the people ease and money. They are not obliged to run a mile or two through the mud to buy a yard of ribbon, they have it in their own Ward, and they can purchase it twenty or thirty percent cheaper than they ever could before" (Ball, 1999, p. 1:559). According to Godbe (1871), this was one more step by which Brigham Young "transformed a religion that

abounded with spiritual manifestations, to a materialistic theocracy, terribly practical and essentially Mosaic in all its characteristics” (p. 406). Godbe railed against this practice, as well as other politically motivated actions by the Prophet, in an address he delivered in London in 1871. He saw it as the monopolization of the Utah Territory.

The effect of all this upon the people is oppression. Brigham’s right to ‘dictate’ them is emphatically and constantly asserted, even to the minutest detail of daily life—not only matters of faith, but also as to their belief about ‘cooperation’—a commercial scheme that literally monopolises [sic] the trade of the territory, and other matters connected with Brigham’s temporal policy. In a word, a more complete theocratic despotism it is difficult to conceive, for the organisation [sic] of the Mormon Church is as perfect as can well be imagined. (Godbe, 1871, p. 406)

Another controversial economic issue during this period was mining. “During the first twenty years of Utah’s development, [Brigham Young’s] policy favored the yeoman farmer . . . Young stoutly opposed mining, which, he feared, would attract to Utah a hostile population of outsiders” (R. A. Walker, 2009, pp. 4-5). Colonel Patrick Connor, of the United States Army and established Camp Douglas on the east bench of Salt Lake in 1862, also believed that mining had the potential to bring non-Latter-day Saints to the valley. He encouraged his men to mine for precious materials in the hills surrounding the valley (E. L. Lyman, 1986). He anticipated that a major gold rush in Utah would draw enough non-Mormons to counteract the established majority at the ballot box (Alexander & Allen, 1984). Notwithstanding the best efforts of the *Deseret News* to assure people that there was no gold in Utah, a mild gold rush took place in 1864. Connor’s dreams of neutralizing the Latter-day Saint influence, however, never materialized.

Combining forces against Brigham Young. Elias Harrison and Edward Tullidge also felt that President Young overstepped his ecclesiastic bounds when he entered the realm of economics and politics. They, however, had other reasons for opposing President Young. They were likely still upset from the failure of *Peep O'Day*. The *Peep* was their initial attempt to start a periodical in Salt Lake City. They initially tried to have the *Deseret News* publish their magazine, but they were turned away. The men had to align themselves with the non-LDS *Vedette* to print their magazine at Camp Douglas in 1864. It was assumed that Brigham Young did not approve the magazine for publication and that is was the reason why the *Deseret News* turned them down. Harrison and Tullidge felt like that decision cursed the magazine to failure because it would come from the non-Latter-day Saint press (McLaws, 1971). The magazine only printed six issues, but the experience was important because of the relationship that would form from its ashes.

This failure actually brought Tullidge and Harrison into league with Godbe. Tullidge and Harrison sought Godbe out to be the financial backer for a new magazine: *The Utah Magazine*. Godbe, although still young, had become very wealthy. In 1860, William Godbe was in the top 5 percent of the wealthiest individuals in Utah. Over the next decade, "Godbe's income was the seventh largest in the territory and his net value approached a third of a million dollars" (R. A. Walker, 2009, p. 40). And so the threesome came together through circumstances that many have interpreted as consequences to Brigham Young's actions. Although the three men may have had strong feelings against President Young, they did not openly reveal those feelings at first.

Seeking alternatives to their faith. Elias Harrison and William Godbe leave Salt Lake for New York in 1868. This trip will forever change their standing in the

community and the Church. Harrison and Godbe had reportedly gone to New York for business, but Ron Walker (2009) believed the men possibly had another purpose in going east. He suggested that Harrison and Godbe went to New York to seek out Charles Foster. Charles Foster was renowned throughout the world for his abilities to perform séances and communicate with the unseen world. He had performed for France's Louis Napoleon, the duke of Wellington, Lord Tennyson, Abraham Lincoln, and Andrew Johnson. Foster was from Salem, Massachusetts, from a "family gifted in 'seeing spirit'" (p. 116). Harrison and Godbe did not collectively or individually record what they experienced while in New York. Second-hand accounts from their friends and associates, however, fill in the gaps as to what happened.

In the midst of their spiritual turmoil, Godbe and Harrison were comforted by the voice of deceased Church leader Heber C. Kimball, who allegedly confirmed their doubts in Mormonism. Kimball had been the first counselor to Brigham Young and had died just four months before this experience in New York. Others reportedly spoke to Harrison and Godbe through Foster including Joseph Smith, Peter, James, John the Beloved, Solomon and even Jesus Christ. According to Godbe's 1871 address, they learned that "Joseph Smith, the founder of [the Mormon Church], was not, as is generally supposed, an impostor, but a spiritual medium" (Godbe, 1871, p. 406). According to Godbe, Joseph Smith allowed himself to be called a prophet, seer and revelator simply because he was associated with the Bible and did not know what other title to take upon himself.

The séances in New York continued for the next three weeks as the men learned "higher doctrines prevailing beyond the veil," and "the laws governing the science of revelation, the facts of another life, and the philosophy or doctrine which should govern the Church of Zion" (Godbe, 1871, pp. 406-407). The manner of the interviews was

usually question and answer. Harrison would write the questions during the day while Godbe was purchasing supplies for his business in Salt Lake, and then the two would go to Foster's salon and the questions would be answered. The spirits disliked Brigham Young, did not care for the Mormon Zion in Salt Lake, told the men not to trust ancient or modern scripture, and taught them that Joseph Smith was actually a spiritual medium "whose revelations, understandably, were inferior to the 'new light' now being given" (Walker, 2009, p. 119). Ultimately, the spirits of Joseph Smith and Jesus Christ charged the men to redeem Zion and those living there. The men were instructed, however, that, for the time being, they were to remain publicly supportive of Brigham Young and other leaders of the Church.

Their experience with Foster became a spiritual turning point that led to monumental changes in Salt Lake. In response to the lack of faith they had in Brigham Young, they turned to spiritualism as an alternative religious experience. "Mr. Harrison was pained to realise [sic] that the system to which he had devoted the best part of his life was not the beautiful ideal his own mind had projected, but a religious despotism destitute of spiritual life, and the inveterate foe of free thought" (Godbe, 1871, p. 406). Godbe claimed that it was their "faith in the religion" that gave them courage to stand against President Young.

Spiritualism held many parallels to Mormonism and offered explanations for the incredible experiences the men had as converts and missionaries in England (R. A. Walker, 2009). The trip to New York eased the tension that Harrison and Godbe experienced dealing with the conflict between emerging intellectual ideas and the faith in Mormonism they had developed when they were in England. Again, Godbe's (1871) own words best describe their feelings:

In the autumn of 1868 the lifelong desire of our souls for tangible, conclusive evidence of a future life was fully met. We then became the happy recipients of a spiritual experience of no ordinary character... it is proper to say that from that time we had a heavenly-appointed mission to help to free the Mormon people from their bondage—to emancipate them from that chief of all soul-dwarfing dogmas, divine authority in the form of erring man. To a few of our most intimate friends only did we unburden our souls, who, without exception, have been true to their trust. (p. 406)

The men returned to Salt Lake and began their attempts to bring about a social revolution from the inside.

Speeding up the reform. United States Vice President Schuyler Colfax visited Salt Lake and met with Godbe, Harrison, and others that were in opposition to President Young and the Church's public influence. The group discussed the possibility of another military episode similar to twelve years earlier with Johnson's Army. Godbe and Harrison convinced Colfax to allow the tide of revolution to cleanse Utah from the inside out. The Vice President virtually forced the men to go public with their attempt at redeeming Zion from the inside earlier than they had planned with his talk of military force (Tullidge, 1886). Colfax promised William Godbe and Elias Harrison that he would delay the military action and, in addition, promised that the men would have federal support to accomplish their designs. Over the next two decades that support included important federally appointed positions going to men that supported the move to strip Brigham of his secular influence (Walker, 2009).

The *Utah Magazine* was the first attempt at the emancipation effort. Godbe said, "We gave them the rich, ripe corn of spiritual truth instead of the husks of a Mosaic theology upon which they had so long been fed, rendered fearfully practical by a

dictatorial priesthood” (Godbe, 1871, p. 406). The movement sought to bring about religious revolution through intellectualizing and educating those in Salt Lake who had been, according to Godbe and his group, misled by Brigham Young. Godbe and Harrison viewed themselves as helping the people of Salt Lake see the ‘higher truths’ that they themselves had received in New York. Godbe asserted,

We did not wish to antagonize them or anybody else or to come out broadly and attack their belief—their religion, but rather to influence them by reason to induce them to see as we did. Their allegiance to the priesthood was of course their fatal error and we were desirous of having them see as we saw. (cited in Walker, 2009, p. 4)

There were two political parties in Utah. Those that supported the Church leaders in political issues, were known as the People's Party. On the other hand, those that opposed Church leadership formed the Liberal Party and referred to themselves as Liberals. The lines were drawn, so to speak, and the war for secular influence was underway. Godbe and his group published articles in the *Utah Magazine* that openly contradicted Brigham Young and his economic visions for Utah. Harrison (1869), for example, praised the early days of the Church when he was a missionary as well as the past efforts to evangelize and grow the spiritual kingdom that had been started by Joseph Smith. He then accused Brigham Young of turning the Church away from its spiritualistic past through his despotic leadership, being focused so much on material things. “We were founding a kingdom whose glory was not the wealth of its people, the extent of their farms, or the elegance of their homes, but the fire of the Omnipotent spirit and the presence and influence of the great ones of the invisible worlds” (Harrison, 1869, pp. 390-391).

Edward Tullidge called for a new age of intellectualism in Salt Lake. He declared that the days of the Lord declaring His will through one man were gone and that the time for “the best intellects of all humanity” to receive the direction for the community had arrived (cited in R. A. Walker, 2009). Editorials also attacked President Young’s restrictive views on mining in the territory. According to Godbe’s account, President Young considered the editors’ desire to mine the “most damning of heresies” because it represented an open and public challenge to his declared direction (Godbe, 1871). William Shearman (1869) wrote, “How long will it take us to learn that [human] nature needs encouraging and developing instead of guiding or crushing” (Shearman, 1869, p. 391). Shearman accused Church leaders of using force and coercion to accomplish their goals in Salt Lake.

Acting against the apostates. Brigham Young called an arraignment before the School of the Prophets in Salt Lake, to consider the Church membership of those involved with the *Utah Magazine*. According to Walker (2009), Wilford Woodruff conducted the questioning of William Godbe. His first question was blunt and to the point. “Do you believe that President Young has the right to dictate to you in all things, temporal and spiritual?” (p. 8). Godbe’s response was careful and calculated. Walker wrote that

[Godbe said] he had followed Young’s business advice in the past—sometimes against his own judgment—and matters had turned out badly. On theological questions, Godbe said he was no more sure of the president’s leadership. Rather than depend on the counsel of a single man for all of God’s people, Godbe believed that a better guide might be found in ‘the light of God in each individual soul.’ (cited in Walker, 2009, p. 8)

Godbe's testimony was vague enough to have escaped excommunication. That escape, however, was no longer available following Harrison's turn to comment. Harrison's response sparked a wildfire in Salt Lake City. Walker (2009) referred to Harrison as the "intellectual and spiritual force" behind the New Movement. Harrison's moment on the stand was one of the "few times since Young had assumed office twenty-five years earlier that he had heard such open accusation" (p. 9) Walker wrote that Harrison turned to face the Prophet as he made the accusations. Although his words are not recorded, Tullidge described the scene following Harrison's speech. Those in the audience, according to Tullidge, were to the point of anger and that "at a word from their chief they would have driven the bold heretic from their synagogue" (Walker, 2009, p. 9).

Brigham Young announced that a church court would be held in two days for William Godbe and Elias Harrison and then requested that those elders in attendance quit subscribing to the *Utah Magazine*. Most consented, however, there were those that would not abandon the publication. Brigham requested that those desiring to patronize the magazine forfeit their tickets to the School of the Prophets. William Godbe, Elias Harrison, Henry Lawrence, Fred T. Perris, Eli B. Kelsey, Edward W. Tullidge, and John Tullidge gave up their tickets and started down a road that would provide a journalistic confrontation spanning many decades.

Launching the Salt Lake Tribune. The "journalistic triumvirate," as O. N. Malmquist (1971) referred to Godbe, Harrison, and Tullidge, abandoned their efforts in the magazine industry and launched *The Mormon Tribune*, a weekly newspaper, on January 1, 1870. They quickly realized that the name created some inhibition on the part of non-Mormon readers, so one year later the trio announced their intention to create a daily newspaper. *The Salt Lake Daily Tribune and Utah Mining Gazette* (later

changed to *The Salt Lake Daily Tribune* and finally the *Salt Lake Tribune*) started printing on April 15, 1871. Initially the paper intended to “know no such distinctions as Mormon or gentile,” but to “oppose all ecclesiastical interference in civil or legislative matters” (Malmquist, 1971, p. 18). Godbe credited the paper with giving birth to free thought in the Territory and stated that it stood for “mental liberty, social development, and spiritual progress” (Godbe, 1871, pp. 406-407).

These three men had the means and the desire to create a new Mormonism that focused more on the spiritual and allowed the political and economic side of Utah to others. They now had the means to openly contradict the Church leaders and their economic and political meddling. Others gathered around the new standard and the *Tribune* was successful. The fact that it is still in print today is evidence of its success in these early days. While Harrison and Godbe saw their role as opposing what they saw as the Church’s attempt to “monopolize” the society in Utah, the *Tribune* did not remain so focused. As the paper changed hands, subsequent managing editors saw that to remain legitimate they opposition of Brigham Young and the Church of Jesus Christ would have to go far beyond anything that the original owners ever imagined.

Growing under new management. The triumvirate was only kindling for the raging flames that would eventually catch in the newspaper battles during the latter part of the nineteenth century. The real sources for the gloves-off fistfight of words were Oscar G. Sawyer, Fred Lockley, George F. Prescott, and A. M. Hamilton. Sawyer was initially hired as editor-in-chief. He gained his newspaper and journalist experience at the *New York Herald* and identified the Mormon practice of polygamy as a topic that would generate sales as well as national interest. He created discord among the three original owners of the paper with his attacks on the Mormon practice. Ownership eventually changed hands, and Fred T. Perris became the general manager of the

Tribune. He stepped down in 1873 and Lockley, Prescott, and Hamilton took the reins. Tullidge (1886) wrote, “Mr. Fred. Lockley... gave the marked and pungent anti-Mormon character to the *Salt Lake Tribune*, for which it has become famous in the Gentile mind, and infamous in the Mormon mind” (Tullidge, 1886, p. Appendix: 13).

The new owners took a stronger stance against the Mormon Church in order to succeed. Over the next several decades, the *Tribune* became critical of every aspect of the Mormon culture, policy, practice and doctrine. They attacked tithing, polygamy, Brigham Young’s personal life, educational ideology, and more. “To the publishers of *The Tribune* during the 1873-1883 decade, objectivity was a vice not to be tolerated in news columns, editorials or correspondence from readers. The news columns and correspondence were frequently more opinionated than the editorials” (Malmquist, 1971, p. 41).

The *Evanston Wyoming Daily Age* described the *Tribune*: “The paper now has a respectable circulation among the liberal Mormons, notwithstanding the heavy blows it is dealing the Mormons of the Church, and denouncing in unmeasured terms the action of the Mormon rulers” (August 29, 1874). Others also saw the paper as the voice for those that opposed ecclesiastic interference in the politics of Salt Lake City. Captain John Codman, a non-Mormon who spent four summers in Utah, told the *New York Times* that certain reports regarding a Mormon uprising in 1876 were the fabrication of gentiles seeking office and their mouthpiece, the *Salt Lake Tribune*, provided solely for other newspapers in the country to print (*New York Times*, October 1, 1877).

Papers that countered the *Tribune*. McLaws (1971) wrote, “Whenever an anti-Mormon paper appeared, a third paper would pick up the challenge the *News* most often chose to ignore” (p. 208). When Kirk Anderson, a former Missouri newspaperman, started *Valley Tan*, in 1858, he was the first real competition for the

Deseret News. The *News*, however, ignored *Valley Tan* not even mentioning its first or last paper or any topic addressed by the Gentile paper. As a result of the *Valley Tan*'s attacks on the Church, a third newspaper, *The Mountaineer*, was started. This new paper was owned and edited by members of the Church and they ardently fought against the claims of the *Tan*. Similar to the *Mountaineer*, the *Herald* took up the battle of the press and allowed the *News* to keep its nose clean, so to speak, with regards to the *Salt Lake Tribune*.

Reviewing the history of the *Deseret News*. The antithesis of the *Tribune* was the *Deseret News*. Tullidge described this paper as the “apostolic exponent of the Mormon community” (Tullidge, 1886, p. Appendix: 14). The *Deseret News* started printing June 15, 1850, on a Ramage hand press that W. W. Phelps purchased in Boston in 1847. The press did not actually publish its first paper until 1850 because it spent almost three years in Winter Quarters (now Council Bluffs, Iowa). The expressed motto of the paper was “Truth and Liberty.” In 1867 it added a daily newspaper to its weekly and semi-weekly papers. Four of the first six editors of this paper eventually held a position in the First Presidency of the Church. Willard Richards, Albert Carrington, George Q. Cannon, and Charles W. Penrose each took turn at the helm of the Church’s paper as well as spending time in the Church’s presiding presidency. Carrington, Cannon and Penrose spent thirty-four years combined overseeing the paper. This leadership is a clear explanation to the paper’s unwavering support of President Young and his policies.

One early challenge the *Deseret News* faced was the difficulty in gathering news to publish. Missionaries from around the world would send in news, along with other information exchanges that were set up with other newspapers, but information traveled slowly to Utah, and especially slowly during the winter months (McLaws, 1971). Willard Richards, the first editor, wrote, “News, very scarce at this season of the

year, all foreign news frozen" (*Deseret News*, December 28, 1850). The mail delivery from the United States Government was unreliable. One shipment of mail was nine months late (*Deseret News*, September 12, 1855). The *Pony Express* solved many of these problems when it came to the Territory in 1860 (Alter, 1938).

There were many newspapers in Salt Lake City that opened only to close a short time later. The mortality rate of newspapers in Utah during the nineteenth century approached 90 percent (Alter, 1938). Regardless of this high rate of failure, "the *Deseret News* was never in any real danger of having to close" (McLaws, 1971, p. 59). This was attributed to the fact that the Church was never going to go without its paper. The paper was used to distribute not only the news, but also religious sermons and historical articles on the Church and especially the life of Joseph Smith. Some bishops even permitted the newspaper to be delivered on Sunday during their church meetings (Alter, 1938). For these reasons, the *Deseret News* was called the "Mormon Hand Organ." Heber C. Kimball(1857) commented, "To the people of Utah [*The Deseret News*] is almost invaluable, for in it appear the History of Joseph Smith, the public counsels and teachings of the First Presidency, the Twelve and others at head quarters" (*Journal of Discourses*, 1974, p. 4:293). In 1891, the *Deseret News* stated reasons Latter-day Saints should subscribe to its paper. "It is the authorized medium through which the views, wishes, and instructions are given to the Saints," and "it may be depended upon as advocating the right side of every question proper for public journals to treat upon" (Why the *Deseret News* Should Be Subscribed for in Preference to Any Other Paper, 1891).

Understanding the Herald's unique role. The *Salt Lake Herald* also played an important role in the newspaper wars. William C. Dunbar was the business manager and Edward Sloan was the editor of the *Salt Lake Daily Telegraph* when it was moved to

Ogden in 1870. Sloan and Dunbar believed that there was still a need for a “secular paper” in Salt Lake City, so they purchased the type and press from the *Telegraph* and started publishing their paper in June 1870 (Alter, 1938). The *Herald* was important because it was free to respond in ways that were not practiced by the *Deseret News*. Brigham Young told Thomas L. Kane “it was the policy of the *News* generally to exclude from its pages ‘agitating topics’ . . . that treating subjects of this kind in detail would attract unwarranted attention to issues best left alone” (cited in McLaws, 1971, p. 180).

Alter (1938) suggested that it was the *Herald* that was willing to respond in ways that the *Deseret News* may have found inappropriate for a paper that represented the leadership of the Church. Malmquist referred to the *Herald*’s role as “the eye-gouging in-fighting” (Malmquist, 1971, p. 42). The *Deseret News* was more delicate with its rebuttals—at least initially—speaking in generalities. Brigham Young’s criticism of those writing about Utah in the 1870’s, for example, accused authors of books and newspapers of seeking profits, even at the expense of truth. He said, “What the real circumstances lack they are sharp enough to furnish from their fertile brains” (*Deseret News*, June 27, 1871, p. 2). Notice the care used to avoid pointing fingers at any specific newspapers or authors. This care may be attributed to the fact that there were too many authors to specify individuals, but it also followed the *Deseret News*’ initial pattern for carefully worded editorials.

War of words over education. One example of how the newspapers carried out their part of the battle is in the court case involving a teacher at a district school, Herbert Van Dam. The *Christian Union* accused the district school of using funds raised through taxes for pay for “Mormon” projects and using the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants as readers. The *Deseret News* responded, “We do not know of a district school in the Territory—there certainly is not one in this city—where the books named

are used as textbooks, or enter into the course of instruction given" (*Deseret News*, January 23, 1884).

The suspicion that the Church was introducing doctrine through Latter-day Saint teachers who had gone to the Normal school at the Brigham Young Academy in Provo, led some individuals to file a lawsuit. Judge Charles S. Zane heard the case. Judge Zane was appointed to Utah in 1884 and served as the Third District Judge and as a member of the State Supreme Court. He was known for his harsh treatment of those convicted of polygamy until the First Presidency issued the Manifesto, at which time he softened his position. The *Deseret Weekly News* said of him, "We know that Judge Zane is a good lawyer and . . . he usually renders sound decisions when they do not relate to the polygamy question, on which we regard him as somewhat of a fanatic" (*Deseret Weekly News*, December 28, 1889). He dismissed the *Christian Union* case because the evidence failed to establish that there had been a breach in appropriate instruction at the school. He did not believe that the teacher, Herbert Van Dam, had taught sectarian principles (Alexander, 1966).

When other churches from the East provided teachers and schools to educate, and proselyte, the young Latter-day Saints, The *Salt Lake Tribune* praised the beneficiaries. The Gentile newspaper deplored the lack of a tax-funded, and therefore government controlled, school system in Utah. The paper placed the blame for the poor school system on "the obstinacy and obstructiveness [sic] of our divinely inspired hierarchy [leadership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints]" (*Salt Lake Tribune*, May 25, 1876). In another article, the *Tribune* editors excitedly announced the arrival of fourteen new teachers from the East. The teachers were dispersed throughout the Territory and opened ten new schools in their assigned locations. "These [ten schools], with the twelve schools already flourishing under the same auspices, make a

commencement which is a fearful menace to the system which prevails in Utah" (*Salt Lake Tribune*, September 17, 1880).

These types of editorial commentaries led to an antagonistic culture where Church leaders placed enormous emphasis on a private education system. A private education system would be free from intrusions by apostates and non-Latter-day Saints trying to dictate curriculum and teacher expectations. Additionally, it provided a counter to the attempts of other faiths to lure the Latter-day students away from the Church's doctrinal tenets. This mutual antagonism created an environment of mistrust on both sides. The result was controversial, and often heated exchange in the largest newspapers of the area. These exchanges often surrounded the issue of education, and more specifically, a non-sectarian, tax-funded education system, referred to in the newspapers as "free schools."

James C. Malin (1942) said about the contention in Kansas during the 1850's, In so bitter a controversy as the Kansas troubles, there is no such thing as the ideal of abstract, absolute truth. Each faction, or even each individual, had a measure of truth on his side, because truth was relative and was conditioned by the interests and position each occupied in the world in which he lived. (p. 32)

This comment adequately describes the battle over education in Utah during the 1870's and 1880's. The newspapers and legislative reports make it very clear that both sides were in favor of education and the welfare of the youth in Utah.

The History of the Church University

Amid all of the contention over education during the 1870's and 1880's, the Church started its own academy system. Brigham Young's vision that started the academy system led to the effort to organize the Church's first private school for higher education that would compete with the leading institutions from the East and save the

youth in Utah from having to travel East for university studies. The previous sections briefly explained the overall history of education in Utah and detailed the contention that newspapers stirred up regarding the Free School movement. The Church University sprang from these beds of fertile ground.

In order to follow the study, it is important to remember that the history of The Church University is often confused and inaccurately intermingled with another Church school in the 1890's. It has been common for historians to confuse The Church University with the LDS College (formerly Salt Lake Stake Academy). Even the Church's own institute manual, *Church History in the Fulness of Times*, seems can be misleading when describing the genesis of the Salt Lake Academy. This manual names the Salt Lake Stake Academy as the third of three academies arranged for by Brigham Young (Church Educational System, 2000). This school was actually started by President John Taylor and was not started on the property in Salt Lake that Brigham Young had deeded for the academy in Salt Lake (Quinn, 1973).

There are several reasons for this mistaken identity. First, the Church University itself was known by at least four different names during its short career: Brigham Young Academy of Salt Lake, Young University, The University of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the Church University (Quinn, 1973).

Second, the Salt Lake Academy changed its name to LDS College just months before the official announcement of the Church University (*Deseret Weekly News*, May 25, 1889). The sudden appearance of the name "LDS College" just before the announcement of a new university in the newspapers and other records may account for some confusion. Finally, the two schools actually shared a campus for the short time that the Church University was in operation. To clarify the mistakes of the past it will be

helpful to identify the roots, birth, and operation of The Church University and finally make a clear distinction between the two different schools.

Brigham Young's vision of Church academies. Brigham Young was determined to see education among the Latter-day Saints in Utah succeed in an extra-ordinary way. The effort to set up the University of Deseret as the "Parent School" over all other schools in the Territory to teach non-sectarian (which really just meant non-denominational Christian) principles was failing because of a national trend to remove all religious teachings from its public classrooms. President Young battled against free, tax-funded public schools largely because he mistrusted federal government officials and because he saw significant limitations on what could be taught in a publicly managed school system. It seems like discussions surrounding religion in the classroom have always existed. The 1800's set the stage for a shift away from the old approach of teaching Christian morals and ethics in the classroom. Prior to this national shift, the discussion revolved around the goal of teaching values rooted in Christianity but abstaining from entering specific religious contexts or dogmas. "Instruction in specific doctrine and dogma would be left to the family, the pulpit, and the Sabbath school" (Yudof, Kirp, & Levin, 1992, p. 146).

Deeding the three properties. As schools across the nation removed the Bible from their curriculum, Brigham Young insisted that the members of the Church would never comply (Church Educational System, 2000). The pressure and limitations placed on publically funded schools, however, forced President Young to consider alternative methods in order to continue a religious influence within the school itself. In the years preceding his death, Brigham Young set up the foundation for that alternative. He endowed three pieces of property to the Church for the explicit purpose of starting private schools (or academies) in Provo, Salt Lake, and Logan. He endowed the Provo

property in 1875, Salt Lake in 1876, and Logan in 1877. The schools in Provo and Logan started almost immediately. The school in Salt Lake City, on the other hand, was still not established by the time Brigham Young died (Quinn, 1973).

After his death, the establishment of the school in Salt Lake City was delayed nearly to the point of being forgotten. One possible explanation for the delay with the Brigham Young Academy in Salt Lake was the controversy surrounding Brigham Young's estate. Five of the seven Trustees for the Salt Lake property were Brigham Young's sons and that may have left the impression that the property was not intended to actually leave the Young family. Leaving the question as to who was actually responsible for establishing the school. The personal situation of members of the Board may have also caused some delay.

George Reynolds was imprisoned from June 1879 to January 20, 1881, because of his plural marriages. Ernest L. Young died four days following the settlement of his father's estate, and his brother Willard left Salt Lake City in 1879 to become an instructor at West Point Military Academy. (Quinn, 1973, p. 71)

Willard Young's absence, may have been the most detrimental to the actualization of Brigham Young's vision of an Academy in Salt Lake City. Over time it became very apparent that Willard Young was more engaged in bringing about his father's initiative in Salt Lake than were the other members of the Board of Trustees for the property.

Willard Young and his father's dream for Salt Lake. In 1883, Willard Young began pushing for his father's wishes to be fulfilled in Salt Lake. He hoped to see a school in Salt Lake similar to those already operating in Provo and Logan. Quinn (1973) wrote, "The history of Young University and the Church University is inseparable from Willard Young, who was the prime mover in its establishment" (Quinn, 1973, p. 71).

Willard Young seemed to always have been motivated by a desire to see his father's vision realized in Salt Lake City. Twenty-five years after Brigham Young established the Board of Trustees in Salt Lake, Willard Young continued to express this desire. The Church University Board of Trustees met in 1901 to discuss the possibility of transferring the property in the Eighteenth Ward to the LDS College. Willard Young made a statement that provides significant insight to his motivations of the previous twenty years with regard to the establishment of a school in Salt Lake City. He participated in the meeting by way of a letter because he could not be in Salt Lake when the meeting took place. He wrote,

Naturally, I feel a very great desire that the 18th Ward Block shall be reserved for the purpose for which father dedicated it. As you know, I have no objections to deeding the property to the Latter-day Saints College, on conditions that it shall be held for church school purposes; but I do not want it deeded to the Latter-day Saints College in order that it shall be sold to raise funds, unless such action is recommended and approved by the First Presidency. (Willard Young, personal communication, May 28, 1901)

Willard Young was concerned that his fathers' wishes be realized, as he doggedly attempted to see that some institution of learning be established within Salt Lake City. Even five years after the close of the Church University, Willard's concern for his father's aspirations is evident, formidable, and commendable.

Willard Young's journal includes several entries touching on the proposed Brigham Young Academy in Salt Lake. On September 10, Willard spoke with John W. Young, his brother, about the matter. Then on September 14, he sought out John Cummons to discuss the topic. The Board of Trustees of the Brigham Young Academy

(Salt Lake) met on September 15, 1883, and they decided to move forward, if possible, with creating a school as per the desires of the late Brigham Young (W. Young, 1893).

Maeser and the Salt Lake Stake Academy. Nothing materialized at that time, however, and Willard returned to West Point in the winter of 1883. Meanwhile, William Dougall and Karl Maeser suggested an academy in Salt Lake and President John Taylor approved the Salt Lake Stake Academy in 1886 in spite of having rejected Willard Young's proposal to move on the desires of Brigham Young to establish a school in the city. There does not seem to be any explanation for why President Taylor did not take action on Willard Young's efforts and then moved forward on another academy in the same city just a short time later. Quinn (1973) suggested that President Taylor may not have been completely comfortable with the image of all the academies being named after Brigham Young and being so closely tied to his family. He suggested that the only difference between Willard Young's proposal and Maeser's was that the Salt Lake Stake Academy "would not bear Brigham Young's name, be connected to his estate, or be controlled by his heirs" (Quinn, 1973, p. 75).

There was another difference, which may have been, in President Taylor's mind, a rather significant distinction: Karl Maeser. Willard Young was an excellent man and devoted to his father's dream, but he was also tied to the military. Karl, on the other hand, had been invested in Utah education since arriving in Salt Lake City. Brother Maeser had already organized a successful Academy in Provo. Brigham Young appointed Maeser to the assignment of starting the BYA in Provo. His previous participation and success in the Utah education may have inspired President Taylor with more confidence than Willard Young, with Willard's divided loyalties at the time, and the remainder of the trustees, whom had not done anything towards establishing the school in the Eighteenth Ward without Willard Young's prodding.

Regardless of the reason for President Taylor's actions, the result was a disheartened group of trustees. In September 1883, the trustees voted to sell the property and donate the proceeds to the BYA in Provo (W. Young, 1893, September 22). In spite of all his efforts to get some momentum for a new BYA in Salt Lake, Willard Young had to leave Salt Lake without any great help or hope of getting the school started. At the end of 1883, the military called Willard Young to report to Oregon.

Establishing private education. In 1886, the First Presidency, under John Taylor's leadership, issued a request that the Latter-day Saints begin establishing schools where the youth could receive education based on the basic principles of the Latter-day Saint theology.

It is pleasing to notice the increased feeling of anxiety on the part of the Saints to have their children educated in schools where the doctrines of the Gospel and the precious records which God has given us can be taught and read. Our children should be indoctrinated in the principles of the Gospel from their earliest childhood. They should be made familiar with the contents of the Bible, the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. These should be their chief text books, and everything should be done to establish and promote in their hearts genuine faith in God, in His Gospel and its ordinances, and in His works. But under our common school system this is not possible. In no direction can we invest the means God has given us to better advantage than in the training of our children in the principles of righteousness and in laying the foundation in their hearts of that pure faith which is restored to the earth. We would like to see schools of this character, independent of the District School system, started in all places where it is possible. (Clark, 1965, pp. 3:86-87)

Appointment of a new chairman. Following the death of President Taylor, Wilford Woodruff took the reins of the Church as the President of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles as well as the head of the Church Board of Education. In 1888, President Woodruff issued another plea for the Latter-day Saints to take the education of their children more serious by ensuring both appropriate settings and appropriate curriculum. President Woodruff believed that every child should have the benefit of the holistic educational experience that blended the secular and the spiritual. To deprive a child of that education placed the faith of that child in jeopardy. He said,

We feel that the time has arrived when the proper education of our children should be taken in hand by us as a people. Religious training is practically excluded from the District Schools. The perusal of books that we value as divine records is forbidden. Our children, if left to the training they receive in these schools, will grow up entirely ignorant of those principles of salvation for which the Latter-day Saints have made so many sacrifices. To permit this condition of things to exist among us would be criminal. The desire is universally expressed by all thinking people in the Church that we should have schools where the Bible, the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants can be used as textbooks, and where the principles of our religion may form a part of the teaching of the schools. (Clark, 1965, p. 3:168)

Searching for the "parent" school. According to the previous model of education in Nauvoo and the early days in Salt Lake City, President Woodruff and the Board of Education became desirous to identify one academy as the academic and administrative head of the Church School system. The effort to establish the University of Deseret as that school failed. As a school, the University of Deseret would not be able to use religious textbooks or teach religious principles because of its ties to the territorial

legislature. This was had to be an integral part of whatever school was selected as the head of all others. Latter-day Saints saw this as the ideal form of education. It is clear that, at least at this point in the history of the Church, the leaders were unwilling to even accommodate an educational system that compartmentalized education separating the religious from everything else. This attitude, however, slowly changed over time.

The Salt Lake Stake Academy's bid. For a time, there was an effort to make the Salt Lake Stake Academy the head of all Normal Schools in the church system. This effort to establish a hierarchy in the Church school system created dissention among other schools such as the Brigham Young Academy, which had been preparing teachers since the fall of 1876. This change would make the school the administrative head of all church-operated schools in Utah. At a Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Meeting Karl G. Maeser, the General Superintendent of the Church School System, pushed for making the Salt Lake Stake Academy (later LDS College) the center of all Church education and raising the level of instruction at that institution to a level that would alleviate the desire of the youth in Utah to travel east for schooling (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, March 21, 1889). In essence, he was encouraging the Church Board of Education and the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education to turn the Salt Lake Stake Academy into the Church's first private university.

In May of 1889, the name of the Academy was changed to LDS College because, among other reasons, the *Deseret News* reported,

[The LDS College is] intended, in course of time, to make the Latter-day Saints' institution in this Stake the chief or central one of its class in the Territory. Hence, in view of the position into which it will ultimately develop, the title college is deemed more appropriate than academy, while the prefix "Latter-day Saints,"

gives it a distinctive character, in keeping with its genius. (*Deseret Weekly News*, 1889, May 25)

In multiple journal entries during May 1890, James E. Talmage, principal of the LDS College, mentioned conversations with general authorities regarding the anticipated future of the LDS College. He had been told that the leaders of the Church intended to build a “commodious building as soon as possible and then to place the College on a higher plane” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, May 1). The only remaining issue: obtaining a site for the building. President Woodruff had written to Willard Young as early as 1888 inquiring about the possibility of using the property deeded for an academy in the Eighteenth Ward for the Salt Lake Stake Academy (Woodruff, 1888). This move seems to have been along the lines of what Karl Maeser and James Talmage anticipated for the academy. James Talmage projected that the 1890-1891 school year would be the last in its current location. He speculated, and maybe even hoped, that the city could condemn the Social Hall property in order to widen the alley behind it to the width of a normal street. The faculty met to discuss temporary alternatives while they waited for more permanent options to be made available (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933).

Talmage’s speculation that the City Council might condemn the Social Hall and require it to be torn down materialized and the Salt Lake Board of Trustees found themselves scrambling to find somewhere to hold classes. They had discussed the idea of sharing the meetinghouse where the Fourteenth Ward met on Sundays, however, several individuals on the Board expressed opposition to that idea (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, August 7, 1890). On June 29, 1891—almost a year after the Board learned they would need a new home—Mrs. H. Ellerbeck informed the Salt Lake Stake Board that she would sell a piece of property in Salt Lake for \$25,000 (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, June 29, 1891). Over the course of several meetings, her

property was decided to be the most desirable and on August 12, 1891, the Board of Education agreed to pay \$10,000 within sixty days of receiving the property and the remaining \$15,000 was due three years later (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, August 12, 1891). This purchase was significant because the property would eventually become the home of the Church University as well.

The decision to start a new institution. The movement to advance the LDS College, however, was short lived. The First Presidency seemed to have other ideas for higher education in Utah. Another option that they had considered, it appears, was an entirely new institution that would be set a top all other Church schools, including the LDS College. The First Presidency wrote Willard Young another letter in 1889 requesting that he leave the military and return to oversee the creation of a “University or other establishment of learning, in advance of any now in existence in our midst” (Woodruff, personal communication, May 1, 1890). Whatever the initial thoughts were regarding Willard Young or the LDS College, eventually the plan evolved to have Willard Young and the other trustees of the Eighteenth Ward property oversee a new school according to Brigham Young’s deed. It would be the Church’s first attempt at a private university. Brigham Young left a provision in the deed for this particular property that the LDS canon was to be the text for the curriculum. The deed also specifically prohibited the use of any book that spoke in a derogatory manner about Jesus Christ, Joseph Smith, or the principles of the gospel as taught by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (*Deed of Transfer: Brigham Young to David O. Calder et al.*, 1876). As a private school, the teachers would be free to carry out the stipulations in the deed for the property in the Eighteenth Ward.

Establishment of a new board for the Salt Lake property. The deed was transferred from the original trustees to a new Board of Trustees over what was initially

called Young University. The new Board was made up of 26 individuals: nine of Brigham Young's descendants and seventeen others including the First Presidency. The group met on June 1, 1891, and the organization of the school was announced the very next day in the *Deseret Weekly News*.

A few weeks later a *Millennial Star* article also announced the organization of "Young University." The article explained to the public that the school was to be built on the two and a half acre lot in the Eighteenth Ward that Brigham Young had originally deeded for an academy. The purpose of the school was to provide an "institution of learning for both sexes, with all the powers and accessories essential and fitting a university of high standard" (Young University, 1891). Captain Willard Young was named the president and President George Q. Cannon was the original chairman of the board of trustees. Other officers included George Reynolds, secretary; H. S. Young, treasurer; Wilford Woodruff, chairman of the finance committee; Joseph F. Smith, chairman of the committee on the by-laws.

The full Board of Trustees included the following individuals: John W. Young, Hyrum S. Young, Willard Young, Joseph D. C. Young, George Reynolds, LeGrande Young, Richard W. Young, Wilford Woodruff, Karl G. Maeser, George Q. Cannon, Orson F. Whitney, Joseph F. Smith, Spencer Clawson, Lorenzo Snow, Moses Thatcher, James E. Talmage, James Sharp, Francis Lyman, Thomas W. Jennings, John Henry Smith, Heber J. Grant, Abraham H. Cannon, Maria Y. Dougall, and Priscilla P. Jennings. Notice that a majority of these individuals are either descendants of Brigham Young or members of the First Presidency or Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.

Dreaming big for the new school. The vision for the University was grand. According to the announcement, the school would eventually include art galleries, institutes, gymnasiums, colleges, academies, museums, libraries and laboratories. The

anticipated curriculum included “science, literature, art, mechanical pursuits, *and in the principles of the Gospel as taught by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints [italics added]*” (Young University, 1891). The chief goal for the school was to help students become “worthy citizens and true followers of Jesus Christ” (Young University, 1891).

At the first meeting of the new Board of Trustees of Young University, the members were given their assignments. George Q. Cannon was designated the Chairman of the Board, George Reynolds was nominated as the Secretary, and Willard Young was nominated to be the president of the new University. The members were then divided into the following committees: Finance, Buildings, and By-Laws. Some of the members sat on more than one committee. James Talmage, for example sat on the Buildings Committee and the By-Laws Committee. The Board approved Willard Young’s salary at \$250 a month (*Minutes of the Board of Trustess of Young University, 1891*).

Although the new Board of Trustees had a deed to property in the Eighteenth Ward, there was no building on the property. That became the first and most important piece of business. At the next Board meeting on June 9, the Trustees decided to build on the southeast corner of the lot first. Spencer Clawson made a motion to allow Captain Willard Young to identify an architect for the construction of the University building. The motion carried unanimously (*Minutes of the Board of Trustess of Young University, 1891*). It seems that the First Presidency had every intention of assuring the success of Young University. In a letter to Willard Young they wrote, “If the Supreme Court of the United States will only decide on the question of church property, so that the Presidency can know what our powers are in such matters and what we can rely upon,

the Church would donate liberally towards the erection of the building” (Woodruff, personal communication, May 1, 1890).

A building for the property. Willard Young went to work finding a suitable architect. He contacted the American Institute of Architects, “asking for a recommendation of a highly qualified architect” (Quinn, 1973, p. 78). Willard Young made inquiry regarding a suitable architect and was directed to Bruce Price, a well-known architect from New York. Willard Young contacted Price by letter explaining the potential construction. Price wrote,

I should be most willing to undertake the work you propose in your favor of the 28th. inst. for the Young University. The scheme is very comprehensive and capable of splendid architectural results without extravagance, and I should enter upon the work with the greatest of interest. (Bruce Price, personal communication, June 29, 1891)

Price requested 3.5% of the expected cost of the building as his charge. Willard reported Price’s response to the Board on July 7 at the next Board meeting. The Board expressed its desire to see the construction on the University buildings be “first class” (*Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Young University*, 1891, July 7). The initial agreements in place, Price provided Willard Young with drawings, which were then presented to the Board of Trustees. The Board approved the plans and expressed strong feelings that the University needed to reflect well on the Church and represent the type of school that would eventually lead the nation in educational efforts of all branches.

James E. Talmage to assist Willard Young. For the first six months, Willard Young was the only member of the Board that was working full-time towards the organization of the University. The next critical step was the selection of a qualified individual to assist Willard Young in the organization and eventually the operation of the University.

James E. Talmage was selected for the position. The decision to appoint Talmage to that position would become extremely pivotal as time passed. Talmage was a very popular and respected individual within educational circles. Quinn (1973) wrote,

In a meeting of the General Church Board of Education on that date, James E. Talmage was appointed to serve on a committee with Willard Young to take ‘immediate steps’ to commence the school. ... The choice of James E. Talmage as co-founder was an important one for Young University because of Talmage’s eminence as a Utah educator and his unswerving determination to establish the university. (p. 79)

James Talmage had been serving as the principal/ president of the Salt Lake Academy since 1888. On December 30, 1891, a member of the General Board of Education informed Brother Talmage that he and Willard Young had been appointed to carry out the Church’s intention to start Young University. According to the minutes of the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education, the purpose of releasing Talmage was to set him over the scientific department at the new Church University (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, January 6, 1892*). Talmage was released from his duties at LDS College so that he and Willard Young could focus on getting the new university started. The Board of Education expressed their gratitude to James for his work while serving as principal at Salt Lake Stake Academy /LDS College and sent him onto his new assignment “with their blessing” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, January 9, 1892*). Willard Done replaced Talmage as principal of the LDS College on January 11, 1892 (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933).

Changing the name and the plans. On March 3, 1892, Willard Young made a very significant proposal to the General Board of Education. He suggested “that the Church found the contemplated university instead of the heirs of President Brigham Young”

(*General Board of Education Minutes*, 1892). This move placed the Young University under the control of the First Presidency rather than the Board of Trustees of the original deed. Thus, when Wilford Woodruff met with Professor Kingsbury in January 1894, the decision to accept or reject to proposed compromise rested with the leading Quorums of the Church rather than the Board of Trustees. In addition to this decision, the General Board of Education desired a name that would identify the school with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. They did not feel like Young University accomplished that purpose. In fact, for a short time the Board considered naming the Church University “The University of Deseret,” that name having been abandoned by the state school in favor of the new title “University of Utah” less than one month earlier. However, “as that name did not tell anything and the name ‘Young University’ not telling, it was therefore decided to call [the school] the ‘University of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints’” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, 1888-1938, March 10, 1892).

Once the name was decided on, President Woodruff assigned Willard Young and James Talmage to express the desire of the General Board of Education that the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education consider changing the name of the LDS College to Young Academy. James Talmage delivered the message to the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education on March 10. The Board rejected the request and continued with the name LDS College.

Sharing the property with the LDS College. As mentioned above, the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education was preparing to move the LDS College to the Ellerbeck property and had contracted an architect, at the suggestion of the General Board of Education, to remodel an existing building on the property in order to fit it for classes. Although Willard Young was conversing with an architect regarding the design and

construction of a building on the Eighteenth Ward property, progress was slow and the Board of Trustees and the Board of Education wanted to move forward.

The Salt Lake Stake and the General Church Board of Education met together in President Woodruff's office on June 27, 1892. There were two items on the agenda. First, the men considered the financial struggles of LDS College and next, they deliberated the possibility of erecting a building on the Ellerbeck property for the Church University. President Abraham Cannon, President of the Salt Lake Stake and Chairman of the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education, was in favor of the idea to sharing a campus with the Church University.

In a breakout session of the same meeting, it was decided that Willard Young would hold administrative responsibilities over the LDS College as well as being the President of the Church University. This would place Willard Done, the principal of the LDS College in a subordinate position to President Willard Young. The group also agreed that when the Church University vacated the buildings erected for its use, such buildings would remain the property of the LDS College "on terms as shall be defined by the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, March 10, 1892*). The minutes were later amended to read:

When all buildings that may be erected on the College grounds by the Salt Lake Literary and Scientific Association shall be vacated by said association, such buildings shall continue the property of said College on such terms as shall be defined by the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938 May 11, 1894*)

This amendment was necessary because before construction began, James E. Talmage suggested that the Salt Lake Literary and Scientific Association take over the

construction of the Church University building and construct said building in such a manner that it would be appropriate for both the Church University as well as the Deseret Museum, which the Association was responsible for. Talmage was the curator of the Museum at the time and its collections were being held in the Zion's Savings Bank building. The collections had suffered some damage as a result of the coal dust and were in desperate need of a better home (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933). Talmage saw this as an opportunity to resolve two issues simultaneously.

Purchasing equipment and supplies. With a location settled on, the business at hand turned to obtaining necessary equipment and supplies. During the summer of 1892 *Deseret News* announced that Dr. James Talmage was traveling to “purchase additional scientific apparatus for the proposed University of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, for which it is the intention to expend at present in the neighborhood of \$12,000” (*Deseret Weekly News*, July 9, 1892). His trip took him to the Eastern United States, England, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and Italy. Before leaving the United States for the European stages of his trip, James visited the Latter-day Saints at Cambridge. This was the first time that Talmage met John A. Widstoe. James Talmage and John Widstoe would cross paths often over the coming decades at the University of Utah and in the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. James recorded his interest in securing Widstoe for the Church University in his journal. He simply wrote that John Widstoe was “regarded as a promising candidate for our Church University at home” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, May 31, 1892). Alan Parrish, Widstoe's biographer, suggested that Talmage offered Widstoe a position as his personal assistant following his graduation from Harvard (Parrish, 2003).

Upon Talmage's return to Utah, the *News* reported that his trip had been successful. In addition to purchasing necessary supplies, Dr. Talmage was also able to

visit the laboratories of high profile universities in the United States and in Europe including the University of Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Clark, as well as the University of Edinburgh (*Deseret Weekly News*, August 6, 1892). James did not just visit the laboratories but also sat in on lectures and visited classes. Professor Nef, at the University of Chicago, showed Talmage the “apparatus and fixtures of the laboratory” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, May 17, 1892) and then allowed him sit in on a lecture on Benzine. May Talmage, James’ wife, recorded her belief that the benefits of the trip would go beyond just the items he purchased for the school. She wrote, “The trip was a very successful one and the benefits are now being felt by us who remained; as he not only saw things and places, but studies, as few would know how to do, and now he can impart the information he gained to others” (M. M. Talmage, 1887-1892, May 24, 1892).

Making the final preparations. Finally, in March 1893, the building at 225 W First North Street in Salt Lake was finished. The Deseret Museum was the first to move into the newly created building (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933). The building had been designed exclusively for courses dealing with science and the languages. Financial restrictions, however, impeded the language classes from every starting (*Deseret Weekly News*, July 9, 1892). The building was part of a previously planned structure that was meant for the Deseret Museum. The Salt Lake Literary and Scientific Association had overseen the construction. This allowed Talmage to take his shopping spree across the ocean and Willard Young to attend to the other important responsibilities in preparation for the start of school.

Once the building was completed and the apparatus all installed, a reporter from the *News* received a first hand tour from Willard Young and James E. Talmage of the newly finished building and reported on the luxuries that awaited students attending the school. The basement contained the heating and ventilation equipment, storage

rooms and bathrooms. Every room was ventilated by a powerful fan, lighted with electricity, and heated by an indirect steam method. The ground level held President's office, library, two classrooms, and a large lecture hall. The seating in the lecture hall was terraced with "opera" style chairs so that every person had a good view of the lecture table. The lecture hall also provided a stereopticon—a slide projector—which produced an image twenty feet in diameter on the wall. "To the unscientific observer the management of the room is absolutely novel, its efficacy is beyond question" (*Deseret Weekly News*, September 9, 1893). The second level held Dr. Talmage's office and laboratory, student laboratories, the balance room, the apparatus room, and a dispensary.

The student laboratories were the most well lit rooms in the building according to a later report. To aid in the lighting issue, the tables in the labs were positioned on the angle so that one student did not cast a shadow on his neighbor's work (*Deseret Weekly News*, November 25, 1893). In the balance room several balances for weighing the lightest of materials were set on marble slabs that had been secured to the walls so that disturbances on the floor would not shift the delicate weights. Dr. Talmage demonstrated the delicate nature of the balances by weighing a hair. The apparatus room contained hydraulic presses of all types, microscopes of several different styles, electrical instruments, contraptions for use with different chemical experiments and many, many other devices meant for the students to use rather than simply observing the teacher. The dispensary is where the students received the needed apparatus and supplies needed for the experimental work in each class. All students received the same supplies, regardless of ability to pay. This, according to the *News* reporter, was another important distinction between the Church University and other schools in the East. The Deseret Museum occupied the third floor.

It was not just the classrooms that were meant to instruct and impress. Talmage's office was also an example of the desire to teach the students with the latest methods and advances. He had electrical wires running from the office to every science classroom in the building (although the reporter never explained what electrical experiments would be performed with the wires). Talmage's desk had a concealed button that would open the door. Dr. Talmage explained to the reporter, "This is not designed to save the trouble of rising to open the door, but to afford students the ever-present example of the serviceableness of electricity" (*Deseret Weekly News*, September 9, 1893). The reporter ended the review with these acclaims:

From all of this, the reporter fears not to state that the equipment of the associated Church University and Museum is the finest and most complete of anything of the sort ever seen in these parts. The excellence of the apparatus is largely due to the fact that purchases have been made after personal inspection. Prof. Talmage himself visited and made selections in the eastern states as well as in England, Germany and France. (*Deseret Weekly News*, September 9, 1893)

Of his new building, Talmage (1879-1933) said, "I am thankful for the present pleasing accommodations and facilities for work. Never before have I had so commodious quarters" (April 18, 1893). His previous quarters in the LDS College had such poor ventilation that Talmage frequently suffered from sicknesses as a result. Talmage actually admitted to being embarrassed by his quarters in the old Social Hall when other professors from the East would visit him at the LDS College (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, 1888-1938). This was a major upgrade for him.

Facing challenges of staffing the school. One challenge to starting the university was getting sufficient teachers with the background and ability to teach the advanced courses that could be trusted to teach according to the desires of the First Presidency.

The *Deseret News* anticipated that, although James Talmage was an excellent starting piece for the faculty, “a corps of instructors will be added, and courses of study comparing favorably with the best institutions in the country will be projected” (*Deseret Weekly News*, November 25, 1893, p. 17). One immediate solution was to draw from the academies those teachers that had experience and degrees. Dr. Phillips, professor of science at Brigham Young Academy, would have taught at The Church University during the 1893-1894 school year had the courses not been limited by the financial struggles (*Deseret Weekly News*, May 20, 1893).

Benjamin Cluff, the principal at the Brigham Young Academy, spent the 1893-1894 school year studying at the University of Michigan. While he was there he wrote to George Brimhall regarding an opportunity to teach at the Church University. He said, “I do not know that I will be [with the Brigham Young Academy] for the [Church] University may need me next year” (B. Cluff, personal communication, January 7, 1894). He recorded in his journal that he had been offered a position in Salt Lake. “But,” Cluff wrote, “the people of Provo and the members of the Academy board rejected and I was released from my call, or at least temporarily” (Cluff, 1881-1909, pp. 43-44). Elder Franklin D. Richards recorded the efforts to secure teachers, and specifically Benjamin Cluff, for the new university. “Prest. A.O. Smoot, H.H Cluff, & [Benjamin] Cluff—J.A. Smith, A[ngus] H Cannon, K[arl] G Mazer [sic] were together over the expediency of the Presidency calling Benjamin Cluff to come and accept a position in the New University that is being formed in SL City” (Richards, 1844-1899, March 24, 1891).

There was a spirit of competition among the schools regarding faculty acquisitions. Benjamin Cluff was studying in Michigan the first time he received a letter from James Tanner. Tanner taught at the academy in Logan and he requested Cluff to consider coming to Logan to teach. This invitation created an effect such that eventually

Abraham O. Smoot, who was the President of the Board of the Brigham Young Academy in Provo, wrote to President George Q. Cannon and said, “You have partly taken Maeser from us, and have taken from us Talmage and Tanner, now if you will take Cluff from us, I wish you to close up the B.Y.A. for we can not run it, and I will not try” (Cluff, 1881-1909, April 20, 1890).

Smoot’s feelings were shared throughout the city of Provo. The Provo newspaper reported on the attempt to remove Cluff matter, albeit after it was already settled.

We also congratulate [the Board of the Brigham Young Academy] on their prompt action to pour oil on the troubled waters just as public sentiment was being aroused in the community in consequence of the contemplated removal of Prof. Benjamin Cluff, Jr., from the Academy to Salt Lake city. There can be no palliating circumstance adduced that would justify an underhanded scheming to bring about such a result. (*The Daily Enquirer*, March 27, 1891)

Although, Cluff would not go to Salt Lake to teach, he was placed on the committee responsible for establishing the University, along with Willard Young, Karl G. Maeser, James E. Talmage and James Sharp (*Daily Enquirer*, April 6, 1892).

Evaluation of success in the first academic year. The Church University officially opened its doors on Monday, September 25, 1893. The only classes offered that first term were chemistry and natural philosophy for university students and a domestic science class for students attending the LDS College. This was on account of the financial troubles of the times. There would not have even been that many classes had it not been for James Talmage. On August 11, 1893, the General Board of Education announced the plan to close about twenty schools and temporarily suspend the first semester of the Church University. Talmage wrote, “This is a great disappointment; our

building is practically ready, most of the needed apparatus is secure and in place, and hopes had been entertained of opening the institution within a few weeks of the present" (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, August 11, 1893). A couple of weeks later, Talmage met with a committee organized by the General Board of Education designed to determine how to utilize the University building during the year if there were no classes held. Talmage suggested the following plan:

1. That certain rooms in the new building be granted to the Latter-day Saints' College free of rent for the use of that institution during the ensuing year;
2. That the Church University institute full class courses in Chemistry and Natural Philosophy: for the conducting of which I assume the whole labor dispensing with the two assistant teachers intended for the work, and using only the men working in the institution...;
3. That all qualified applicants from among the College students be admitted to these courses free of charge and the College be thus relieved of the responsibility and expense of conducting any classes in these branches;
4. That a thorough course of popular public lectures be established under the auspices of the University. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, August 26, 1893)

The committee accepted the suggestions and recommended that the General Board of Education accept each one. The Board of Trustees of the Church University adopted the recommendations and Talmage was able to move forward with his plans for the school year, although seriously trimmed back from the expectation of just a month earlier. The announcement for the 1893-1894 school year detailed the plans:

The work that will be undertaken this year will, necessarily, be limited. It will consist in a series of public popular lectures, on scientific and kindred subjects, which will be delivered in the main lecture room of the new building; and, more especially, in regular class work in theoretical and practical chemistry and in

theoretical and experimental natural philosophy. Full courses of study, leading to the Bachelor of Science, will, it is expected, be established in the near future. It is intended that the work done this year in chemistry and natural philosophy shall be that which hereafter, will be required for the first year's work, in regular course, in these subjects. (Announcement of the Church University for the year 1893-4, 1893)

Achieving early success. As the school embarked on its maiden semester, the leaders and members of the Church held high expectations for success. On the first day of classes, Dr. Talmage recorded, "The attendance is large compared with our expectations, and the usual conditions with high grade classes. I find myself in a building better suited to my work than any other I have ever labored in" (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, September 25, 1893). The *Deseret News* expressed its belief that the school would meet with great success: "There is little doubt that the university will grow rapidly and have a prosperous career" (*Deseret Weekly News*, October 7, 1893, p. 27). The newspaper suggested that the instruction in experimentation was equal to that of any university in the east. President George Q. Cannon dedicated the building on October 9, 1893, during the Priesthood session of the General Conference. It seemed as though the Church University was headed for a long tenure of success (*Deseret Weekly News*, October 14, 1893, p. 22).

The first semester was a success, especially when compared to the enrollment for the same semester at the University of Utah. The Church University enrolled a couple hundred students that fall semester of 1893. The University of Utah, with a full offering of classes only enrolled 412 students (Chamberlin, 1960). The two schools were only a few city blocks apart and yet, at least in the beginning, nobody mentioned the potential for competition. The Territorial Legislature had given a very small appropriation to the

University of Utah for the 1893-1894 school year because of the financial struggles brought on by the Panic of 1893. Quinn wrote, "It soon became apparent that if the economic situation did not close the University of Utah, the new Church University would do so" (Quinn, 1973, p. 83).

In the end of this successful semester, Willard Young submitted a letter of resignation as the President of Young University (W. Young, personal communication, December 5, 1893). It seemed such a strange time to resign. Quinn (1973) attempted an explanation:

At the time the Church University was prospering and it is unlikely that Willard Young was divorcing himself from it. The resignation was apparently a technical matter created by the change of the institution's name to Church University.

Rather than resigning from the school, Willard Young was resigning one title to adopt another. As evidence of this, the papers of the Salt Lake Literary Scientific Association indicate that he continued to function in his capacity as president over a year after the above resignation, and as late April 2, 1894, he signed a letter "Prest. Church University." (p. 85)

Night classes at the school. The Church University started offering night classes in January 1894 in an attempt to increase enrollment and the University's footprint in the community. After just one semester, Talmage's classes were to be offered as night courses in order to make the classes available to more than the full-time, enrolled students. Classes included chemistry on Mondays, natural philosophy on Wednesdays, and "Light Science" on Fridays. One difference being that the night classes contained the experimental and exciting lectures and the day classes continued "in dull and more technical work." (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, January 15, 1894) On January 15, 1894, James Talmage taught the first night class in chemistry. Dr. Talmage taught the first class in

natural philosophy two days later. Initially the first classes were held in one of the classrooms and the expectation was to limit attendance to the capacity of the room. Turnout for both the chemistry and natural philosophy classes was so great that it was immediately decided to move the instruction to the large lecture hall (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933). Turnout to the second chemistry class reached 200 students.

Theology classes at the school. In June 1892, Karl G. Maeser expressed disappointment that the Salt Lake Stake had not met with the General Board's request that every ward establish a religion class to supplement the secular education that many students were receiving in the public schools. He told the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education that there had been established 246 religion classes throughout the Church, but that "there should be more" and he was disappointed that the Salt Lake Stake was not leading out in an example to other Stakes in the Church (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, June 16, 1892*). Seven months earlier, the Salt Lake Stake Board decided not to start Sunday School classes for students attending the LDS College. Rather, the Board felt it would be advisable for such students to join with established wards (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, December 11, 1891*). This resistance to religion classes, however, would not continue much longer.

A committee consisting of the First Presidency and some members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles determined to establish a theological class for the students attending the Church University. Classes were to be held on Sundays at 12:15. James E. Talmage was assigned the responsibility to teach the class. Talmage felt that the new assignment was in a large measure his own fault for suggesting that such a class should exist. He wrote, "I myself suggested it having been impressed for a long time with the opinion that some theological work should be done in the Church Univ.

from the beginning of its career of actual work" (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, October 20, 1893).

The Articles of Faith. This decision to start the theological classes had a major impact on the Church aside from the University students. Earlier in February 1893, the First Presidency requested that Talmage write a doctrinal book for use in the Church schools and other theological settings. It was Talmage's idea that a class be conducted and that he use the class as the initial preparation for the book. Talmage's journals are not clear whether this theological class is what he had in mind when he suggested that a class could be offered and taught as the basis of the book or whether he suggested classes be taught on two different occasions and they just happened to come together in one setting. Regardless, when the theological course associated with the Church University began, the "course of study would be the material to be incorporated in the textbook which he had been commissioned to prepare" (J. R. Talmage, 1972, pp. 155-156). The result of the class and Elder Talmage's efforts was the book *A Study of the Articles of Faith*.

The class was a huge success. The first session, on October 29, filled the lecture room in the University building and additional chairs had to be brought into the room. It was much more than James had ever anticipated.

I had not ever dreamed of such a class. As it was first suggested to my mind I saw a small body of University and College students with perhaps a few outsiders: but the Presidency of the Church directed that the scope of the class be enlarged. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, September 29, 1893)

As a result of the huge turnout and the number of people that were turned away the first night, the classes were moved to the Assembly Hall. The next Sunday,

somewhere between 500 and 600 people attended the class. The next Sunday attendance was around 900. Attendance continued to grow throughout the semester.

Downward trends at the University of Utah. While the Church University was expanding its enrollment notwithstanding of a very limited course offering, the University of Utah was struggling to enroll students and faced a very serious threat of being closed and moved to Logan for consolidation with the Agricultural College. The University of Utah had struggled from some time. A serious financial pinch in the 1880's—largely due to gubernatorial vetoes of legislative appropriations for constructing additional buildings and for student funds—still haunted the school. The financial depression of the early 1890's magnified the seriousness of the situation as enrollment dropped even more. James E. Talmage was offered a teaching position in 1893 at the University of Utah, but he was uncomfortable with the offer. So, seeking their advice, he notified the First Presidency about the offer. He was counseled to reject the offer and continue with his labors in preparing for the first semester at the Church University.

Trying to persuade Talmage. The following day, Joseph Kingsbury returned to James Talmage and pleaded with him to “accept some position in connection with the University” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, September 26, 1893). Talmage, at the suggestion of the Church Board of Education, agreed to give some lectures on the campus of the State University. It was felt that this would engender friendly feelings between the two schools. Eventually, as the 1893-1894 school year started, Talmage found himself teaching Metallurgy, Biology, and Human Physiology at the University, in addition to the courses he was teaching at the Church University. This was a significantly larger role that he had initially anticipated. The *Salt Lake Tribune* wrote:

The University of Utah is now in a most excellent condition. It has been a continued effort on the part of the Regents to put the University on equal standing with the majority of other like institutions in the United States, and they have now succeeded in doing so. Important additions to its forces have been made for the coming school year. Dr. James E. Talmage, a graduate of Lehigh University and a well-known educator of our Territory, had been appointed professor of metallurgy and biology. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, August 20, 1893)

Attempting to consolidate the two state schools. The financial situation in Utah for both the Church school system and the University of Utah continued to spiral downward during 1893. Everyone in Salt Lake was aware of the efforts to close the university in Salt Lake and consolidate it with the Agricultural College in Logan. Logan was already receiving federal funds because it was a land grant institution under the Morrill Act.

Supporting two universities was very difficult in the financially depressed economy of the 1890's and to sacrifice the university in Logan meant sacrificing the pecuniary benefits of the land grants. Citizens expected that there would be even more budgetary benefits to keeping the Agricultural College once the Territory became a State (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 11, 1894). On the other hand, there were those that felt like the course offerings were different enough at the two institutions to warrant keeping both schools (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 18, 1894). It seemed like, in spite of the public outcry to keep the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, the Territorial Legislature was poised to close the doors.

The University of Utah had always been required to walk a very tight line between non-sectarian and secular education, and more specifically, between being "un-Mormon" without being "anti-Mormon." The serious divide in the community

created a major challenge for Kingsbury as he tried to add faculty and, most important, oversee the selection of the next president. Kingsbury became the acting-President of the University of Utah following John Park's removal/resignation. Finding a new president and additional faculty that could unite such a drastically severed community enough to persuade the legislature to not close the school was a major task.

Offering a major compromise. The desperate situation moved the University of Utah's acting-President to possibly a last effort to save the school. Just ten days after the first night classes were held at the Church University, Professor Joseph T. Kingsbury and William M. Stewart came to President Wilford Woodruff's office on January 25, 1894, and made a bold offer for compromise. James Talmage's journal provides the best insight to what took place.

By request of President Woodruff I was present today at a consultation between the Presidency and Professors Kingsbury and Stewart of the University of Utah. These professors asked the Presidency to use the Church influence in behalf of the State University; giving up the present idea of advancing the Church University. The chief reasons assigned were: 1. Self evident value of concentration of effort. 2. Too few pupils in Utah and surrounding states and territories to supply two first class institutions. 3. Rivalry tends to weaken both. 4. With myself at the head, influence would favor the Mormon people. 5. Means thus provided for the employment of more Mormon professors. 6. Subsidiary organizations for theological study could be effected. The brethren took this proposition under advisement referring it to a Council Meeting of the Presidency and Twelve held this afternoon in the Temple. Later in the day I was called to the President's office and there informed that no decision had yet been reached: that a telegram would be sent at once to Prest. Geo. Q. Cannon over in New York,

and his opinion would be learned within a few days. In the mean time we can only wait. This is an unlooked for, though a very important question. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, January 25, 1894)

A new direction for Latter-day Saint education. President Woodruff did not take long to make up his mind. Although, there is no record of President Cannon's response to the telegram, it seems likely that he supported the proposition to close the Church University and support its public counterpart. Only four days after the original meeting between President Woodruff and Joseph Kingsbury, President Woodruff again called Dr. Talmage to his office. This time he notified him of a change in direction. Talmage recorded President Woodruff's explanation.

Under existing circumstances it will be best to suspend the Church University, and give influence and aid to the State University. This will enable the Church to devote more energy to the Stake Academies which are in the nature of High Schools, practically unparalleled by any grade of schools in the Public School System. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, January 29, 1894)

Following the interview with Brother Talmage, President Woodruff called for Professors Kingsbury and Stewart. When the two arrived, President Woodruff gave the positive reply, but conditioned the abandoning of the Church University on the fact that the University of Utah remained in Salt Lake City.

Sending Talmage to the public school. Dr. Talmage was not entirely surprised by the turn in events. Two days before Professor Kingsbury met with President Woodruff he wrote in his journal that individuals had been inquiring whether or not he would consider taking the position of President at the public university. He wrote, "Of late I have heard several rumors to the effect that my name was being mentioned in connection with the Presidency of the University of Utah" (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933,

January 22, 1894). Most of these rumors reached Dr. Talmage in the days prior to the entry. The most formal inquiry happened on January 22. A professor from the University of Utah claimed to have been sent by the Chancellor of the University to find out if Dr. Talmage would accept such an offer if it were proffered. Although Talmage did not mention who made the inquiry, he took it serious enough that the following day he met with the First Presidency and some of the Twelve to discuss the option. Again, it was decided that Dr. Talmage should continue in his labors with the Church University. Talmage responded to the decision in his journal.

This suits me well, for I have no personal desire to cease my labors in the Church service. True, the position of President of the State University is an exalted one: financially and from the stand point of reputation and professional advancement the change appears desirable: yet it would mean much loss to me: --the loss of freedom of speech, of liberty of action in teaching. I fear that my tongue would be bound, my energies crippled. I have therefore sincere pleasure in the decisions of the authorities. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, January 23, 1894)

James Talmage was not the only one hearing rumors of change. Benjamin Cluff was the principal of the Brigham Young Academy and going to school at the University of Michigan for the 1893-1894 school year. On November 12, 1893—two months before Kingsbury approached President Woodruff—Cluff wrote a letter to George H. Brimhall about rumors he was hearing. Cluff had left Brimhall in charge of the academy in his absence as a sort of “acting principal.” Cluff wrote, “News reaches me that a movement is afoot to unite in some way the Church university with the U[niversity] of Utah by establishing a theological class close to the latter” (B. Cluff, personal communication, November 12, 1893).

In retrospect, it made perfect sense to offer James Talmage the position. There were few individuals that would have been trusted enough by both sides of the divide during the 1890's. John Park had done an excellent job, but because of conflict with the faculty, he had moved on two years earlier (Chamberlin, 1960). Karl G. Maeser would have also been trusted by both parties, but he was serving on the Church's Board of Education at the time and there was little chance of getting him to take the position.

James Talmage may have been the only available candidate trusted enough by both sides to make a reasonable fit. Both the Latter-day Saints and the non-Latter-day Saints trusted him as an educator, even if they disagreed with him with regards to religious beliefs. Latter-day Sains trusted him because of his history of faithfully following the leaders of the Church. At an early age, Talmage had demonstrated that he was a dedicated member of the Church and was loyal to the counsel and direction given by the leaders of his Church. For anyone else, this attribute would have been enough for the Liberal Party to jump ship and cry "Foul." James Talmage, however, was also a very educated and well-honored member of the science community. He had attended Lehigh University and Johns Hopkins in the 1880's. Then, in 1891, James was elected to the Royal Microscopical Society of London. This was a very significant honor and placed Utah on the map of the global scientific world (J. R. Talmage, 1972). He regularly attended and lectured at the public teachers' conventions in Salt Lake, Provo and Ogden on various secular topics. For example, on January 6, 1893, James lectured before the Salt Lake County Teachers' Convention on the topic "The microscope as a teacher's aid," and then on January 14 he spoke to the Utah County Teachers' Association on "The Microscope." Because of this background, both parties could get behind Dr. Talmage and support his appointment as President of the University.

Gaining influence at the public school. Dr. Talmage immediately immersed himself in the higher education issues involving the University of Utah. He started attending meetings of the Legislature dealing with the school. On February 3, 1894, he commented, “A strong effort is being made to have the institution moved to Logan” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, February 3, 1894). The leaders of the Church followed the efforts of Territorial Legislature very closely over the next several months. Talmage was very uneasy about how the events would turnout. He wrote in his journal, “Personally, I have never had a desire for the presidency of the institution, and I am loath to step on deck just in time to marshal all hands as the vessel goes down” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, March 16, 1894).

In order to walk the line between non-Mormon and faithful Latter-day Saint required changes in the life of President Talmage. For example, the extremely popular theological lectures at the University had to stop. The April 7, 1894 *Deseret News* reported on the last session of the Theology Class. According to the report, over 1,300 students attended the class and learned about the gathering of Israel in the last days. The congregation was shocked when Dr. Talmage announced that it would be the last session (*Deseret Weekly News*, April 7, 1894). The First Presidency ended the courses because, according John R. Talmage (1972), Dr. Talmage’s son and biographer, they felt that “it would be inconsistent for Dr. Talmage to occupy a prominent position in the teaching of Church theology while directing the affairs of a non-sectarian [secular] institution” (p. 157). He felt that his father “clearly saw the logic of the position taken by the First Presidency and agreed with it. Yet he felt real reluctance to abandon, even temporarily, an undertaking to which he was deeply committed in his innermost feelings” (p. 157).

The word about the Church University being closed spread almost immediately. On February 4, Cluff wrote another letter to Brimhall. Cluff said, “You will remember that some time ago that I suggested that a combination of the Church university and the U of U was under contemplation. A letter from Captain Willard Young announces to me that my services in the Church University would not be needed. The Church Univ. will not exist; and force will be centered on the U of U, with Talmage as a possible president” (B. Cluff, personal communication, February 4, 1894).

Closing the Church University. The First Presidency waited eight months before making the official announcement that the Church University would be closing. Perhaps the unease regarding the future of the University of Utah is why the leaders of the Church waited so long. The acceptance of Professor Kingsbury’s compromise was based on the assumption that the University of Utah would stay in Salt Lake. Had the Legislature decided to move it to Logan even after the agreement, the Church would have been in a position to re-open the doors of the Church University without the political stigma of fighting public education. August 25, 1894, however, the First Presidency released an official announcement declaring that the Church University would be closed and encouraged members to support University of Utah:

Dear Brothers and Sisters—For several years past, the presiding authorities of the Church, acting in conjunction with the General Board of Education, have operated toward the establishment of a Church University, this institution to become the head of our Church school system, and to be equipped for the work of higher instruction. During the past two years, steps were taken toward founding and endowing such an institution as would meet the needs of the people of Utah, and particularly of the Latter-day Saints, as a denominational school of high grade; and on the 8th of September, 1893, a circular was issued

announcing the opening of the Church University. The work of the institution was conducted during the academic year 1893-1894 with abundant proofs of success, and all connected with the management of the Church University had reason to anticipate for the school a brilliant future. There was no intention on the part of the promoters of the Church University to arouse any unfair competition or rivalry between that school and the University of Utah; nevertheless, the existence of two institutions in the same city with many courses in common, rendered the paralleling of work, and the consequent duplication of expenditure, absolutely unavoidable. Time has very plainly demonstrated the fact that Utah, while abundantly able under present conditions to maintain one well equipped institution for higher instruction, cannot adequately support many such, either in material supplies of means or in students prepared for university courses of study. After due consideration of the present conditions and future prospects of educational affairs in Utah, the presiding quorums of the Church have deemed it wise to bring the work of the Church University to a close, that greater energy, resulting from concentration of effort, may be devoted to the development of our Territorial University. Toward the University of Utah our people may properly indulge a feeling of pride; the institution was established in the early days of Utah's history; it was incorporated, indeed, under the name of the University of Deseret within less than three years after the first settlement of this region. It has grown in spite of the numerous difficulties incident to pioneer existence, to its present fair proportions, and to the attainment of its forty-fifth year, with a steady and healthful progress which inspires strong confidence for its future. Utah has need of such an institution of learning; indeed there appears no reason why our University should not become

the great inter-mountain center for the diffusion of knowledge in advanced and specialized branches. We hope that the day is not far distant when the youth of Utah will not longer need to journey afar in search of professional instruction; but that our own State will offer her sons and daughters ample facilities in all departments of intellectual progress.

We recommend to the Latter-day Saints that they faithfully devote their influence and energy, such as might have been claimed by the university of the Church, had wisdom dictated the continuance of that institution to the University of Utah. We trust that our people will sustain the Territorial University by their good words and works, and particularly by their patronage in sending thither their sons and daughters who are prepared to become students in the institution, which by law is constituted as the head of the public school system of Utah.

The officers of the University are men in whom the people have learned to repose their confidence; the Chancellor and the Regents need no encomiums from us in their responsibilities and honorable stations. The President and Faculty of the institution are severally of recognized abilities in their professions, and of steadfast devotion to the educational advancement of the people; they are entitled to the fullest confidence of Utah's citizens without distinction

We feel assured that the moral influence of the University will prove of salutary effect, and that all due attention will be paid to the training of students in the duties of true moral citizenship as well as in the subjects of purely secular instruction. However, as the University is a public possession, the property of people of many sects and creeds, it would be manifestly improper to allow any

species of sectarian religious instructions to be imparted within its walls, or under its auspice. In view of these facts, and, knowing as we do, that many of the Latter-day Saints are imbued with a strong desire to have their youth instructed in theological tenets co-ordinately with secular training, we call your attention to the fact that the Latter-day Saints' college, an institution which stands among the foremost of our Church schools, is conducted in close proximity to the University, and that the very full courses of daily instruction in theology will be offered at such hours, and under such conditions that Latter-day Saint students who are attending the University, and others not regularly attending the College, may pursue in the latter such of these sacred studies as their ability and opportunities will permit. It is the aim of our local and general educational boards to strengthen the theological department of the college, increasing and augmenting the courses to meet all requirements.

We request that Presidents of Stakes, Bishops of Wards and other presiding officers, will cause this letter to be read in their places of public gathering; and that they will use their influence in otherwise bringing this subject before the people. Respectfully your brethren, Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, Joseph Smith, First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
(*Deseret Weekly News*, August 25, 1894)

President George Q. Cannon addressed the closing of the Church University in the October General Conference. He explained that the First Presidency found it necessary to "concentrate efforts in education, and ... the Territory could not sustain more than one university" (*Millennial Star*, 1894, p. 724). That being the situation, the leading officers in the Church decided to accept the proposal made by Professor Kingsbury. Church leaders recognized that the students attending the University of

Utah would not be offered an opportunity to study religious topics at the public school, and so students were allowed to attend the daily LDS College theology classes.

In addition to requesting that the Latter-day Saints support the University of Utah, the First Presidency decided to donate \$60,000 in land, buildings and scientific apparatus. This endowment was strategic. The University of Utah had become crowded and people in favor of closing the school had cited this as one of their arguments. Logan at the time had started a new building and a remodel of an existing building and therefore had more space than Salt Lake for university classes (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 1, 1894). The endowment provided desperately needed classrooms and provided leverage to the argument in favor of keeping the University in Salt Lake City. The initial \$15,000 of the endowment was in the form of the lease on the buildings that the University would use. The remaining \$40,000 would not be realized if the school was dissolved as a result of relocation. When it became apparent that the school was going to stay in Salt Lake City, the property, buildings, and all of the scientific apparatus was deeded to the University of Utah as the final payment of the endowment (Chamberlin, 1960). The endowment put the legislature in a position to forfeit the \$60,000 in buildings and equipment if they moved the school. It was a very strong argument.

Appendix B: Methodology

Importance of Historical Research

The value of historical work is evident in every day life. Individuals make decisions each day based on lessons from the past. Because dark clouds have previously been an indicator of potential rain showers, an individual will prepare for rain at the simple appearance of dark clouds today. When someone fails to recognize patterns from the past, that person is exposed to the difficulty of reliving challenging circumstances over and over again. Thucydides (1951) expressed his belief that history is cyclical in nature. "What happened in the past . . . will, in due course, tend to be repeated with some degree of similarity" (p. 14). Thucydides intended his writings to influence the future. Those studying the past through his writings might identify similarities and learn from historical successes and failures. In this way, his histories became more than just informative, but useful to those who are able to identify the correct correlations. To associate the rain with something other than dark clouds may lead to embarrassing situations.

Thorough historical studies deal with not only issues of the past, but also the correct and incorrect interpretations of the past of those that have gone before us.

Novick (1988) quoted Ralph Gabriel on this topic:

'History' is that image of the past which filters through the mind of the historian, as light through a window. Sometimes the glass is dirty; too often it is distressingly opaque. The long and sometimes unfortunate experience of mankind with history has taught the historian that the biases, prejudices,

concepts, assumptions, hopes, and ambitions which have contributed to the opaqueness of the minds of his predecessors are a part of the past with which he must deal. If he be a conscientious craftsman, he explores his own mind to discover those distorting bubbles which play such pranks on light rays. But at the outset he is sadly aware that, although he may discover a few of the more obvious imperfections, his task is hopeless. (cited in Novick, 1988)

This section explores and explains potential pitfalls within historical methodologies and pose an underlying assumption that if historians understand these pitfalls, they are more likely to avoid serious historiographical mistakes.

Potential Sources of Bias.

Since the 1830s, “positivists and relativists have each sought to prevail on the question of whether history should be objectively or subjectively grounded” (Isacoff, 2005, p. 72). The question regarding historical bias with regard to the researcher's personal bias is a significant issue in every historical study. To assume a position of neutrality simply increases the probability of error based on personal bias. There are no neutral participants in historical writing. In a pamphlet distributed at the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail we are reminded that history, at least initially, is usually written from the point of the conquerors (“Indians”, 2006). This can be a very important factor when reading documents that interpret the events of the past. Jenkins (1995) noted,

For today we know of no such things as neutral/objective ‘interpretation’, as ‘innocent’ surveys, as ‘unpositioned positions’. Rather, we should all know by now that the best we can do is to alert and keep on alerting ‘readers’ to the position we are interpreting from, rather than imagining that interpretations not

only might spring from nowhere, but that some interpretations are not interpretive at all but 'the truth.' (p. 13)

Personal bias of the researcher. Personal prejudice can be seen in the historical studies on the life of Woodrow Wilson with regards to the President's major stroke in 1919. First, Edwin Weinstein attributed the stroke to several, less-serious strokes beginning in 1896 (Weinstein, 1981). Michael Marmor (1982), however, wrote that the 1919 health issues of President Wilson were the result of neuritis and an interocular hemorrhage, or severe bleeding in the eye. Each was an expert in the field to which they attributed Woodrow Wilson's maladies. Weinstein was a neurosurgeon specializing in strokes and Marmor was an ophthalmologist at Stanford University.

In research as in life one is far more likely to find what one looks for than what one does not care about . . . We may then say without implying any blame that [the historian's] interest will determine his discoveries, his selection, his pattern-making, and his exposition. (Barzun & Graff, 2004, p. 154)

This does not invalidate the historical method. It simply identifies the need for absolute disclosure by the authors. Honest historians disclose personal bias and thus provide the audience a more accurate perception and help the audience avoid erroneous assumptions.

Everything comes to the reader as interpreted by the historian. Everything is seen through the medium of his personality. The facts of history when they are used to teach a moral lesson do not reach us in their entirety, nor grouped and generalized according to their internal relations, but selected and arranged according to the overmastering ideal in the mind of the historian. The reader is

at the historian's mercy. . . . Thus history sells its birthright of truth for a mess of the pottage of partisanship. (Novick, 1988, p. 46)

In other words, the responsibility for full disclosure, for lack of a better phrase, rests with the historian. For the sake of the project itself, the historian must first be honest with himself regarding personal bias and then be open with the readers regarding that personal position. "The clearer we are about our own bias, the more honest and efficient we are likely to be in our own research" (Momigliano, 1954, p. 57). Gaetano Salvemini taught his class, "Impartiality is a dream and honesty a duty. We cannot be impartial, but we can be intellectually honest" (cited in Barzun & Graff, 2004, p. 155). Karl Popper (1957) suggested that a "way out of this dilemma, of course, is to be clear about the necessity of adopting a point of view; to state this point of view plainly, and always to remain conscious that it is one among many" (p. 152).

Following Popper's suggestion for initial and up-front clarity and Salvemini's quest for "intellectual honesty," let me explain my own background as the author of this dissertation. This study deals with the actions of leaders and members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. As the author, I am, and have been all of my adult life, an active member of this same Church. Additionally, I have been employed for the last eleven years by the Church as a religious educator. I received a Masters Degree and currently pursue a doctorate degree at Brigham Young University, the Church's private college. This background has inevitably shaped the way that I view historical events involving the Church and its influence. Being conscious of that background, however, helped me remain alert to my own bias during the recreation of events that transpired in the history of the Church that has had such a major influence in my own life. I provide such information to permit those that might read the work to

be alert for explanations and arguments that may have been tainted by this “personal” perspective and bias.

Bias of the original creator. Another concern in historical works is the personal bias—intentional or unintentional—of the original creator. “It hardly takes a regional expert to perceive that the way the ‘story’ of the Arab-Israeli conflict is told depends on the perspective of the storyteller... To whose story do we listen? How do we know that one story is not just as good [or true] as the next?” (Isacoff, 2005, p. 71). Lucas (1981) wrote, “Personal documents tend to be biased, couched in the terminology and conceptions of their creators’ own time, with a limited range of perception and comprehension... Organizational and institutional records are very little less so; even more than personal papers” (p. 227).

Alexander (1966) described the challenge of researching early Utah history because of this kind of bias. He wrote,

Until recently, the interpretation of Utah territorial history has suffered from two conflicting conspiratorial points of view. Some writers have seen in the tremendous economic, political, and social power of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints a conspiracy against the United States government; and others have viewed congressional enactments and the actions of territorial officials as a conspiracy against the Mormons’ basic rights of self-government, economic freedom, and religious liberty. (p. 290)

It is important to emphasize that these issues do not represent an unconquerable obstacle. There are methods that allow researchers to produce quality research in spite of the almost certain reality that the information has been tainted by its original creator. For example, using sources from all parties involved can provide a balanced view of the

situation and lessen the probability and degree of original bias. Researchers must give equal value to varying perspectives especially when those perspectives differ from their personal perspective. Providing multiple angles of the time period or event will help the reader view the tension from both sides of the fence.

Another consideration is the fallibilist approach to research. Pierce, a notable fallibilist, wrote, "Try to verify any law of nature, and you will find that the more precise your observations, the more certain they will be to show irregular departures from the law" (cited in Margolis, 2007, p. 232). This is very similar to the conclusion to which Albert Einstein arrived in 1919. In an article that was not quoted—or even cited—until 1984, Einstein wrote, "But the truth of a theory can never be proven. For one never knows that even in the future no experience will be encountered which contradicts its consequences" (cited in Adam, 2000, p. Appendix I).

Although, in these contexts, the authors are describing the limitations on knowledge gained through the scientific method, similar limitations can be applied to those involved in the search for knowledge through historical methodologies. Avshalom M. Adam (2000) explained, "The source of scientific theory is not the singular facts by themselves but general hypotheses based on the scientist's mental intuition, which evaluates an ensemble of facts" (p.27). This also applies to historical researchers that search for interpretations based on the biases previously mentioned. If any of the interpretations are incorrect because of the bias of an initial author or the personal bias of the researcher, fallibility becomes an issue. In order to overcome this fallibility, a researcher must first recognize the issues resulting from current as well as past biases and then address each with the appropriate precautions.

As I studied the Church University, I found that there were two very different approaches to education in Utah during the nineteenth century. Typically the side that

writers took depended on what church they attended (if any) on Sunday. Those authors that faithfully attended The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints clearly stood on the side of the leading authorities of that Church. Talmage, a key figure in this study, was an example of this original bias. Talmage sided with the leaders of the Church even when their point of view opposed his own. The bias, in my own biased opinion, of non-Latter-day Saints was even more one-sided and slanted. This is evidenced in the slanderous attacks found in the newspapers and commentaries of the day. Perhaps the reason for this division is the polarizing individual in the middle: Brigham Young. The best way to handle these different records of how the past happened is to take into account both opinions. The reality is that truth is really somewhere in the middle and by showing both sides I tried to at least identify the boundaries of what really happened in the tumultuous nineteenth century.

Data Collection and Analysis.

In any given trial, a lawyer may request that the judge refuse certain witnesses if it is determined that the witness' testimony is built on hearsay rather than a personal account. The same should be true in historical writing. Robert Williams (2003), Vail professor of History at Davidson College, wrote,

Primary and secondary sources are the crucial tools of the historian. A primary source is a document, image, or artifact that provides evidence about the past. It is an original document created contemporaneously with the event under discussion. ... A secondary source is a book, article, film, or museum that displays primary sources selectively in order to interpret the past. (p. 58)

Primary Sources. Responsible historians have always placed a greater importance on primary sources, or 'eyewitnesses,' of an event. Primary resources have a greater value to historians because they are closer to the actual event and are free from

later interpretations or manipulations. Han (2003) wrote, “[The historian’s] passion for the original source of an event is one of the evidences of his desire for an authentic apprehension of historical reality” (pp. 3-4).

As I approached this study, I initially focused on the histories of the two schools involved. This focus led me to the Church History Library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Special Collections in the J. Willard Marriott Library at the University of Utah, and Special Collections in the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University. I initially approached these libraries focusing on identifying the key individuals in the decision to open and then close the Church University. Previous research had led me to believe that James E. Talmage was the President of the Church University, and as such, I started with his personal journals. As other individuals were identified, I would search out journals, newspaper articles, and other information that would hopefully provide helpful insight to their role and perspective with regards to the focus of this study. Other primary sources that became very helpful included personal journals, diaries, and communications of Franklin D. Richards, Wilford Woodruff, Karl G. Maeser, Benjamin Cluff, and Willard Young, as well as minutes to important bodies such as the Church Board of Education, the Salt Lake Stake Academy Board of Education, and the Church Board of Examiners.

As the study progressed it became apparent that the Utah Legislature had an important role in the study because of its efforts to close the University of Utah. As such the Territorial Legislative minutes and newspaper editorials summarizing important sessions of the body provided valuable information regarding what happened politically during the late nineteenth century to influence the decision to close the school. Another helpful resource with regard to these political influences was The Utah State Archives.

Another important primary source in this project will be the newspaper editorials of the time period. The tension in Salt Lake over free schools in the Brigham Young era was largely the result of the fight among the newspapers in the city. The important role of these newspapers with regards to the issue of education is handled in the following chapters. That story includes an intense background of arguing everything from education, to politics and finances. Through the dual lenses proffered by *The Salt Lake Tribune* and *The Deseret News* readers will be given insights to how the two sides viewed the issues important to the proposed article. These resources helped me find the story from both sides. Seeing the story from both sides is important, as the truth likely lies somewhere in between the two. By using each of the newspapers, the proposed article gets closer to the *real* truth through a sort of source-triangulation.

Modern technology was a major aid in this research, and especially with the newspapers. I was able to search both newspapers through electronic databases to identify specific articles that dealt with educational issues in general and, more importantly the Church University, the University of Utah, and political issues that affected this project. This use of technology significantly narrowed the search providing a very quick list of potential articles that held possible snapshots of the past. The advances in the research technologies make historical research more effective and comprehensive than it has been in the past.

These important primary documents have allowed an in-depth study regarding the circumstances surrounding the Church University. The primary sources, utilized jointly, establish the credibility of this work, giving an overall look into the decision that changed the face of Utah education and potentially created the current demographics of the state overall.

Secondary sources. Secondary sources were also used in the absence of primary sources or when primary sources existed but are not made available by the bodies that hold them. For example, documents and other articles that were once available from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have already been published in one form or another. As a result, the Church has restricted access to these original materials and now direct researchers to the published form. The journals of Wilford Woodruff are an example. In such situations, the secondary source will have to suffice for the proposed article. An example of a valuable secondary source is Ralph Chamberlin's work, *The University of Utah: A History of Its First 100 Years, 1850 to 1950*. This work is very significant as it tracks the University of Utah through the period of interest in this current study. It is important to note, however, that Chamberlin was professor of zoology at Brigham Young University from 1908 to 1911 and at the University of Utah from 1925 to 1938 and his experiences at these school have certainly "tainted the window" of history as we see it through him.

This study of the Church University relied on secondary sources for several reasons. First, many of the secondary sources related to this study were created fifty to eighty years ago, placing them closer to the events of significance. This proximity in time provides insights and sources that are not available today. Also, a good secondary source will highlight what primary sources may or may not be available and what topics need to be considered. As I studied Chamberlin's work, for example, I discovered important primary sources that I had not considered previously. In this way the use of secondary sources significantly strengthened the study because it led to additional perspectives, thus providing a more full account of the events in the 1890's. Finally, these secondary sources, when taken together and assimilated helped identify what researchers have missed to date and how the missing information may alter our view

and appreciation of the long-reaching effects of the decision to close the Church University.

Limitations.

Individuals exploring historical research face challenges that those researching contemporary issues can, and should, avoid with careful preparation. Historical researchers are limited to the sources available. They cannot conduct interviews to tease out additional details or necessary information with clarifying questions or follow up interviews. In this particular study, and in any historical study, there were three specific limitations that required attention during the research and writing process: the significant lapse in time since the events of interest, the time constraints, and the limited access to necessary documents.

Researching a case that is over one hundred years old limits what a historian can say regarding the case, because the researcher has to question documents rather than individuals. This limitation restricts the depth that any historical project is able to reach. In this study, James E. Talmage's journals were a constant reminder of this limitation. Although Elder Talmage made regular journal entries, the lack of information was frustrating. At times he only mentioned meetings without disclosing the topic of discussion or even an outcome. Unfortunately it is not possible to go back to Talmage and conduct a follow up interview to identify some of these omitted facts. His journals did provide hints, however, to where additional details might be found. This was not always the case and provided a major limitation to the study.

Another limitation is the time-consuming nature of historical research. Time is not an endless resource. Locating, obtaining, and then cataloging primary records for this project required a significant investment of time. All projects must come to an end, and so a balance had to be maintained between actually finishing the project and

ensuring that adequate time had been spent in search of potentially relevant information in different sources from the time period. It is always possible that additional information might be uncovered. The required challenge for every researcher in every discipline is to provide substantial evidence and sources so that the end result answers critiques and challenges appropriately and to know when that point in the research has been reached in order to complete the process. One indicator in this study that sufficient work had been done was the fact that additional searches led to a duplication of information. When I was getting fewer new facts, I knew that I had accomplished my purpose in the libraries.

Access to information is another hurdle that creates problems for historians dealing with religious organizations, such as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A very important primary source for this study would be the minutes to the meetings of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. These minutes from the January discussion regarding the Church University would have eliminated the need for guess work regarding the points of discussion and the final intentions of the leaders when they decided to close the Church University and why they decided to give \$60,000 in buildings and apparatus to the University of Utah instead of giving it to the LDS College. The Church, however, will not grant access to those minutes. In this project, information was gleaned from other primary and secondary resources to estimate what may have occurred in those meetings based on the outcomes or things said in later meetings. The actual discussions of those involved would present a greater insight, but because of the limited access to these documents, I made my best effort with what was available and then moved forward with the material that was accessible.

Research Questions

Considering the limitations on time and the potentially overwhelming amount of information that is available on the topic of Utah education during the 1800's, perhaps the most important part of this research process was clearly establishing the research questions that would guide the research. Identifying questions that are important to current educational issues provide a filter of sorts with regard to what information I focused on. Professors and peers helped in this process as questions were considered and either adjusted or thrown out because they were too broad, unanswerable, or too easy. Initially, the research was aimed solely on the University of Utah, but considering the amount of research that already exists on the school, it became apparent how little information was available on the Church University. There had to be more available than what was easily accessible. At that point, questions regarding the Church University became the focus and the entire direction of the project was changed.

With a new set of questions, it became easier to identify, at least generally speaking, whether or not potential sources would be helpful in this project. The questions did not become concrete until later in the process, but early on a major challenge was that everything was important. Every newspaper article, every journal entry, and every book might have been important to the study. It was impossible to handle that overload of information. This issue underlies the importance of developing specific and interesting questions at the beginning of a research project, even if those questions change over time or become irrelevant to the study. Booth, Colomb, & Williams (2003) explained it this way:

Once you settle on a question or two, you have a guide to doing your research more systematically. A question narrows your search to only those data you

need for its answer.... When you only have a topic, the data you can find on it are, literally, endless; worse, you will never know when you have enough. (p. 48)

The timing of the decision to close the Church University created questions regarding *why* would the Church do that then. *How* and *why* questions usually interest the audience and typically lead to more interesting subjects than standard *what*, *when*, and *where* questions. These latter questions simply provide information and are less provocative.

The initial answer to the *why* question dealt with the financial struggles that the Church was experiencing. The subsequent donation of \$60,000 in buildings and equipment to the University of Utah suggested that the question could not be written off as purely financial. This created additional questions: *What other factors were present when the Church chose to close its school and how might they have influenced the Church to close its university?* The research process really became a search for these answers. A complex web of factors from the 1890's had to be sorted out and evaluated against the potential influence each may have had on this important decision. Understanding these factors provided a clearer picture as to why the shift in the Latter-day Saints' educational policies and practices took place. This process identified other significant factors that motivated the First Presidency to make this landmark decision. Ultimately, there were several questions that guided the focus of the article, and not all of them were answered. What was uncovered, however, will open the door to future conversations and potentially discovering the answers to those questions that remain unaddressed.

Delimitations.

In order to answer the key research questions in the limited space of an article, the emphasis had to be focused on the Church University. The experiences are viewed

largely through the newspaper editorials, journal entries and personal communications of those involved as mentioned above. The scope of the article did not allow for detailed accounts of events outside of this focus. Important background information was provided in subsequent appendices in order to establish credibility in the topic area, but the article itself focused on the major research questions listed above.

Appendix C: Why Start the Church University

Introduction

The Church University influenced the success of other institutions of higher education that continue to enroll and educate students today (see Appendix G). In order to understand how the Church University came to be, it is necessary to address questions regarding why it was started. What were the issues that motivated the Church to start the Church University? What additional benefits did President Woodruff and the First Presidency anticipate from the Church University that other Church Academies did not offer? This appendix addresses these questions in an attempt to set the stage for the decision to open the Church's first private university.

There were three major reasons that the Church started the school. First, Willard Young had an insatiable drive to see his father's desire for a Church Academy in Salt Lake City come to fruition. Brigham Young deeded property for a school in the Eighteenth Ward, and Willard, even as the young member of the Board of Trustees, felt an obligation to carry through with the wish. The second issue was the number of members heading east for post-secondary education. As secularized curriculum in eastern universities became more and more common, the leaders of the Church began to fear that Latter-day Saints exposed to such curriculum might lose their faith. Finally, there was a vacancy at the top of the Church School System hierarchy of institutions. According to the education model that was established in Nauvoo, and then attempted again in Salt Lake, the Church's system of schools functioned beneath one administrative head. Initially, that was supposed to be the University of Deseret, but

that school was being operated and controlled by the Territorial Legislature and the Church needed to identify one school for the others to look to as the flagship.

Willard Young and His Father's Vision

Without Willard Young, there may have never been a Church University (Quinn, 1973). Willard Young was born in 1852 and was the third child to Brigham and Clarissa Ross Young. He was the first of Brigham's children to leave Utah in search of higher education when he left in 1871 to attend West Point where, according to Simpson (2007), Brigham knew that his son would receive a solid education but also be in a position to demonstrate that the Latter-day Saints were "as rational, loyal, and civilized as other Americans" (p. 785). Willard graduated fourth in a class of forty-three in 1875 and Utahans believed their native son had shattered the national sentiment that "polygamous children are inferior to those of monogamic parentage" (Return of Utah's West Point Cadet, 1875).

The next year, Brigham Young deeded property in Salt Lake City for an educational institution. President Young created a Board of Trustees for the property, which consisted of David O. Calder, George Reynolds, Hiram S. Young, Ernest I. Young, Brigham Young, Jr., John W. Young, and Willard Young (Quinn, 1973). The deed explicitly required the institution to use scriptures as part of the curriculum and teach as fact the history of the Prophet Joseph Smith, the atonement of Jesus Christ, and the veracity of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (*Deed of Transfer: Brigham Young to David O. Calder et al.*, 1876). When Brigham Young died in 1877, the idea of an academy in Salt Lake may have died with him had it not been for the efforts of his son, Willard. Quinn (1973) wrote, "The history of Young University and the Church University is inseparable from Willard Young, who was the prime mover in its

establishment” (p. 71). The impetus for the Church University came from Willard Young and his drive originated in the vision of his late father.

Brigham Young and the battle over education. Brigham Young’s desire to establish Church Academies throughout the territory transcended three decades. To understand why it was such an important issue for Brigham Young, it is important to comprehend the opposing forces that were at odds in the 1870’s. Historians have attributed the increasing hostility and tension to the growing number of non-Mormons living in Salt Lake and surrounding areas. Moffitt, for example, pointed out that non-LDS “newcomers were unwilling to subject their children’s educational welfare [in general] to the existing influence of the Church leaders” (Moffitt, 1946, p. 51). The railroad and the non-Latter-day Saints migration to Utah may mark the official end of isolation for the church, however, there were already those in Utah that resented Brigham Young’s seemingly unchecked influence in political issues before the railroad was finished. This was a composite group made up of apostate Latter-day Saints and non-Latter-day Saints.

The most vocal of these opponents to Brigham’s economic and political vision for Utah were William S. Godbe, Elias Harrison, and Edward Tullidge. For a brief period of time, this group referred to themselves as the “Church of Zion.” These men started the *Salt Lake Tribune* as their way to voice their point of view in contrast to the Church. The *Salt Lake Tribune* changed ownership and three non-Latter-day Saint newspapermen from the East took the reins and intensified the battle with Brigham Young and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. “To the publishers of The Tribune during the 1873-1883 decade, objectivity was a vice not to be tolerated in news columns, editorials or correspondence from readers. The news columns and correspondence were frequently more opinionated than the editorials” (Malmquist, 1971, p. 41). The *Tribune*

attacked the Church over every possible subject, but one of the most intense battles dealt with the education policies in the Territory.

When it came to education, neither side trusted the other to oversee the curriculum or control the purse of a public school system. The State pushed for public schools that were funded by a general tax. This system was referred to as Free Schools in the newspapers. In 1866, the Territorial Legislature passed an Act that allowed for a tax that would fund Common Schools. "This Act undoubtedly looked to the establishment of Free Schools," much to the dismay of Governor Charles Durkee, however, "the first section of [the Act] left it to the option of the inhabitants of the several districts, whether they should give effect to the provisions of the Act or not." (*Deseret Weekly News*, January 20, 1869, p. 2). The Governor explained the benefits of a Free School system and then petitioned that the Act of 1866 be amended in such a way that the assessment became mandatory. A year later the Governor was still asking for a "wide spread system of common schools." He stated, "Property should cheerfully take up the burden and provide for a system of public free schools" (*Deseret Weekly News*, January 19, 1870, p. 4). The Territory, however, did not get a Free School bill passed until 1890. The leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ, starting with Brigham Young, fought the establishment of Free Schools in Utah, as described by the Territorial officials.

Leaders of the Church also opposed the Free School movement because they did not trust that the federal government would actually provide the schools promised in the legislation. The lack of trust was not totally ungrounded. As a result of the fact that the federal government had not followed through on their commitment to give land grant schools to the territory, Brigham Young doubted that money collected through taxes for the purposes of educating students would entirely make it to the schoolhouses.

For these and other reasons, Brigham Young continued to oppose the Free Schools until the end of his life.

Many of you may have heard what certain journalists have had to say about Brigham Young being opposed to free schools. I am opposed to free education as much as I am opposed to taking away property from one man and giving it to another who knows not how to take care of it. But when you come to the fact, I will venture to say that I school ten children to every one that those do who complain so much of me. I now pay the school fees of a number of children who are either orphans or sons and daughters of poor people. But in aiding and blessing the poor I do not believe in allowing my charities to go through the hands of a set of robbers who pocket nine-tenths themselves, and give one-tenth to the poor. Therein is the difference between us; I am for the real act of *doing* and not *saying*. Would I encourage free schools by taxation? No! (*Journal of Discourses*, 1974, p. 18:357)

This battle between Brigham and the political effort to establish Free Schools antedated the Church University by nearly twenty years, but the battle persisted almost until the Church University was established. In fact, the Free School Act was passed only one year before the General Board of Education established the Board of Trustees of Young University, which a year later became the Church University. Almost twenty years after the inception of Brigham Young Academy in Provo, *The Normal*, a BYA publication, printed an article by Karl G. Maeser about the history of the Academy. He commented on the feelings that Brigham Young had when the school was started. Maeser (1892) wrote, "The necessity of the establishment of a new kind of educational institution for Zion had been revealed by the Lord the Prophet Brigham Young" (p. 67).

Clearly Brigham Young anticipated a very different education system from what the state would be able to provide due to the separation of Church and State limitations.

He expressed concern over the challenges to the conviction of those attending school in secularized systems. He voiced this concern to his sons that were going to the East to study higher education. He wrote to Willard Young in 1876 and said,

We have enough and to spare, at present in these mountains, of schools where young infidels are made because the teachers are so tender-footed that they dare not mention the principles of the gospel to their pupils, but have no hesitancy in introducing into the classroom the theories of Huxley, of Darwin, or of Mill and the false political economy which contends against co-operation and the United Oder. (B. Young, 1974, p. 199)

There is evidence that those feelings continued into the 1890's. For example, the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education needed teachers for its Church Schools in the Stake. Elias Morris, a member of the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education, wondered if there were not sufficient "District School Teachers [that could] be educated so as to be used in Church Schools" (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, January 7, 1890*). Religious education was not another topic; rather, it was a manner in which the whole education system should be carried out. The fact that school teachers coming from the school district classrooms needed additional education in order to suffice in a Church school suggests that the people saw science, or other subjects, incomplete without the added dimension of solid and confirmed Church doctrine.

Contend with the Universities in the East

Another important educational issue for the Latter-day Saints in the end of the nineteenth century was the number of students heading east to obtain their post-secondary education. Karl G. Maeser addressed the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education

in 1889 as the Superintendent of the Church School System. He spoke about the need to establish a school that would “preclude the necessity of our youth going away for education” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, March 21, 1889*).

President Cannon expressed this same sentiment. He hoped “to establish at least one of our schools on such a plain as to obviate the necessity of our young men going East to complete their education” (*General Board of Education Minutes, 1892, April 9, 1889*). Two years later, during the Convention of Church Schools in June 1891, President George Q. Cannon declared, “It is to be hoped that the Church University will soon be established, so that it will not be necessary for any of our young men to go away from home to master the higher branches” (*General Board of Education Minutes, 1892*). Karl G. Maeser wrote to President Wilford Woodruff and encouraged a “much needed University in Salt Lake, for the purpose of eventually stopping that pernicious annual exodus of our young people to Eastern High Schools” (Maeser, personal communication, March 21, 1889). At the 1892 CES Convention, Maeser said, “With reference to going East for courses of study, advice in favor of this should be given very cautiously, as many had gone who were but ill-prepared, and as a result some had lost their faith. Even one soul is too great a price to pay for the science which the world could give” (*Deseret Weekly News, June 11, 1892*).

Once the Free School Act was passed in 1890, there were an increased amount of Latter-day Saint children attending public schools. One of the Church’s responses to this tendency was to increase the number of Latter-day Saint teachers in the public schools. Not so the teachers could instill Latter-day Saint theology into the curriculum, but so that they could teach secular ideas in a way that would not destroy the tender faith of the young children. In response to the district schools and the increase in Latter-

day Saints who chose to send their children to them, the *Academic Review*, Brigham Young Academy's first magazine, stated:

We prefer seeing schools of our own faith established in all wards of Zion, to enable the children of the Latter-day Saints to be taught by teachers of their own belief, but as long as we have not reached this highly desirable plan, we are, in justice to all, satisfied with non-sectarian district schools, if they really are such, and not breeding places of infidels. (p. 27).

Eastern education was expensive. It was not only the risk that going to a secularized university posed to the faith of young Latter-day Saints that caused hesitation, although that was the major issue. The *Daily Enquirer* explained some of the benefits of establishing the Church University. The article stated:

It is found to be very expensive for young men to go east for that which should be imparted much more cheaply here. The General Board of Education, which has this important matter under consideration, will have the entire support of the Latter-day Saints. (*Daily Enquirer*, March 27, 1891.)

The cost was not the only thing that caused the leaders of the Church to hesitate sending young men and women to the East for higher education. It was not even just what was in the curriculum—although that was certainly a major concern. Rather, the Latter-day Saint view of education insisted that a secular approach was inappropriate because of what it lacked.

What schools lacked that bothered Latter-day Saints. The problem with the education in the East, according to members of the Church, was not necessarily based in a notion or belief that the science was bad or that the math was inaccurate, although there were some theories that conflicted with Latter-day Saint doctrine. Rather, Latter-day Saints took issue with what those subjects left out. *The Normal* published a brief

history of the BYA in 1892. The history was written by Karl G. Maeser (1892) and provided a significant insight to how Latter-day Saints viewed higher education at the time when the Church University was started. He wrote:

The necessity of the establishment of a new kind of educational institution for Zion had been revealed by the Lord to the Prophet Brigham Young. The lack of what element created that necessity? It has been said the Saints will be saviors upon mount Zion: that they are destined to redeem the world. Redeem the world from what? From the thralldom of sin, ignorance, and degradation! In order to do this Zion will have to take the lead in everything, and consequently in education. But there is much education already, much science, much art, much skill, and much so-called civilization—in fact, so much that this generation is fast getting into the notion that they can get along without a God, like the Titans of old that wanted to storm the heavens by piling one mountain on top of another. (Maeser, 1892)

Going East out of necessity. Brigham Young and John Taylor both sanctioned and encouraged members of the Church to go to Universities in the East. There was a desperate need for surgeons and other professionals in the Utah Territory. It was hoped, however, that only a few students would have to travel to the eastern States to obtain the education necessary in these branches. They could then return to Utah and teach others what they had learned and avoid the risk of sending additional students away. James E. Talmage was an example of this thinking (Simpson, 2007).

Talmage as an example. James E. Talmage left Utah in August 1882, for a two-year scholastic mission during which time he studied for one year at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania and Johns Hopkins University in Maryland. Professor Karl G. Maeser, Talmage's most influential mentor, reinforced that the purpose of his trip was to go to

school and then return to Utah to assist in building up the educational effort at home. Maeser wrote a letter to James just before he left Provo to begin his journey. Maeser's purpose was to emphasize to Talmage that he was to obtain the education he sought with the purpose of blessing those in Utah. He said, "May you fully realize the benefits which you anticipate from your contemplated efforts and sacrifices, and return to us in due time still more qualified to assist us in the advancement of the educational interests of our Mountain Home" (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, August 25, 1882).

Infidelity was always a concern. Before leaving Salt Lake, James received a blessing from Elder Brigham Young, Jr., a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. In that blessing, Talmage (1879-1933) was counseled,

If you seek inspiration you will perform your mission profitably; and your mind shall expand in the faith of the gospel as well as in letters. If your heart and desires remain pure you shall go in peace and shall return in safety. We pray God to guard your mind from yielding in the least degree to the spirit of infidelity. (August 26, 1882)

While he was at school, Talmage was aware of the conflicts that men of faith and men of science had engendered. The scholar and the disciple collided while James was studying at Lehigh University. He wrote,

The more one reflects, the more is found for reflection. Now, I am here for a scientific training: Science has caused many of her votaries to become infidels, and I have been warned to carefully weigh every argument and statement presented to me. Now, an error I can see in my past-life, among many others, is that I have been too set in an idea once gained, and endeavoring to profit by that very visible error, I try to keep myself open to receive suggestions at all time. Now, the last letter from Bro. Maeser warned me again, against accepting

statements untried. I am between two fires in my own conscience—what shall I do? (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, January 21, 1883)

Talmage answered his own question in the same journal entry. He committed to “rely upon [his] priesthood, as a touchstone, to detect at all times truth from error” (January 21, 1883) The key for James, according to his own record, to staying true to his Latter-day Saint faith was his connection to the Prophets and other leaders of the Church. By the time he reached Johns Hopkins, James E. Talmage had come to an important conclusion about the science-theology debate. For him, there simply was no debate. On March 16, 1884, James wrote,

In course of my studies I have naturally been brought face to face with the alleged atheistic tendency of scientific thought; and the conflict usually said to exist between Science and Religion. Now, I have felt a dilemma—and begin now to fancy I see a way out—I have been unable to see the point of conflict myself: my belief in a living God perfectly accords with my reverence for science... The dilemma which has troubled me is this—being unable to perceive the great difficulty of which scientists and Theologians, and scientific-theologians refer—I have feared that my investigation of the subject was lightly superficial, for when such great men, as most of the writers upon this subject are, find a puzzle, ‘twould be high egotism for me to say ‘I find no puzzle.’ ... I perceive that there can be no antagonism between the true science as revealed and made easy by the Priesthood. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, March 16, 1884)

Those that lost their faith. Unfortunately there were those that were not successful in maintaining their faith while studying in the universities of the East. One such example was LeGrand Young, Brigham Young’s nephew. LeGrand was one of the first Latter-day Saints to seek a degree in Law. He attended the University of Michigan

from 1873 to 1874 and upon his return to Salt Lake City he started a practice with Parley Williams, a well-known anti-Mormon. Young became inactive in the Church for a time, although he eventually returned and defended the Church from non-LDS legal attacks. The community continued to remember LeGrand as what could happen to young Latter-day Saints if they attended a secularized, non-Latter-day Saint University (Simpson, 2007, p. 787). As his sons went away to school in the East, Brigham Young was concerned about their testimonies.

[He] worried about the temptations [they] would face in schools where students indulged in swearing, smoking, or irreligion. The intellectual environment of the university concerned Brigham as much as the moral. He warned his sons about the corrupting intellectual influences of rationalistic skepticism, scientific naturalism, and poisonous—that is, capitalistic—economic notions. (Simpson, 2007, p. 796)

Karl G. Maeser, expressed his concerns about Eastern universities. He wrote, Some of our brightest intellects...that have gone East have suffered themselves to be swamped by the influence of worldly education and flinging away their divine inheritance having [en]dangered the faith of their fathers. I hold that all the knowledge and learning that the world can give us is too dearly paid for the loss of one of these precious souls. (Maeser, personal communication, May 30, 1892)

A school to compete. In September of the same year, Karl G. Maeser and James E. Talmage both spoke at the dedication of the Weber Stake Academy. Talmage recorded in his journal that Maeser prophesied saying “that the day would soon come when instead of our young men going east to study, there would be a tide toward Zion seeking truth” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, August 29, 1892). Elder Franklin D. Richards

was in attendance and endorsed the statements made by Dr. Maeser. Just a few months later, Maeser repeated the sentiment saying,

The time will come, and you will live to see it, I may not, but it will surely come, when the tide will set in from the other way; and they will come from the east and the west, from the north and the south to be educated by the learned in Zion. (Maeser, 1892, p. 14)

Deseret News articles reiterated Maeser's sentiments and felt that the Church University would be the school to bring the students to Utah. One such article, written just as the first semester was coming to a close, read, "A corps of instructors will be added, and courses of study comparing favorably with the best institutions in the country will be projected" (*Deseret Weekly News*, November 25, 1893, p. 17).

In his summary of the Church University, Quinn explained that it was "the church's first true effort to establish a university of such grand proportions that it could succeed in competing with leading educational institutions in the East" (Quinn, 1973, p. 89). The Church University was started in the seedbed of competition. Initially, it was Brigham Young's competitive exodus against the secularized common schools. The Church, however, had begun the process of integration with the United States and a more and more Latter-day Saints traveled east for advanced degrees a new competition had to be addressed. Leaders in the Church were concerned over the advanced secularization at the institutions of higher learning in the East. That worry created a vision of offering advanced degrees in Utah without the concern of secularized principles attacking the faith of the students.

Establish a Central Institution

The Church established a model of education in Nauvoo before coming west. That model utilized one administrative head, which oversaw education at all levels

below it. The education system initially set up in Salt Lake followed that model. The University of Deseret was meant to be that institutional head that would ensure uniformity and establish standards of excellence. One branch of education that became a specific focus for the need of uniformity was the Normal Departments in the Church. Before the Church University was established there was a movement to make the LDS College that school. Karl G. Maeser met with the Salt Lake Stake Board of Education and expressed “the desire of the General Board to make Salt Lake School the leading School in the Territory with proper chairs endowed of such high grade as to preclude the necessity of our youth going away for education” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, 1888-1938, March 21, 1889).

Preparations for this advancement were begun. The name of the school was change to the Latter Day Saints’ College [LDS College]. In another meeting of the Board “it was ... resolved by the General Board that a Normal Department be included in the Latter Day Saints’ College the coming season which was to be known as the ‘Central Normal College of the Church’” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, 1888-1938, April 7, 1890). Later in the year, Karl G. Maeser pointed out the serious lack of control that the Church had over the District Schools. He impressed upon the Salt Lake Board of Education the need to establish elementary schools within the city to compensate for the uncertainty that would be associated with the instruction in the public schools. He then suggested that lower grades could be put under the direction of the LDS College (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*, 1888-1938, June 21, 1890).

The new school and the Normal Departments of the Church. Eventually, the focus shifted from the LDS College to the Church University. It was decided that one of the ways to distinguish the Church University as the premiere educational institution within the Church School System was to furnish it with the very best equipment. This

also gave the school a better chance in competing with the schools in the East. James Talmage was sent on a transcontinental trip to search out the best scientific apparatus being used in the elite schools of the eastern United States and even some European universities during the summer of 1892.

When the decision was made to start the Church University in lieu of turning the LDS College into the central institution in the Church School System, it became likely that the Church University would also take responsibility for overseeing the Normal Departments throughout the system as well. This would provide a needed homogeneity to the courses and the teachers entering into the schools whether academy or district. This, perhaps, was even more important considering the number of teachers that the Church desired to put into the district schools.

Those who are interested in the development of education under a church system, affiliate in the recognized fact that teachers who design working in Church schools, should possess that which they are expected to impart to others. They must therefore, be drilled as they expect to drill pupils under them, for they cannot impart that which they do not possess. To reach this condition, and *make such a system universal*, demands the establishment of an institution where the highest branches of learning are taught. (*Daily Enquirer*, March 27, 1891)

The members of the Church started to feel that if enough teachers were prepared in the Church's Normal Schools and then placed in teaching positions within the public schools that a sense of control over the curriculum could be preserved. Sectarian teachings would be out of the question, but teachers thus prepared would not undercut the faith of the Latter-day Saints. This phenomenon occurred in Provo during the late 1880's and early 1890's. "The district schools of Provo have been largely supplied by teachers from the [Brigham Young] Academy, giving them such importance as to

greatly satisfy parents with the class of training given to their children" (*Daily Enquirer*, March 27, 1891).

In a Church Education System Conference in 1892, President George Q. Cannon expressed similar feelings. "In places where district schools are taught by members of our Church, there is not so much necessity for Church schools as there is where other conditions prevail. Judging from the reports which have been given, it seems that the church schools are becoming more firmly established, and the people are maintaining their disposition to sustain them."

Appendix D: The Church's Financial Pinch

The Financial Consequences of Federal Interventions

By 1890, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was financially in trouble. The United States Congress passed the Edmunds Act in 1882. The Act prohibited the practice of polygamy and was authored by Senator George F. Edmunds of Virginia. In addition to outlawing polygamy, the act made bigamous or unlawful cohabitation illegal. The Act also required that wives in polygamous relationships testify against their husbands (Staver, 2004). The Latter-day Saints believed the Act to be an unconstitutional infringement on their religious freedoms. President John Taylor, the third president of the Church, commented publicly on the Edmunds Act as the Senate was considering it on the floor. He asked, "Are we living under a government of law, or are we and all our rights as freemen subject only to the whim and caprice of Congress" (Taylor, 1887, p. 294)? Regardless of the protests by leaders and the members of the LDS Church, the Act was passed. It marked a major point in the U.S. political pressures on the LDS people in Utah and throughout the country.

The Edmunds-Tucker Act of 1887 continued the assault against the Latter-day Saint practices. This bill dissolved the corporation of the Church and the Perpetual Emigration Fund and authorized the Federal Government to confiscate Church property not used explicitly for religious purposes. This 1887 Act had a huge impact on education in the Utah Territory. Any funds seized by the government were required to be used for the territorial schools. Additionally, the position of territorial superintendent of schools became an appointed position rather than an elected one.

This removed the power from the overwhelmingly Latter-day Saint majority to elect someone of their choice. It basically insured that someone not religiously obligated to follow the direction of the Church leaders would fill the position (Esplin, 2006, p. 63). McBride (1952) noted, "This period of persecution, moral, physical, and financial, had a very [deleterious] effect upon the growth of education within the Church" (p. 133).

The Church fights the Edmunds-Tucker Act. The political struggles were not restricted to Utah. President John Taylor spoke out against the political efforts in Idaho and the fear of placing the LDS youth in public schools. President Taylor, along with other leaders of the Church, went into the underground in order to avoid arrest under the warrants that came as a result of the Edmunds Act and the Edmunds-Tucker Act. President Taylor wrote a letter in April 1886 discussing his views of the federal government's interference with education in Idaho. The letter was read at a Church General Conference.

In Idaho Territory the usurpations of the officers have gone from bad to worse. They there out-Herod Herod in their disregard of the people's liberties. One of the latest movements has in view the revocation of all certificates given to school teachers who are members of the Church of Jesus Christ which means 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. (Taylor, 1886, p. 314)

Too much to withstand. The Edmunds-Tucker Act almost of its own accord brought the Church to a financial ruin. The legislation enforced the Morrill Act of 1862 that limited religious institutions to no more than \$50,000 in assets. All assets in excess of this limit were escheated from the Church and, according to the bill, were supposed to be used for the territorial schools. In the meanwhile, the Church was forced to pay

rent for those buildings and properties that it still occupied. President Woodruff recorded in his journals,

We paid the United States Government \$28,000 dollars interest on our own property since the government had taken possession of [the Gardo House] and we were paying \$450 a month interest on the Gardo House and we thought it was time to stop. (Woodruff, 1985, p. 9:174)

In addition to what the Church was required to pay out, the Edmunds Tucker Act also affected its income. George Q. Cannon stated, "The seizure of the Church property had a very marked effect upon the income [of the church], very many members of the Church fearing to give what they otherwise would lest further seizures might take place" (*Deseret Weekly News*, July 14, 1888). Gibbons noted,

The escheatment of the properties of the Church had robbed it of most of its assets, fixed and liquid. But it had not reduced the expenses of operation. Indeed, it had increased expenses because of the rentals the Church had to pay for the use of its own facilities, and because of the heavy fees of the receivers. (Francis M Gibbons, 1988, p. 367)

The Church did not regain ownership of its confiscated properties until 1893. In 1891, President Wilford Woodruff was convinced that only the Lord could help the Church out of the serious financial hole it was in (Woodruff, 1985). The Manifesto was the first step towards integration with the nation as a whole, however, the financial difficulty did not end with the manifesto and the end of the political war over the practice of polygamy.

Impact on the schools. The Church University, along with Brigham Young Academy and other counties in Utah, had applied to receive properties that had been escheated from the Church through the Edmunds Tucker and Morrill Acts. The Church

University argued that private individuals had donated the property for charitable uses and requested that the Government allow it to be used as such. The Government refused the request, and that decision was appealed to the Territorial Supreme Court (*Daily Enquirer*, September 3, 1893). This was not a major set back as the Federal Government returned the properties taken during the previous decade.

President Woodruff received the news that Congress had voted to restore the properties via telegram on October 23 just a little more than a month after the Territorial courts had refused the requests. Although the Utah Attorney General interfered with the actual return of the properties and money, on January 9, 1894, the courts ruled the “receiver to turn over money to the president of the church amounting to \$438,174.39” (Woodruff, 1985, p. 9:284). This unfortunately, did not resolve all of the problems for the church: financial or political. The Church University found itself at the center of both issues during the 1893-1894 school year, which was the only year that the school was open. Unfortunately, the political actions of the 1880’s simply set the stage for an even more serious financial problem in the 1890’s.

The Panic of 1893

Ronald Walker (2004) said that the financial crisis of 1893 “was among the most disastrous in American history” (p. 258). James Talmage recorded in his journal the following insight regarding the times: “I have never known a stronger current of financial difficulty than seems now to have swept over the land” (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, July 31, 1893). Americans were losing their jobs at an alarming rate and those that did not lose their jobs watched their paychecks shrink by up to ten percent. As the money in the East evaporated, the banks in the West, which were typically short on cash, began to collapse. Two major banks in Chicago, Columbia National Bank and Chemical National Bank, failed in 1893. Each bank held capital stock of \$1,000,000 and,

at the time of their failure, liabilities totaling \$2.6 and \$2.9 million respectively (Kane, 1922). As a result of the failures, Americans lost their faith in the banking industry. People began to doubt the solvency of banks throughout the United States. Nearly 575 banks closed, at least temporarily, before the panic subsided (Carlson, 2005).

George Q. Cannon, Heber J. Grant and other members of the Church organized CG & Co. in December 1891. It was an investment firm designed to help the Church obtain a favorable credit rating in order to secure loans from banks across the United States. George Q. Cannon and Heber J. Grant were the senior partners in the firm. The firm received a \$1,000,000 Double A rating and Elder Grant secured over \$250,000 in loans from San Francisco banks and another \$260,000 from New York banks in 1892. The firm maintained a close connection to two Latter-day Saint banks in Utah and was heavily invested in Z.C.M.I. Signs of financial difficulty became evident in December 1892 and January 1893.

Elder Grant Goes to New York. Elder Grant left for New York in May 1893 hoping to renew \$300,000 in notes. Failure to secure just one of the notes “could [have destroyed] the Mormon credit rating and make it impossible to arrange further renewals and loans” (R. W. Walker, 2004, p. 263). Walker suggested that “everyone intimate with Mormon finances realized that a single defaulted note. . . . could spell the end of church credit” (p. 265) Francis Lyman wrote in his journal, “This is the most difficult mission Bro. Heber has ever undertaken now that the financial affairs are tumbling in all directions” (F. Lyman, 1885-1951, May 10, 1893).

On June 22, W. S. McCornick, a non-Mormon banker requested payment on his “demand” notes held by CG & Co. for \$20,000. If CG & Co. collapsed, its close association with the Utah banks would have forced them to file for bankruptcy as well. On the other side, if the banks in Utah failed, the CG & Co. would not have been able to

sustain itself because it had secured loans using bank securities as collateral. Elder Grant approached John Claflin. He was the president of H. B. Claflin Company, and, although he was hesitant, Claflin eventually provided Elder Grant with a \$5,000 loan and helped him secure another \$5,000 albeit at an interest rate of eighteen percent. This only satisfied half of the debt owed to simply one man back in Salt Lake, however, and Elder Grant was running out of time (R. W. Walker, 2004).

While Elder Grant was working to find trusting investors in New York, President George Q. Cannon was doing the same in London. Elder Franklin D. Richards recorded a one-word telegram from President Cannon: “unsuccessful” (Richards, 1844-1899, July 7, 1893). This failure in England placed even more pressure on Elder Grant in New York and President Woodruff in Salt Lake. Elder Grant felt the pressure of the responsibility and it weighed heavily on the young Apostle. He received communication from Salt Lake on a regular basis and watched from afar the matters in Salt Lake City getting worse. Walker (2004) described Elder Grant’s physical exertion while he was in New York. “Expecting to be absent three weeks from Utah, he had now spent six weeks in the East, and he wondered if his strength would allow him to continue his efforts.” (p. 267)

Hard times in Utah. James Talmage spent the summer of 1893 in England visiting museums and scientific societies. Upon returning to Utah, he wrote in his journal,

I find that the painful stringency in the money market is felt here in Utah as elsewhere ... I have never known a stronger current of financial difficulty than seems now to have swept over the land ... From every side arises the cry of hard times. I have never witnessed a greater stagnation in business enterprises than has manifested itself during the last month. Money is not to be had, confidence

seems to have disappeared and credit is denied to nearly all tradesmen. Public works are stopped and in this city alone thousands of men are out of employment. (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, July 31, 1893)

On August 31, 1893, Elder Richards recorded an encounter with one sister from Salt Lake. Her case summarized the situation in Utah. Elder Richards wrote,

The Security of money renders it difficult for many of the poor saints to make themselves comfortable for food & necessities. A poor & afflicted sister called [and] related her adversities in trying to sustain her family with her needle . . . she sees starvation before them. I encouraged her the best I could & she wiped away her tears & went with apparently increased bravery. (Richards, 1844-1899, August 31, 1893)

Elder Grant returns home. Elder Grant's three-month trip to New York had simply bought the Church a little time. At the end of August, Elder Grant returned to New York trying to find a more permanent financial solution to the Panic of 1893. Grant finally secured the loan that would eventually get the Church headed in the right direction. He met with John Claflin. Luckily for the Church, Claflin sensed the worst of the national situation had passed and felt that the time was right to make a handsome profit, cement his trade with Z.C.M.I, and help his Latter-day Saint friends out of their financial predicament. He proposed a \$500,000 loan with a \$100,000 bonus at six percent interest. Over thirty-three percent of the loan amount would be lost to interest or commission. The conditions were not pleasing, but Elder Grant realized the desperate state of things in Utah, so he asked to split the offer in half. The final deal was \$250,000 over two years at six percent interest and \$50,000 going to Claflin as a bonus. The result was the Church received \$200,000 but owed \$250,000 due in just two years (R. W. Walker, 2004).

Paying for Two School Systems

The financial difficulties were felt throughout the educational system as well as the banking industry. Even before the Panic of 1893, the Church School System was in trouble because of the “Free School Act” of 1890. This Act mandated a property tax to fund a public school system. This placed a large burden on the people that wished to send their children to the Church Academies. These parents were still required to pay the taxes that went to fund the public, or district, schools. Then, in order to send children to a Church Academy, the parents would have to pay tuition. This tuition was the second school that the family had to pay for, and there were some families that just simply could not afford to pay for both. Because one was not an option, many of the parents sent their children to the public schools.

On June 17, 1893, the Salt Lake Stake gathered a representative from each of its wards to discuss how the Stake could raise necessary funds to keep the LDS College operating. Eight of the forty-seven wards were excused from the meeting, because they operated their own Academy or Seminary and the Stake did not feel like it could place the burden of financing both their own school and the Stake school. The financial difficulty of the time was apparent in the comments of the meeting. The representative from the Third Ward “considered it would be a hard matter to raise the amount as people were not interested to the same extent as in the Temple and many could not afford to send their children [to school] through their financial condition.” Another representative, this one from the Eighth Ward, reminded the people in the meeting of the “general indebtedness of the people at large and their financial embarrassment” (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938, June 17, 1893*).

Church funding for academies is cut. In August 1893, the General Church Board of Education announced that it would not be giving any appropriations to Church

Academies or Seminaries for that school year. The financial situation with the banks and the CG & Company left the Church unable to extend any financial assistance to any school. The Board of Education responsible for the LDS College recognized how close the school was to being closed down. They turned the school over to the teachers and hoped that tuition would cover the operating expenses. For the portions of salaries that the Board could not pay in cash, the teachers would receive the remainder of their salaries on the donation account—which meant that they be permitted to receive payment in the form of supplies from the Bishop’s Storehouse or those things that others had handed over to the Bishop for their tithing (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938*).

Payment on the Ellerbeck property. To make matters worse for the Church, in January 1894, just a few days before Joseph Kingsbury approached President Woodruff with his offer for compromise, Mrs. H. Ellerbeck approached the LDS College demanding that the school pay \$650 in interest owed to her on the property where the College and the Church University sat. The Salt Lake Board of Education purchased the land from her in 1891 for \$25,000 (*Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes, 1888-1938*). If the Board did not make the interest payment, Mrs. Ellderbeck threatened that she would be forced to foreclose on the property. Just four months later, the teachers at the LDS College offered to take a \$500 per year decrease in salary per year in order to keep the school operating. For most of the teachers, this amount represented nearly one-fourth of their annual salary.

It was clear that the Church’s financial situation had become a pressing concern for anyone familiar with the finances of the Church. President Wilford Woodruff was not pleased with the fact that Elder Grant had entered into the steep, one-sided loan from Claflin. He did, however, recognize that it was necessary in order to stay the hand

of bankruptcy. The Church simply had no other option. President Woodruff's journal entries for the last quarter of 1893 consistently refer to the financial problems of the banks, the sugar producers, stakes or Church in general. Leonard Arrington (1958) wrote, "Indeed, the church's financial problem by 1894 had become so acute that the trustee-in-trust found himself borrowing from one bank to pay another" (pp. 401-402). The Church continued to survive from loan to loan through the 1890's, making the final payment on the Claflin loan—which was due in 1895—in 1899.

Conclusion

The affects of the financial situation in Utah on the Church University were made clearer in 1901. Members of the BYA faculty expressed the opinion that the State should not be spending money on higher education (the University of Utah) when there were still areas in the State that did not have state-funded high schools. Brimhall expressed the feelings of the faculty in a talk on June 13, 1901, at the summer school session of the BYA. A report of the talk was carried June 14 in the *Deseret Evening News*. Brimhall expressed the opinion that all a school really needed to have a University was solid teaching. The excessive buildings and apparatus that found their way into education were unnecessary and excessive if you did not have teachers equal to the task of using them effectively (*Deseret Evening News*, June 14, 1901, p. 7).

J. H. Paul, the principal at the LDS College in Salt Lake, argued that starting a university was out of the question for the Church. He mentioned the fact that the LDS College had nearly been forced to close just two years earlier because of the lack of funds. Paul expressed his own desire to see the Church start a university, were the funds readily available, because it would "certainly insure great prestige at home and abroad, and unbounded influence among our young people, to have within the Church itself an educational authority than which there is none higher in this immediate

vicinity" (*Deseret Evening News*, June 17, 1901, p. 5) As much as Professor Paul would like to have had a university in the Church, he felt that finances precluded the possibility.

The financial situation in 1894 was so precarious that the Church leaders spent time considering the possibilities of bankruptcy. To avoid this almost any measure was contemplated. The compromise offered by Joseph Kingsbury may have been seen as an answered prayer. The burden of funding a University—even though it was only operating at a limited capacity—may have been exactly what President Woodruff was looking for at that time. In addition to the financial burden, they were given the assurance that James E. Talmage would have a major influence on who and what was being taught at the state university. If factors leading up to the closure of the school could be weighted, it is likely that the financial situation of the Church at that particular time in history may have been the most influential of the factors.

Appendix E: Effect of Closing the Church University

Retrospective Speculation

It is an interesting exercise to look back over the years and speculate how the long-term effects of President Woodruff's decision to close the Church University. Had the Church continued its efforts to establish the Church University in Salt Lake as the head institution of its educational system, the education landscape in Utah would be very different today. Would the University of Utah have closed and moved to Logan? Would the Brigham Young Academy have remained an academy instead of becoming BYU? Would the LDS College have evolved into the LDS Business College, or would it have been closed with other academies and the Business College just been a part of what may have been known as CU (Church University)? With the benefit of hindsight and intuitive speculation, Quinn suggested that the decision to close the Church University resulted in saving three institutions of higher education that are still in operation today in the State of Utah: The University of Utah, Brigham Young University, and the LDS Business College (Quinn, 1973, p. 70).

Closing the school had a major impact on the Church Education System at the time. There was some concern regarding the future of other Church academies, but especially Brigham Young Academy in Provo and the LDS College in Salt Lake. Before the Church University was announced, the plan was to make the LDS College the administrative head of the Normal Schools for the Church. What did President Woodruff's agreement with Professor Kingsbury mean for the future of these academies? With a vacancy at the top of the Church School hierarchy, which school

would take its place, or would the Church adapt a totally different model of education and leave forever the pattern set in Nauvoo? These became very interesting questions over the next decade.

Interpreting the Compromise.

Closing the Church University created challenges for the Church's academies. The First Presidency did not definitively lay out their expectation for the academies in the absence of the Church University. This absence of specific direction created a situation where the academies began creating their own future. This was especially the case for Benjamin Cluff and the Brigham Young academy.

The problem arose out of differing interpretations of President Woodruff's commitment to Joseph Kingsbury about closing the Church University. James Talmage, Karl Maeser, and Benjamin Cluff will be the examples in this paper because of their different approaches. Talmage held the extreme position in favor of limiting the academies to schools that would prepare students to enter the University of Utah. He felt strongly that President Woodruff's commitment to support, rather than compete with, the state school, precluded the academies from duplicating any work done therein. Cluff, on the other hand, felt like the agreement only limited the Church's operation of its university in Salt Lake and that it could not be extended to implicate the academies or limit their course offerings. Maeser became a very important person in this situation, because he became the voice in the middle seeking to bring both sides together. In December, 1894, almost one year after the decision to close the University, Maeser wrote to George Reynolds and expressed his hope that "a conservative medium between the extremes represented by Profs. Talmage and Cluff respectively must be found" (Maeser, personal communication, December 12, 1894).

Initial reaction by the Board of Examiners. Once the Church University closed, the Board of Examiners, at least initially, seemed to interpret President Woodruff's agreement with Professor Kingsbury and the University of Utah as a non-compete clause that applied to all Church schools. James E. Talmage, as the President of the state university and a member of the Church's Board of Examiners, lobbied that no church school be allowed to offer college-level courses. He was not alone. In fact the entire Board of Examiners seemed to agree, at least in the beginning. Consider the minutes of the meeting of the Board on April 7, 1894. Note the comments by Professor J. H. Paul from the Brigham Young College, and Professor Benjamin Cluff from the BYA in Provo.

Prof. Paul suggested that in the light of present circumstances, which seemed to indicate the discontinuance of the Church University, it would be well to prepare the courses in the Stake Academies to lead to the Freshman Year of the University of Utah.

On motion of Prof. Cluff, it was decided to recommend to the General Board the issuance of letters of recommendation to Church Schools of academic grade, that they form their courses to meet the requirements for entrance to the University of Utah; and that these school refrain from paralleling work done in University branches; this not to be considered as referring to strictly, Normal work. (*General Board of Examiners, 1890*)

Talmage felt that offering courses and degrees that paralleled the University of Utah breached the agreement between President Woodruff and Professor Kingsbury as well as the message of the First Presidency in August 1894, which stated,

The existence of two institutions in the same city with many courses in common, rendered the paralleling of work, and the consequent duplication of expenditure, absolutely unavoidable. ... We recommend to the Latter-day Saints that they

faithfully devote their influence and energy, such as might have been claimed by the university of the Church, had wisdom dictated the continuance of that institution to the University of Utah. We trust that our people will sustain the Territorial University by their good words and works, and particularly by their patronage in sending thither their sons and daughters who are prepared to become students in the institution. (*Deseret Weekly News*, August 25, 1894)

Differing opinions about degrees and duplication of efforts. Even though, the Board of Examiners seemed united immediately after the school closed, it did not stay that way. The issue of degrees and, ultimately, the role of Church academies became a major point of controversy, especially with Cluff in Provo. Cluff felt that James Talmage was unjustified in his assumption that the academies should be restrained to simple feeder schools and any effort to do so hampered potential growth and kept the schools from accomplishing their divine mission. Cluff summarized the issue in his personal journals:

We are having some difficulty in regard to our conferring degrees. Bro. Talmage, now president of the U of Utah, seems determined to stop the growth of the Church Schools. The three schools, however, have now united (B.Y. Academy, B.Y. College and L.D.S. College), and will present a joint petition to the General Board for certain privileges due to all colleges. viz: the power to confer degrees. The Academy has been conferring degrees upon its own authority for two years now, but this was done because of the antagonism manifest by some of the members of the General Board. (Cluff, 1881-1909, December 25, 1894)

The controversy over issuing degrees remained an important debate into the 1900's. The question, in the minds of several educators, rested on two points. First, what was the intention of the First Presidency when they closed the Church University in

1894 and subsequently supported with large donations the University of Utah rather than the church academies (*General Board of Education Minutes*, 1892, November 8, 189)? And second, what work being done at the University of Utah, if any, should the academies be allowed to duplicate?

Talmage, and others, believed that allowing academies to offer college courses and degrees would create literal competition for the University of Utah and that this would contradict President Woodruff's agreement with Professor Kingsbury. The academies did not have the right to award degrees in and of themselves before the Church University was closed. The General Board of Education maintained control of awarding degrees controlled this power. In July 1893, Professor J. H. Paul from the Brigham Young College in Logan requested the privilege of issuing the Bachelor's of Science Degree. The Board of Examiners denied the request. Captain Willard Young explained to Professor Paul "that for the present the General Board of Education had refused to confer these degrees in any of the schools" (*Board of Examiners Minutes*, pp. 51-52). Had the power been granted to the academies before the Church University was closed, it may have been easier to maintain that power.

Cluff's push for BYA.

Benjamin Cluff, the principal of the Brigham Young Academy, felt certain that the BYA would take the place of the Church University as the top tier institution in the Church. He wrote, "Should [the Church University close] I am certain emphasis will be given to the academy [BYA] and it will immediately increase in importance. We want, therefore, the most modern methods and the best trained teachers we can get" (Cluff, personal communication, November 12, 1893). Cluff was so excited about the anticipated boost in prominence that he suggested that every year someone from the Academy should be given a furlough from teaching to travel to East for advanced

schooling while the Academy paid them their full salary and paid for the substitute to cover necessary classes during the absence.

In an attempt to secure BYA's place in prominence, Cluff began pushing to offer more degrees at BYA. Willard Done, the secretary to the General Board of Education, wrote to Cluff and asked him to prepare a course list and submit it to the Board of Examiners for their approval to the request that BYA be given degree-granting privileges (Done, personal communication, March 31, 1896). This was in direct conflict with how James Talmage understood President Woodruff's agreement with Professor Kingsbury in 1894. Talmage believed that when the Church closed the Church University, it had closed its claim to offering higher education and that all of the academies should focus on high school level instruction and become feeder programs for the University of Utah.

The Normal departments. The Normal departments of the academies—especially BYA and LDS College—became a problem in the debate. The Normal work was considered collegiate level, but was still viewed separate. This changed when the Board of Examiners began awarding the Bachelor's of Pedagogy. At which point, the Normal work entered the discussion of whether or not the academies should be offering collegiate degrees. The Brigham Young Academy, however, had been offering degrees through its Normal Department since it opened in 1876. Professor Cluff could not see any reason that the practice should stop. BYA's Normal Department set it apart from almost every other academy in the Church. Quinn suggested that the BYA in Provo “fell under the same cloud during John Taylor's administration as did the Young Academy at Salt Lake City,” and that the Provo institution was “on par with the Sanpete and Box Elder Stake academies” (Quinn, 1973, p. 87). These assertions, however, overlook the important role of the Normal Department in providing teachers for both church schools

and public schools. The importance of the Normal Department to the Church School system cannot be understated.

Maeser in the Middle

As the Superintendent of Church Education, Karl G. Maeser was thrown into the middle of the contest and was forced into the role of mediator. As Cluff and Talmage exchanged views the opinions became very heated. Cluff and Talmage viewed the decision to close the Church University and how it should affect the academies totally differently. Cluff felt Talmage was attacking the future of the academies. Maeser wrote a letter to George Reynolds about Cluff's feelings on the matter following an interview between Maeser and Cluff. Maeser said that Cluff felt "irreconcilable to the whole movement in regard to the BYA and the University, and declares that he sooner will resign, if he cannot see it any clearer than he does now" (Maeser, personal communication, September 21, 1894). The very next day the *Deseret Weekly News* carried a letter written by Karl G. Maeser explaining the decision of the First Presidency. In that letter he clarified that all church academies would be strengthened, but that it was, indeed, the desire and intent of the leaders of the Church that the academies all become "feeders for the State University" (*Deseret Weekly News*, September 22, 1894).

It is not fair to assume that James Talmage was hoping to hurt the Church School system as Cluff did in his letter. This assumption goes against everything that Talmage had done to this point in his life. In 1893, when he was offered a teaching position at the University of Utah, which included professorship and the same salary for much less work, he recorded his apprehension over the thought of leaving the Church School system. Talmage wrote,

All the active years of my life have been devoted to the Church School cause, and I do not think with favor of a change. Were I to enter the Univ. of Utah as a

regular professor I have little doubt that I would be expected to take no prominent part in Church organization and doubtless to separate myself from entirely from the Church School cause. I therefore hope there will be no change.

(J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, March 6, 1893)

He took to the offer to the leaders of the Church and sought their council. As mentioned before, he was told that the First Presidency considered him employed in the Church School and preferred not to release him from that commitment unless he requested such a release. Talmage wrote, "This suits me well." (J. E. Talmage, 1879-1933, March 6, 1893) His efforts to curtail the academies' from offering college credit were based on something other than his competitive spirit. It is likely, based on the pattern of Talmage's life to seek counsel from the leaders of the Church and then follow that counsel regardless of personal cost and expense, that his efforts during this debate over degrees and coursework was due to how he interpreted the agreement between President Woodruff and Professor Kingsbury.

Karl G. Maeser, however, did not agree fully with Talmage's interpretation of the agreement and how it affected other academies that had already been offering some higher-level courses in the Normal Schools. He did not agree with Cluff either, however, that the Church Schools should be allowed free reign with regards to higher education and degrees. Rather, Dr. Maeser seemed to be the voice of moderation, perhaps because he was not tainted by any personal motive or connection to any of the individual schools involved. Maeser had been in California when the First Presidency decided to close the Church University. This separation may have blessed Karl with a more neutral approach to the situation. However, Karl Maeser was still engaged in the effort to further the Church School system, and irrespective of Talmage's motivations, Maeser foresaw some serious consequences if the restrictions were enforced to the

extreme that Talmage was requesting. Dr. Maeser—who was Talmage’s most trusted and beloved mentor—wrote President Wilford Woodruff and expressed his concerns regarding President Talmage’s position on the issue of degrees and the church schools. Karl said,

After carefully considering the representations made by Dr. Talmage on the one hand, and by the Principals of our three Church Colleges on the other, I have come to the conclusion that the General Board of Education has to adopt a conservative medium between the two extremes.

Dr. Talmage insists upon certain restrictions upon all church schools *for which demand he has no foundation*. The ‘Official Announcement’ of Aug 18, last, refers only to the suspension of the Church University and the transfer of its intended work to the University of Utah, and making provisions for students of our faith to receive theological instructions in the LDS College. The people were exhorted also to support by their influence and energy the State University. In an article on the subject, explanatory to the ‘Official Announcement’, under date of Sept 18, last, above my signature, our church schools were instructed to consider themselves feeders to the State University. The reason for this is obvious. It is better to have our young people pursue their University course at our home institution, instead of going abroad for that purpose away from our control and influence.... There are, however, three Church Colleges, that are not mere Stake Academies, and *have been authorized to conduct academic courses before our Church University had been established, and were not restricted in their labors after the opening of the Church University*. The “Official Announcement” or its explanatory supplement of Sep 18, could have, therefore, no application to our Church colleges. *Any restrictions in regard to them as proposed by Dr. Talmage are not justified*

by any documentary evidence, they would deter our Church School Organization from developing that system of education which the Spirit of God has prompted the First Presidency to inaugurate in Zion [italics added]. (Maeser, personal communication, December 29, 1894)

Normal Schools Under Fire

In October 1895, the Church General Board of Education granted the BYA, Brigham Young College in Logan, and the LDS College in Salt Lake the right to award bachelor's degrees. This was likely an anticipation of a political move to require a bachelor's degree in order to teach and was meant to protect the most important Normal Schools in the Church Educational System. Legislation requiring a bachelor's degree to teach would create problems for graduates from the Church's Normal Schools to get teaching positions in the district schools if those academies were kept from awarding the necessary degrees. The University of Utah began pressuring the legislature to grant exclusive rights to the State University for granting teaching certificates. This also, obviously, would hinder graduates from BYA, BYC, and LDS College from getting hired in the public school system.

Karl G. Maeser was strongly opposed to such legislation, because of the success that the Church schools had in training teachers and then placing them in schools. He wrote a letter to George Reynolds and expressed the importance of the work done in the Church Normal Schools. "This is another step forward in the great work going on in Zion to prepare our youth for the glorious future awaiting them, and to *counteract the tendencies of our public school system [italics mine]*" (Maeser, personal communication, April 10, 1894). Karl felt like this move by the University of Utah was a deliberate attempt to eliminate the Church's normal schools (Maeser, personal communication, September 25, 1895).

From the very beginnings of the Brigham Young Academy, Karl G. Maeser had been engaged in preparing teachers for the public schools as well as the Church schools. In 1901, just days before Maeser's death, Thomas E. Ricks, Stake President in Rexburg, Idaho, responded to a questionnaire from Brother Maeser, regarding the importance of Church schools and teacher preparation for the public schools. Ricks expressed the need to flood the public schools with even more Latter-day Saints trained in a Church institution:

Your question as to my opinion in regard to the advisability of maintaining Normal Training schools in some of our leading church schools is a matter that perhaps affects us more than in the Stake of Utah...it is a difficult matter to find anything like enough of our own young people here to pass a satisfactory examination as a teacher in our district schools and in many cases our district school trustees have had to resort to the deplorable inevitable in employing teachers not of our faith and the results are sorely to be regretted. We shall hail with delight the time when from the Normal Training schools of the Church sufficient of our young people can be obtained to fill the demand for teachers in our district schools, which by the way are rapidly increasing and the necessity for more of our own people qualifying themselves to fill these positions of trust becomes daily more and more apparent. (T. E. Ricks, personal communication, February 6, 1901).

Closing the Church University gave even greater impetus to the desire to prepare as many LDS teachers for public schools as possible. It was important that the Church maintain a significant presence on the faculty of the University of Utah. This policy was consistent with a belief that the inclusive qualities of an LDS religious education had more to do with the character of the educators than with the specific content of the

instruction. While good, Latter-day Saint teachers would not be allowed to teach Latter-day Saint doctrine in the classroom, they would be able to ensure that the students were not being subjected to a curriculum that was damaging to their testimony. Church leaders believed that with Talmage as President of the state university, the religious beliefs of LDS young people would not be undercut by their university experience.

Long Term Effects

How different would the field of higher education in Utah be today had the Church refused to close the Church University? It is likely that the University of Utah would have moved to Logan and been consolidated with the Agricultural school, which today is called Utah State. Brigham Young University would have likely never become a university and may have met the same fate as the academies in Ogden, Ephraim, and St. George (Esplin, 2011). Each was turned over to the state and became state-run colleges. Under this hypothetical scenario, Utah Valley may have been the home of a four-year state school and Salt Lake Valley may have been the home of the Church's private university. Consider that possible situation with how the demographics of the two valleys have evolved over the last hundred years. Is it possible that even community demographics were influenced by the 1894 decision?

The total ripple effect will never be known. The impact of this school, that was only open for one academic year, in today's educational landscape is huge. Unfortunately, because of confusion with name changes and other things, the school and its impact have gone largely unknown. Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner, two of the world's foremost researchers in leadership theory, described abilities that great leaders have. They said,

[These] leaders in our studies share the characteristic of being forward-looking, of being concerned not just about today's problems but also about tomorrow's

possibilities. They are able to envision the future, to gaze across the horizon of time and imagine the greater opportunities to come. (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 111)

The two authors then explained how individuals might improve their ability to be “forward-looking” leaders. They wrote, “To be able to envision the possibilities in the distant future, to enhance your ability to be forward-looking, look first into the past” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 119). This creates a problem for leaders today if, when they look back on Utah’s past, they do not have an accurate understanding of what happened, or how they arrived where they are. The story of the Church University is a major fixture in the history of Utah education, and yet its story is still misunderstood and overlooked. A clearer understanding of this short-lived institution may provide a clearer picture of Utah’s future.

REFERENCES

- . (1885). *Academic Review*.
- . (1894). *Millennial Star*.
- Adam, A. M. (2000). Farewell to Certitude: Einstein's Vovelty on Induction and Deduction, Fallibilism. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 31(1), 19-37.
- Alexander, T. G. (1966). Charles S. Zane: Apostle of the New Era. *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 34(4), 290-314.
- Alexander, T. G., & Allen, J. B. (1984). *Mormons and Gentiles: A History of Salt Lake City*. Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company.
- Alter, J. C. (1938). *Early Utah Journalism: A half century of forensic warfare, waged by the West's most militant Press*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Historical Society.
- . Announcement of the Church University for the year 1893-4. (1893). In T. U. o. t. C. o. J. C. o. L.-d. Saints (Ed.). Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Arrington, L. J. (1958). *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Ball, E. (1999). *The Prophets Have Spoken* (Vol. 1). Salt Lake, UT: Deseret Book Company.
- Barzun, J., & Graff, H. F. (2004). *The Modern Researcher* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Bennion, M. L. (1939). *Mormonism and Education*. Salt Lake City: Department of Education of the Church.
- Berrett, W. E. (1988). *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education*. Salt Lake, Utah: Salt Lake Printing Center.
- Biber, E. (2004). The Price of Admission: Causes, Effects, and Patterns of Conditions Imposed on States Entering the Union. *The American Journal of Legal History*, 46(2), 119-208.
- Black, S. E. (2009). The University of Nauvoo, 1841-45. *The Religious Educator*, 10(3), 189-206.
- Black, S. E., Black, H. B., & Allen, S. (2008). *University of the City of Nauvoo: 1841-1845*. Wilmington, DE: World Vital Records, Inc.
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2003) *The Craft of Research*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, F. S. (1982). Education Among the Mormons: Brigham Young and the Schools of Utah. *History of Education Quarterly*, 22, 435-458.
- Buchanan, F. S. (1996). *Culture Clash and Accommodation: Public Schooling in Salt Lake City, 1890-1994*. San Francisco: Smith Research Associates.
- Campbell, B. A. (1990). Social Federalism: The Constitutional Position of Nonprofit Corporations in Nineteenth-Century America. *Law and History Review*, 8(2), 149-188.
- Cannon, D. Q. (1993). Joseph Smith and the University of Nauvoo. In S. E. Black & C. D. Tate Jr. (Eds.), *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, The Man* (pp. 285-300). Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University.
- Carlson, M. (2005). Causes of bank suspensions in the panic of 1893. *Explorations in*

- Economic History*, 1.
- Chamberlin, R. V. (1960). *The University of Utah: A History of Its First Hundred Years, 1850 to 1950*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press.
- Church Educational System. (2000). *Church History in the Fulness of Times*. Salt Lake City, UT: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Clark, J. R. (Ed.). (1965). *Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft.
- Clausen, C. (2007). America's Design for Tolerance. *The Wilson Quarterly*, 31(1), 26-32.
- Cluff, B. (1881-1909). *Benjamin Cluff Diaries*. L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University.
- . *Deed of Transfer: Brigham Young to David O. Calder et al.* (1876).
- Documentary History of the Church*. Church History Library. Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Dwyer, R. J. (1971). *The Gentile Comes to Utah: A Study in Religious and Social Conflict--1862-1890* (2nd ed.). Salt Lake City, Utah: Western Epics.
- Esplin, S. C. (2006). *Education in Transition: Church and State Relationships in Utah Education, 1888-1933*. Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo.
- Esplin, S. C. (2011). Closing the Church College of New Zealand: A Case Study in Church Education Policy. *Journal of Mormon History*, 37(1), 86-114.
- Gaustad, E. S. (1999). *Church and State in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- General Board of Education Minutes*. (1892). The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- General Board of Examiners*. (1890). Church History Library. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Gibbons, F. M. (1984). *Joseph F. Smith: Patriarch and Preacher, Prophet of God*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company.
- Gibbons, F. M. (1988). *Wilford Woodruff: Wondrous Worker, Prophet of God*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company.
- Godbe, W. S. (1871). The Situation in Utah. *The Medium and Daybreak: A Weekly Journal Devoted to the History, Phenomena, Philosophy, and Teaching of Spiritualism*, (A copy is held in the Special Collections at the University of Utah Marriott Library, Hamption C. Godbe Papers, MS 664 Bx 1 Fd 4), 406-407.
- Gordon, S. B. (2002). *The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth Century America*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Han, T. (2003). *Methodology of History*. Seoul, Korea: Yonsei University Press.
- Harrison, E. L. T. (1869). *Utah Magazine*, 3.
- Heytens, T. J. (2000). School Choice and State Constitutions. *Virginia Law Review*, 86(1), 117-162.
- Hood, E. L. (1905). *The New West Education Commission: 1880-1893*. Jacksonville, Florida: The H. & W. B. Drew Company.
- Indians", V. C. o. (2006). Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. Commonwealth of Virginia.
- Isacoff, J. B. (2005). Writing the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Historical Bias and the Use of History in Political Science. *Perspectives in Politics*, 3(1), 71-88.
- Jenkins, K. (1995). *On 'What is History?': From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London: Routledge.
- Jeppson, J. H. (1973). *The Secularization of the University of Utah to 1920*. Ph. D. , University of California.

- Journal of Discourses*. (1974). Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book.
- . *Journals of the Legislative Assembly*. (1869). Salt Lake City.
- Kane, T. P. (1922). *The Romance and Tragedy of Banking: Problems and Incidents of Government Supervision of National Banks*. New York: The Bankers Publishing Co.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Larson, G. O., & Poll, R. D. (1989). The Forty-fifth State. In R. D. Poll, T. G. Alexander, E. E. Campbell & D. E. Miller (Eds.), *Utah's History*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints v. United States, No. 136 U.S. 1 (Supreme Court 1890).
- Leukel, J. G. W. (2001). *Pioneering Public Schooling in Rural Utah: Factors contributing to Utah's transition from ward schools to public schools: Heber, Utah 1859-1896*. Ph.D., Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Lucas, L. (1981). The Historian in the Archives: Limitations of Primary Source Materials. *Minnesota History, Summer*.
- Lyman, E. L. (1986). *Political Deliverance: The Mormon Quest for Utah Statehood*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Lyman, F. (1885-1951). *Personal Journals*. Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Maeser, K. G. (1892). A Retrospect. *The Normal* (January 4, 1892).
- Malin, J. C. (1942). *John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- Malmquist, O. N. (1971). *The First 100 Years: A History of the Salt Lake Tribune--1871-1971*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Historical Society.
- Margolis, J. (2007). Rethinking Peirce's Fallibilism. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 43(2), 229-249.
- Marmor, M. F. (1982). Wilson, Strokes, and Zebras. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 307(August 26), 528-535.
- McBride, D. W. (1952). *The Development of Higher Education in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. Doctor of Philosophy, Michigan State College.
- McLaws, M. B. (1971). *Early Mormon Journalism and the Deseret News, 1830-1898*. Ph. D., University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
- Minutes of the Board of Trustess of Young University*. (1891). Young University Papers. Church History Library. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Moffitt, J. C. (1946). *The History of Public Education in Utah*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press.
- Momigliano, A. (1954). A Hundred Years After Ranke. *Diogenes*, 6(Summer 1954), 52-58.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parrish, A. K. (2003). *John A. Widstoe: A Biography*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book.
- Popper, K. R. (1957). *The Poverty of Historicism*. Boston: The Beacon Press.
- Quinn, D. M. (1973). The Brief Career of Young University at Salt Lake City. *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 41(1), 69-90.
- Record, t. C. (1875). *Annual Message of the President of the United States*.
- Return of Utah's West Point Cadet. (1875, July 2, 1875). *Deseret Evening News*.
- Reynolds v. United States, No. 98 U.S. 145 (United States Supreme Court 1878).
- Richards, F. D. (1844-1899). *Franklin D. Richards Journals*. Richards family collection,

- 1836-1961. Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Richardson, J. (Ed.). *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*.
- Ricks, B. W. (2007). *James E. Talmage and the Nature of the Godhead: The Gradual Unfolding of Latter-day Saint Theology*. Master of Arts, Brigham Young University, Provo.
- Salt Lake Stake Board of Education Minutes*. (1888-1938). Meeting Minutes. Salt Lake Stake. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- School: The Story of American Public Education*. (2001). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Shearman, W. (1869). *Utah Magazine*, 3, 391-393.
- Simpson, T. W. (2007). Mormons Study 'Abroad': Brigham Young's Romance with American Higher Education, 1867-1877. *American Society of Church History*, 76(4), 778-798.
- Smith, G. A. (1851). *Diary*. George A. Smith Papers. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Smith, J. (1951). *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (2nd ed.). Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company.
- Smith, J. F. (1922). *Essentials in Church History*. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Staver, M. D. (2004). Why We Need a Federal Marriage Amendment. *USA Today*, September, 56-57.
- Stegner, W. (1970). *Mormon Country*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Stout, W. (1967). *History of Utah*. Salt Lake City: Wayne Stout.
- Talmage, J. E. (1879-1933). *Personal Journals*. Church History Library, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City.
- Talmage, J. R. (1972). *The Talmage Story*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, Inc.
- Talmage, M. M. (1887-1892). *May Booth's Journal*. L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University.
- Taylor, J. (1881) *Journal of Discourses* (Vol. 21, pp. 91-101). Liverpool, England.
- Taylor, J. (1886). An Epistle of the First Presidency to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in General Conference Assembled. In J. R. Clark (Ed.), *Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1933-64*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- Taylor, J. (1887). *Millennial Star*, 49.
- Thucydides. (1951). *The Peloponnesian War* (J. H. F. Jr., Trans.). New York: Modern Library.
- Tullidge, E. W. (1886). *History of Salt Lake City*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Star Printing Company.
- United States, C. (1860). *The Congressional Globe: Containing the Debates and Proceedings of the First Session of the Thirty-Sixth Congress: Also of the Special Session of the Senate*. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc30805/>
- Walker, R. W. (2009). *Wayward Saints: The Social and Religious Protests of the Godbeites against Brigham Young* (2nd ed.). Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press.
- (2004). Crisis in Zion: Heber J. Grant and the Panic of 1893. *BYU Studies*, 43(1), 115-142.
- Wayland, F. (1961). Francis Wayland's Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System. In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), *American Higher Education: A Documentary History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weinstein, E. A. (1981). *Woodrow Wilson: A Medical and Psychological Biography*.

- Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Whitney, O. F. (1908). *The Making of a State: A School History of Utah*. Salt Lake City, Utah: The Deseret News.
- Why the Deseret News Should Be Subscribed for in Preference to Any Other Paper. (1891, May 23, 1891). *Deseret News*.
- Williams, R. C. (2003). *The Historian's Toolbox: A Student's Guide to the Theory and Craft of History*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Woodruff, W. (1888). [Woodruff to Young].
- Woodruff, W. (1985). *Wilford Woodruff's Journals: 1833-1898 Typescript*. Midvale, Utah: Signature Books.
- Young, B. (1881) *Journal of Discourses*. Liverpool, England.
- Young, B. (1974). *Letters of Brigham Young to His Sons*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book in Collaboration with the Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Young, B. (1997). *Teachings of the Presidents of the Church: Brigham Young*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Young University. (1891, June 29, 1891). *Millennial Star*.
- Young, W. (1893). *Personal Journals*. Church History Library. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake.
- Yudof, M. G., Kirp, D. L., & Levin, B. (1992). *Educational Policy and the Law* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.