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PREFACE

Historic preservation is a young movement in the United States. Generally, the preservation of objects and buildings has been connected either with organizations seeking to honor illustrious ancestors or with plain antiquarians. Preservation, for most people, has been seen as an exotic and even quixotic, movement of little practical value. Such attitudes stood in marked contrast to those of Europeans, who had long devoted both public and private efforts to the preservation of the past.

Americans in ever greater numbers began searching for their own past during the troubled decade of the 1960s. This heightened interest in the American heritage led large numbers of Americans to an active involvement in historical preservation, just as it led to the widespread pursuit of family genealogy.

The state of Utah witnessed a number of important battles for historic preservation. By studying what occurred in Utah during the 1960s and 1970s, we may be able to understand in microcosm something of the larger national movements.

Yet, there were some important differences between Utah and the nation, too. For example, in Utah the hardest
fought of the preservation battles involved Mormon pioneer tabernacles, a subject of intense religious as well as cultural interest to the predominantly Mormon populace of the state. So spirited did the struggles become, that they led to the development of new institutions, such as the Utah Heritage Foundation. The Utah Historical Society was moved to assume a far more active role in preservation, and there was even the participation of the federal government, based upon the Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

As in the case of the national battles for historic preservation, Utahns vehemently debated the individual issues from two separate perspectives, each of them based upon a different conception of the idea of progress. For some, "progress" meant shiny new edifices of steel and glass. For others, "progress" meant coming to terms with ones own pioneer heritage and learning to live in peace with the past. I intend to show these two conflicting theories of progress in operation. I also hope to suggest a possible way of reconciling them.
CHAPTER I

NATIONAL TRENDS IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Development of Early National Trends

The roots of historic preservation in America trace back to the nineteenth century. The first public attempt to preserve a historic building was made in 1850 when the State of New York purchased the Hasbrouck House, the last headquarters of George Washington during the American Revolution. Since that time, historic preservation has broadened to encompass culturally and historically significant homes, commercial buildings, government buildings, churches, and archeological sites. Its activities transpire on the national, state, and local levels.

While examining national trends in historic preservation, one notes two different types of activity. One type noted in the example of the Hasbrouck House, involves public ownership and control over the historic properties in question. The other type, developing later but becoming more significant, involves private ownership and control. It is my contention that the latter most clearly represents the course of future development.

To the extent that historic preservation in the United States draws its inspiration from Europe, there are
three different kinds of influence. The French model is one in which the national government plays a dominant role. The English model, by contrast, is one in which private activity is more important. Conceivably, cultural ties between the United States and England may account for the importance of the private entrepreneur in American preservation activities. The third model is Swedish and is best exemplified in the Swedish institution of the "outdoor museum," where an entire community is reconstructed in such a way as to allow visitors to view its historical life and operation. The "living history" movement of the 1960s clearly derives from the Swedish experience. But all three kinds of activity are to be found on the American scene today.  

The first major private venture in historic preservation was launched in South Carolina by Ann Pamela Cunningham in December of 1853. Miss Cunningham wrote a stirring appeal to the women of the South to save Mount Vernon and on March 17, 1856, the state of Virginia chartered her organization as the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union. Miss Cunningham was then able to persuade John Washington, the owner of Mount Vernon, to sell the estate to the MVLAU for $200,000.  

Later, as regent of the organization, Cunningham elaborated a national structure with vice-regents in thirty states. By December of 1859 the MVLAU had almost cleared Mount Vernon of debt, and a drive was launched to
permanently endow the property. After the Civil War the Cunningham organization succeeded in bringing in the federal government as a partner in its activities. It even set up an archive of resource materials from which other preservation societies could draw. By means of this archive, the influence of the MVLAU extended well into the twentieth century. ⁶

The experience of the MVLAU demonstrated that an historical preservation society needed to be well organized, needed to cultivate widespread moral and financial support, and needed to think in terms of an endowment in perpetuity in order to really insure the permanence of its work. Finally, the MVLAU experience showed that cooperation between public and private effort was not only possibly but eminently desirable.

No other preservation society of the nineteenth century achieved the size or the success of the MVLAU. The reasons for their failure are instructive. For example, when a Mrs. William H. Holstein set up an organization to save the site of Washington's headquarters at Valley Forge, she discovered that public attitudes were appreciably cooler toward a building whose use had been purely functional as opposed to Mount Vernon, an historic home. And when the Ladies Heritage Association of Nashville attempted to rescue the Hermitage, Andrew Jackson's old plantation, it learned a few lessons of its own. One of them was that merely preserving an historical monument was considerably less
successful than converting the monument to a national shrine—with all of the accompanying advertising. Another was the historic sites which happened to be off the beaten path, such as the Hermitage, were rarely visited in the days before the automobile, a debilitating circumstance in those situations where the properties must be maintained by entrance fees. On the other hand, some preservation movements succeeded as well as the MVLAU. In the 1890s, a movement to purchase and restore the Peterson House, where Abraham Lincoln had died, was successful, probably because it had the backing of Congress. Other successful national organizations included the Colonial Dames of America, the Sons of the American Revolution, and the Daughters of the American Revolution. Each of them found a formula for historic preservation that proved to be adequate to the challenge at hand.7

The formula itself varied from situation to situation was graphically demonstrated by the experience of Uriah Phillips Levy in preserving Monticello. Levy, an ardent admirer of Jefferson, bought the Virginia plantation in 1836, preserved it as well as he could, and passed it intact down to his heirs. However, the task of maintaining both buildings and grounds was an enormous one, well beyond the stretch of the Levy family finances, and try as they might, the Levys could not seem to enlist the cooperation of others in their endeavors. Throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, the effort to preserve the Jefferson
property proceeded in fits and starts. Then, in 1923 the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation was organized in New York City and placed under the direction of professional financiers. Owing to close cooperation between this group and Jefferson Levy, then owner of the property, the preservation efforts finally caught fire. So effective, in fact, did these activities become, that a professional architect of considerable talent was retained to direct the actual work. Historical preservation was acquiring an expertise of its own.8

William Sumner Appleton

In rank order of importance, the preservation efforts of William Sumner Appleton must be placed closely behind those of Ann Pamela Cunningham. In 1910, while still in his early thirties, Appleton founded the society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities. The society was devoted not to the preservation of a single monument, as had been the case in the nineteenth century, but to a broad range of activities. Appleton himself became an acknowledged expert in the techniques of restoration, acquiring much of his knowledge from European organizations with whom he kept constant contact. He learned, for example, to facilitate the restoration work by means of a picture file which could be used for advertising purposes and for the solicitation of financial support, in addition to documenting the progress of a given project. But Appleton's real
contribution was in developing new ideas about preservation. For him, there was something sterile and useless in the concept of a mere "museum." He preferred to think of a restored edifice as a living and still functional part of the community, and as a result, he often saw to it that such buildings were rented to provide income. This, unquestionably, pointed to the future path that preservation in America would take.10

**Historical Societies**

Historical societies also encouraged preservation. Beginning as amorphous and omnifunctional organizations at the end of the eighteenth century, historical societies gradually became highly developed and specialized, evolving into such institutions as the public archive and the historical museum. The Massachusetts Historical Society, founded by the Reverend Jeremy Belknap in 1791, led the way in this process, even though the real growth in historical societies did not occur until the 1820's. By the end of the nineteenth century these organizations had become sophisticated in their handling of and respect for historical relics. That such respect would grow into the preservation of architectural monuments was inevitable.10

The modern state historical society was pioneered at the turn of the century in Wisconsin by Reuben Gold Thwaites. Under his aggressive leadership the State Historical Society of Wisconsin branched into such
activities as public education, the development of museums, the formal marking of historical sites, the support of celebrations and pageants, and the direct service of historical research. As a part of this explosive activity, a number of important public buildings in Wisconsin were either preserved or restored or both. And in time the concept of "restoration" became a highly developed one. George Francis Dow, working with the Essex Institute, introduced the "period room" as a necessary concomitant of the restored edifice, and by the 1920s meticulous interior appointments were a regular feature of restoration. The process was carried to its logical conclusion in the outdoor museum, also a contribution of Dow after a visit to Europe in 1909, which recreated not only the house or the room but an entire way of life.

The Entrance of the Federal Government into Preservation

Beginning with the Peterson House mentioned above, the federal government made a halting and somewhat tentative entrance into preservation activities. Needless to say, politics were involved, as the case of Arlington clearly demonstrated. In May of 1861, federal troops easily occupied this all but indefensible estate overlooking the Potomac from the Virginia side. The recent owner, Robert E. Lee, had had reason to vacate the property of late, and as events of the war pressed on, he had even more reason to stay away. As far as Secretary of War Edwin Stanton was
concerned, losing the Civil War was not sufficient punish-
ment for the one-time federal army officer, and so, in an
unprecedented series of legislative manipulations, Arlington
was stripped from its owner and sold for taxes to the
government, which converted it into a national cemetery in
1864. However, in 1882, some twenty years later, the U. S.
Supreme Court ruled that the confiscation had been illegal
and hence that the Arlington property still belonged to the
Lee family. The apology came late as far as Robert E. Lee
was concerned, and his son George W. C. had little use for a
union cemetery. He sold it back to the federal government
the following year. It was not until war passions had
thoroughly cooled in 1924 that the mansion house was
restored to the condition of its prime. What the experience
demonstrated was that historic preservation could not be
undertaken by the federal government without a certain mix-
ing of motives.13

Trends from 1850 to 1920

By the time Arlington was restored, the principal
lessons and techniques of historic preservation had been
mastered. Preservationists had learned, for example, that
certain kinds of group organization worked better than
others. They learned that the mere purchase of a historic
property was often insufficient, that an endowment fund was
usually necessary for keeping grounds manicured and build-
ings in repair. They learned that public support was vital
to the work of restoration, and thus that public relations were equally vital. They learned that cooperation with and support from the federal government—as well as state and local governments—were desirable assets, even though they came at a price. They learned that the technology of restoration was a challenging and sophisticated one, often requiring the expertise of architects and engineers. They acquired such devices as the picture file, which would later grow into the historic register and building survey, and the period room, which would eventually grow into a living recreation of history complete with authentic clothing and live actors.

**Modern Preservation Trends**

The decade of the 1920s is viewed as a major watershed in historical preservation for two major reasons. The first was the multi-million dollar intervention of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. into the reconstruction and restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. The second was the widespread development and adaptation of the outdoor museum. Moreover, in the 1930s, the federal government again became actively involved in historic preservation. Many relief programs were used to help advance the cause. Workers in these programs materially contributed to the restoration of New Salem, Illinois, to the renovation of local historic homes, and to the compilation of the Historic American Building Survey.
The restoration of Colonial Williamsburg was a remarkable event in preservation history, ensuing almost by accident, from a casual conversation in 1926 between Reverend W. A. R. Goodwin and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. To Goodwin's lament that it was a shame to see so much history lying in such a state of ruin, Rockefeller suddenly came alive. He would see to it that the past was resurrected.

The reconstruction of Williamsburg was the first restoration of an entire town in the history of the United States. It was characterized by painstaking research into documents, furniture, and architectural styles. The work could be appreciated on two levels. Restoring the old buildings, as Dr. Goodwin pointed out, seemed to take the visitor back to the great events which occurred in the House of Burgesses and the College of William and Mary, bringing him into the presence of Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson. Rockefeller, on the other hand, tended to emphasize not only the historic importance of the area, but also its scenic beauty. He believed that the real attraction of Williamsburg was to be found as much in the beauty and charm of the town as in the events which transpired there.

By 1951, eighty-two colonial buildings had been restored and three hundred and forty-one entirely reconstructed. Also, six hundred and sixteen modern buildings had been torn down or removed from the restoration area.
Moreover, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated has succeeded in bringing together a treasure trove of books and documents, the nucleus of an impressive research facility. The research function of the restoration was further enhanced in 1943 when Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated joined hands with the College of William and Mary to found the Institute of Early American History and Culture, far and away the most important and productive institution of its kind in the United States. Scholarship of the IEAHC pervades the pages of the William and Mary Quarterly. 20

And what of the price tag? By December of 1951 it had tallied into a grand total of $34,518,741.20, and the work was far from complete. 21 Historic preservation is not a poor man's undertaking.

**Historic Districts**

Beginning with Charleston, South Carolina in 1931, American cities gradually adopted the practice of creating historic districts in order to facilitate preservation. Such districts were given special protection in the zoning laws, and the buildings in them were placed under various kinds of restriction. In an historic district neither demolition nor radical alteration could be undertaken without special permission. In this way a harmony of structural styles could presumably be preserved. 22

The Charleston example was followed by New Orleans in 1936 with the creation of the Vieux Carre
(French-Spanish Quarter) District, and by Alexandria, Winston-Salem, Georgetown, Natchez, and Annapolis in the years following the Second World War. In each of these examples the historic district proved to be sound business as well as sound preservation practice. Tourist dollars inevitably followed declarations of historic protection. Yet the principal gains were still made in terms of aesthetic and cultural values. The city with a historic district was perceived to be less monotonous, more interesting, and a more desirable place to live.23

The creation of the historic district was only one of several legal methods enabling special protection. Flexible zoning, scenic easements, tax incentives, and the power of eminent domain have all been used to create the same effect. Still, historic district zoning has been and continues to be the principal legal device, for it is broad enough to operate within the framework of traditional zoning arrangements and flexible enough to permit the declaration of a single edifice as a historic district. In essence, historic district zoning simply adds to existing zoning laws those protections deemed specifically requisite to the kind of preservation desired. Although the experience has differed considerably from one city to another, there are three general elements to the practice. First, the exact boundaries of the historic district are defined. Secondly, the architectural values to be preserved are identified. Thirdly, a board is created to administer the
controls contemplated. That the system works tolerably well in practice is attested by the enthusiasm of present-day tourists for the Old Towns, Vieux Carres, and Mission Districts of important American cities.24

**National Trust for Historic Preservation**

Eventually the federal government sought means by which it too might become involved in the historic preservation movement, carefully protecting local and state organizations from the omnivorous government encroachment so often decried in post-New Deal America. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, chartered by Congress in 1949, seemed to be at least part of the answer. A specifically nongovernmental organization, the National Trust serves generally as a clearing-house and information center, publishing books, dispensing legal aid, providing technical advice, and sponsoring conferences in which the techniques of preservation and restoration of historic buildings can be discussed. In these limited functions it has been moderately successful. It has spared the federal government from twentieth-century fiascos of the Arlington description, while at the same time providing general advice and encouragement to private and local initiative.25

**Early Preservation Laws**

This restraint, however, was limited to the problem of government interference in the private sector. When dealing with its own lands, sites, monuments, and edifices,
the government clearly had to assume a more active posture. And that posture was also manifest in the legal no-man's-land between public and private. As early as 1906, the Act for Preservation of American Antiquities addressed itself to the historic protection of structures or objects on federally owned land. The Antiquities Act gave the president power to declare national monuments for historical purposes, and to accept private historical properties presented to the government as gifts. But until 1916, when the National Park Service Organization Act was passed, there was really no machinery for the implementation of a historic preservation program. Once the National Parks Service was created, there was a federal agency specifically charged with such responsibilities, and in time it became effective in its work.

Yet still there was no policy of historic preservation as such. Another two decades passed before the policy came into being. Then, in 1935, with the passage of the Historic Sites Act and the Surplus Property Disposal Act, the government cautiously committed itself. The Historic Sites Act declared that it was not national policy to preserve historic buildings, sites, and objects for public use, and it created the Historic Sites Survey (renamed the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in 1957) to compile and update a comprehensive listing of historically or culturally significant properties. The Surplus Property Disposal Act declared that no federal building could be
demolished before its historic significance could be ascertained. Since "historic significance," like beauty, is often in the eye of the beholder, there was high probability that the new law would be construed liberally.

Federal interest in historic preservation continued to broaden. In the years following the Second World War there was an increasing awareness of the historical dimension of the American experience and an increasing fear that this dimension was in peril. Thus the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1969 provided for the safety of archeological, paleontological, and historical artifacts threatened by the interstate highway system; and the Reservoir Salvage Act of the following year applied similar provisions for sites threatened by man-made lakes. There was an implicit balancing of the interests of progress against those of preservation.

Trends from 1920 to 1960

In the decades between 1920 and 1960, then, we note a steady expansion of interest and involvement in historic preservation. Where before there had been only the small-scale preservation of public and private buildings, now the preservation was decidedly large-scale in character. Where before the organizations concerned with these activities were small, private, and highly individualistic, now, increasingly, they were large, well organized and well financed, drawing technical assistance and encouragement
from the federal government itself. During these same years the idea of the outdoor museum was implemented in a new and culturally significant way, most notable in the massive restoration of Colonial Williamsburg, but also in such large-scale restorations as that undertaken by the Mormon Church in Nauvoo, Illinois. "America," said preservationist Edward P. Alexander, "had altered the outdoor museum to stress history." 30

Importantly, the expansion of governmental interest in preservation did not mean the diminution of private interest. Quite the reverse. During the same years in which government on all levels had increased its awareness of historic preservation, private citizens have done the same. The growing body of federal legislation in this area has found its complement in the growing number of Nauvoos and Williamsburgs of private initiative and financing.

1960 to the Present

The 1960s witnessed two further developments. The first was the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The second was the development of the Chicago Plan for protecting historic districts in highly urbanized areas. Both developments represented significant departures from the course of earlier preservation activity.

In the case of the National Historic Preservation Act, the departure was manifest in the degree to which the federal government was now willing to involve itself in the
preservation process. Despite its declaration that preservation has been and ought to continue to be a private business, the tenor of the law was clearly interventionistic. The law directed the Secretary of the Interior to expand the National Register to include all significant historical, architectural, archeological, and cultural sites in America, and to grant funds to the states for the preparation of comprehensive statewide surveys of the same description. It then set up a program of matching grants-in-aid, both to the states and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, to the end that all preservation activities undertaken by these institutions be properly funded. Finally, the new legislation established a high-level advisory council, essentially private in composition but essentially public in the character of its responsibilities, to direct, coordinate, and oversee the manifold preservation activities of all units.31

The effect of the National Historic Preservation Act was to convert the old National Trust for Historic Preservation from a passive, private organization into an active, semi-public one. Indeed, it became a quasi-official agency of the federal government, with broad, if informal powers of intervention. Understandably, the National Trust has steadily increased both its activity and its influence since 1966. Few preservation activities lie wholly beyond its scope at the present.
The second major development since 1960 has been the so-called Chicago Plan. As historic preservation has become involved with ever more difficult legal problems, ever more sophisticated solutions have been in demand. For example, how does a preservation society deal with the astronomical land values which a given historic site may happen to tie down in some densely populated urban area? The Chicago Plan presented an answer to this question. Capitalizing on another legal device, the development rights transfer, the plan enabled the owner of a low-density building in the downtown area to acquire from nearby developers the accrued value of his "development rights" (i.e. the theoretical value of his property if the historic building were torn down and some new development erected in its place) without sacrificing the historic edifice in question. It amounted to a complex and subtle way of having one's cake and eating it too. Since many historic buildings were found in precisely these circumstances, the development rights transfer almost literally stood between them and the bulldozers. It removed the burden of historic preservation from the shoulders of individuals and placed it instead on the shoulders of the community.  

Present Preservation Laws

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the federal government has further expanded preservation legislation. For example, in 1968
the Federal-Aid Highway Act pledged the Secretary of Transportation to cooperate with cabinet colleagues in seeing to it that highways did not continue the dismal practice of running unerringly through public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.\(^{33}\) In the National Environment Policy Act of 1969, the concept of "Environment" was expanded to include historic significance, and environmental impact studies were required to win the approval of local preservation officials.\(^{34}\) The potential power of obstruction thus handed over to local officialdom was considerable, but the operation of the law seemed to generate further interest in historic preservation. In 1974 the ambit of governmental scrutiny was further expanded by the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, mandating that not only federal construction but private construction as well (where federal licenses were involved) had to wait upon a survey of possible historic sites in its path. If such a survey turned up archeological or historic artifacts, time must be duly allowed for salvaging them.\(^{35}\) No longer would it be possible for even a private individual to wantonly desecrate a historic shrine in the name of progress.

_Trends Since 1960_

The 1960s have witnessed the dramatic entrance of federal money--and federal control--into historic preservation. The federal government has prodded state governments into becoming more active in preserving their historic and
cultural past. The states, in turn, have often continued this line of pressure to the municipalities. The cities are expected to help support local efforts to form historic districts and to preserve individual historic buildings.

Most state interest in preservation did not come about until after the enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. States began to set up statewide surveys only after the federal government required them by law. Yet, even with the large number of federal preservation laws passed in the 1960s and the 1970s, the federal, state, and local governments have still attempted to maintain private and individual initiative in historic preservation.

Summary

National trends in historic preservation can be divided into three distinct epochs. The first of these ran from 1850 to 1920. It was a time of gestation, when rudimentary techniques were developed to restore old buildings and when federal and state governments did little to encourage historic preservation.

The second epoch ran from 1920 to 1960. This period witnesses the application of the outdoor museum concept to private projects such as Williamsburg, Virginia or government projects such as New Salem, Illinois. The federal government started to participate in a limited way by passing laws to save historic buildings on federal
property. Eventually, the federal government chartered the National Trust for Historic Preservation as a means of encouraging the preservation of historic buildings on private property.

The third epoch of historic preservation has come about since 1960. It has been distinguished by the active participation of the federal government through the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Private activism has resulted in the formation of voluntary societies to encourage the preservation of the nation's heritage. Some private devices such as the Chicago Plan have been widely adopted by the cities while both cities and states have encouraged the formation of historic districts.

It may well be supposed that the third epoch represents a kind of maturity. Insofar as we think of maturity as that quality of being in which an individual or a nation comes to terms with his own or its own past, then surely there is a maturity reflected in historic preservation of the present. Or, viewing the matter another way, we may note that preservation activities in the United States today, both public and private, have reached a stage of development comparable with that of Europe, whose past is much longer, and whose interest in the past is thought to be much more absorbing. Without doubt, the history of historic preservation in the United States has been analogous to the simple biological process of growing up.
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CHAPTER II

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE STATE OF UTAH

Although sporadic attempts at historic preservation were made in Utah prior to 1960, most organized preservation activity has occurred during the decades of the 1960s and 1970s. Traditionally, Utah's heritage has been preserved in museums such as that of the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers in Salt Lake City or in the reconstructed Pioneer villages found in Provo's Pioneer Park or the Lagoon Amusement Park. Then, in the mid-1960s, two events occurred which helped to spur the organization of historic preservation activities in the state. The first of these was the threatened destruction of the Heber Tabernacle in 1965. The second was the passage of the Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Prior to the controversy surrounding the Heber Tabernacle, most historic preservation activities in Utah were led either by isolated individuals or by societies such as the Utah State Historical Society, the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, and Sons of the Utah Pioneers. Many of these groups had tried their luck at preserving Utah's physical heritage but none had achieved any important success. During the decade of the 1960s a number of these groups combined into temporary organizations for the purpose of
battling to preserve a historic building. While these temporary organizations might succeed at their limited objectives, they could not give a uniform direction to historic preservation activities nor could they develop the needed financial base for long term projects.

The Heber Tabernacle

On May 22, 1965, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints announced that the tabernacle in Heber City, Utah would be razed to make room for a new stake center. The announcement ignited a full year of struggle by the local church officers to carry out the proposed objective. It also led to the formation of the Committee for the Preservation of the Heber Tabernacle.

In June of 1965, Dr. Everett L. Cooley committed the Utah State Historical Society to assist in preserving the threatened tabernacle. Cooley stated that the society "is charged by law with the preservation of historic buildings. It is this legal responsibility which has brought the Historic Society into the campaign to save the Wasatch Tabernacle." By July, the temporary committee to save the tabernacle became itself a chapter to the Utah State Historical Society. This was an important step toward developing a state-wide historic preservation society as such.

Cooley wrote a form letter in which he encouraged people to contribute money to help buy an alternate plot of
land for the stake center in Heber so the pioneer tabernacle could be saved.⁵ And in late July, a special priesthood meeting was held in which President Hugh B. Brown of the First Presidency of the Mormon Church announced that the old edifice would indeed be saved and an alternate site would be used for the new stake center.⁶ Don Barker, chairman of the newly established Wasatch Historical Society, then thanked the people of Heber and the city officials for their support in helping to save the building. He noted, however, that money would still be needed to help preserve and restore it.

Utah Heritage Foundation

The idea of a permanent preservation society, with state-wide support and adequate funding, began to catch on. As Donald J. Bergsma explained in an article in the Utah Architect, the fight over the Heber Tabernacle (and later over the Heber Town Square) had only begun; now came the onerous task of raising enough money to make the preservation proposals a working reality.

At a meeting of interested parties at the Utah State Historical Society, it was decided that an effort was being made to "save the world with a bake sale" and it was agreed that only through a united effort by all the people concerned with preservation could this project—and many others to follow as well—be successfully accomplished.⁸

Thus was the Utah Heritage Foundation organized. It grew out of the meetings held throughout the fall and
winter of 1965 and 1966 to determine how the recently threatened tabernacle was to be restored. By February it was concluded that however helpful the Utah State Historical Society had been in leading the way, another, more narrowly focused organization was obviously needed, one which would coordinate the efforts of preservationists all over the state, and, more importantly, could raise the large amounts of money necessary for their work. Dr. Cooley was appointed interim chairman, and the task of organization was set in motion.

Appropriately enough, the restoration in Heber City was marked out as the UHF's first objective. Not only must the tabernacle be preserved, the town square with its old courthouse and hall must somehow be snatched away from the wreckers as well. This was a big order. When the first President's Report of the UHF was issued in 1967, it was noted that the battle for the courthouse was anything but won. The road ahead was clearly to be one of constant and uphill campaigning, and the opponents of preservation happened to number in their ranks some of the most influential individuals and institutions in the state.

Nevertheless, at the meeting of incorporation, there was an air of hopefulness and the announcement of a broad program. The purpose of the new organization would be to

...Preserve and perpetuate historic and patriotic values, including historic districts, notable buildings, "living
Monuments" as well as historic house museums, historic gardens and agricultural plots, grounds and settings, including traditional open spaces, archeological sites, works of art and books and documents, which illuminate our past and inspire the present.\(^4\)

Mrs. Calvin Rampton, the state's first lady, pledged the support of her husband, the governor, and presented an outline of her own of what the new society might seek to accomplish.\(^5\) With the selection of a president, a board of trustees, and a twenty-five-member advisory council, the Utah Heritage Foundation seemed to be off to a promising start.\(^6\)

By 1967, after pausing to consider several proposals dealing with natural monuments and wilderness areas, the UHF got down to business. In conjunction with the state historical society, it presented to the legislature a bill proposing to permit the creation of historic districts. The bill won active and widespread support, partly on account of the energetic lobbying of Trustee Heber Romney and easily passed into law. Thereafter, counties, cities, and towns of the state were given authority to form historic districts, and a number of them put the authority into action. It was an important landmark for historic preservation in the state.\(^7\)

The UHF was also able to broaden the base of its financial support through newly available federal matching funds. Through the efforts of Charles E. Peterson of Washington, D. C., a grant from the Historic American
Building Survey was made available for the purpose of creating detailed drawings, photographs, and historic verifications of buildings in the Salt Lake City area. It was partly as a result of this work, in fact, that the UHF scored one of its most important early victories, that of the Capitol Hill Historic District. The district was located in a lovely, if somewhat dilapidated, neighborhood between North Temple Street and the Capitol Building itself. In the area were to be found a number of historic buildings, most of them in various stages of disrepair, including some of the great mansions of pioneer Utah. The UHF was able to set up a complex revolving fund program which enabled the purchase, restoration, and resale of eleven of these buildings. Through a combination of low-interest loans and a line of credit guarantee from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the redevelopment program was able to continue apace throughout the 1970s. So successful was it, in fact, that by 1979 the work called for a revolving fund coordinator to be added to the UHF as a permanent staff position.

Also during the 1970s the UHF undertook to sponsor a series of historic building tours in various communities of the state. The Provo Chapter of UHF, for example, sponsored such a tour in 1974. The Provo Historic Buildings Tour took visitors to such landmarks as the Provo Tabernacle—a marvel of pioneer architecture and technology—the homes of former prominent citizens, examples of unique architecture, the old
Fifth Ward Relief Society Hall, and the Pioneer Museum and Village on Fifth West Street. The Provo tour was far more than, as one might suppose, a pastime for senior citizens. It frankly aimed to promote and consolidate political influence for the cause of historic preservation, and ultimately to preserve as well as display the edifices in question. As of the writing of this thesis in 1980, the effort seems to have been entirely successful.

Utah State Historical Society

As with the Utah Heritage Foundation, so too the Utah State Historical Society has been an active promoter of the preservation movement. The State Historian, for example, is also ex officio State Historic Preservation Officer, in charge of coordinating all preservation activities with the appropriate federal agencies. Moreover, the historical society further aids the cause of historic preservation by sponsoring Preservation Month during May of each year, by sponsoring such historic home tours as the yearly "fun run" (limited to viewing the exteriors of the buildings), and by sponsoring conferences and joint projects with the UHT. Its more important contribution, of course, remains the direct campaigning in behalf of specific preservation undertakings, such as the Heber City project.

Indirectly, the historical society maintains many of the support functions necessary to evaluate, purchase, and restore old buildings. The large library of books, maps,
pamphlets and periodicals is invaluable. Even more valuable is the file of some 30,000 photographs kept in the historical society library. Even its oral history project, recording and transcribing the oral reminiscences of Utah residents, has proved useful to the work of preservation, for oftimes the specific history of a given building or site is unrecorded. 23

**Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966**

The Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966, like the struggle to save the Heber City Tabernacle, has a catalytic effect upon preservation activities in the state. From this time forward there were an increasing number of federal programs demanding state attention, and the state was increasingly quick to take advantage of them. Among the first fruits of the new activism was the Act to Permit the Creation of Historic Districts, noted above. Two years later, in 1969, Governor Calvin Rampton issued an executive order which set up a state register of Utah history under the supervision of the state historical society and, more importantly, established a historic and cultural sites review committee to submit nominations of historic properties to the state and national registers. 24 The state legislation was rounded out in 1973 by the Antiquities Act, the purpose of which was to insure protection of all archeological sites located on state property. 25 By August of 1979 the UHF *Newsletter* could report with pride that
Utah, while ranking forty-seventh among the states and territories in population, received the fourteenth highest supplemental allocation of federal preservation funds. In order to appreciate the full significance of this statistic, we must examine more closely the development and implementation of specific state programs.

National Register

The National Register of Historic Places is a listing of America's cultural resources worthy of preservation. Recognition in the National Register confers legal benefits, as well, among which are: 1) making owners of historic properties eligible for federal grants-in-aid for historic preservation; 2) providing a measure of protection from would-be developers by insuring that all federally assisted construction projects be assessed for their impact by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and 3) making owners who rehabilitate such properties eligible for federal tax benefits. On the federal level, preservation activities are coordinated by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, formed in 1978, but much important work is done on the state level. Here the protection of the national register is administered by a State Historic Preservation Officer, appointed by the governor. In Utah the SHPO has generally been the director of the state historical society. Along with his custody of the national register (which is shared by a state review board), the SHPO also oversees and
administers state preservation programs and coordinates these with the federal. In nominating properties to the national register, the SHPO relies heavily on the state review board, on which is to be found professional expertise in the fields of architecture, history, and archeology. Even so, any application for inclusion in the register is further reviewed at the federal level by the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Criteria for listing in the National Register are often extremely broad. Nominated Properties must possess, as one description asserts, "integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association." Such criteria might conceivably be stretched to include anything—and sometimes are. But the supplemental criteria are more down to earth. Properties to be included in the National Register must be: 1) associated with events that made a significant contribution to general historical trends; 2) associated with the life of a historically significant person; 3) reflective of unique characteristics of a style of building or representative of a historic period; 4) a useful source of information on history or prehistory. Generally speaking, properties which have achieved importance within the past fifty years are not listed in the National Register, nor are cemeteries, birthplaces, graves, and properties owned or used by religious institutions. This last exception poses special problems for Utah, so much of whose history is tied to the
institution of Mormonism. Nevertheless, the national register can be used--for the preservation of religious buildings, and was employed to great advantage in campaign to save the Coalville Tabernacle, to be discussed later. As a bulwark against the modernists—for modern's-sake, the National Register of Historic Places has few institutional peers. 32

**Historic Preservation Grants-In-Aid**

Historic Preservation Grants-In-Aid were established as a result of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. These grants are made available to states and territories for the protection and preservation of properties listed in the national register. Applicants can be private individuals, private organizations, or public institutions. Any given preservation project may be funded up to fifty percent of its total cost by the grants, which generally are paid on a reimbursement basis. It is, as in so many other matters, the SHPO through applications for grants-in-aid are made and by whom the grants themselves are administered. The funds may be used for a variety of treatments, including acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of the property in question. The Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation has established standards appropriate to each type of treatment, and it becomes the responsibility of the SHOP to see that such standards are respected. Of even greater
significance than the standards, however, is the requirement that properties preserved by federal grants-in-aid must be open to public view for at least twelve days each year, and that the property, if sold, must be made available by option to the state before being made available to private purchasers. 33

**Tax Incentives**

As with federal grants-in-aid, historic preservation is encouraged through a system of liberal tax incentives. Such incentives were first made available by Section 2124 of the Tax Reform Act of 1976, amending the federal income tax code for the declared purpose of stimulating the preservation of historic properties and discouraging the destruction of the same. Basically, the amended regulations permitted owners of historic properties to spread the cost of rehabilitation over a five-year period. 34

Eligible properties are defined a number of ways, from listing in the national register, to location in a certified historic district, to simply being designated as "historic" by appropriate officials. What must be demonstrated is that the property in question is genuinely historic, and that the work to be performed on it is of a sufficient quality. Once again, it is the SHPO through whom the necessary applications are made and granted. 35
Utah Historic Preservation Programs

In addition to the federal programs administered by state preservation agencies, there are at least two state programs of importance. One of these is the Summer Internship Program, which was begun in 1978. The fundamental concept of the internship program is to give experience in actual preservation field work to qualified students, while at the same time shifting much of the leg and shoulder work of preservation from high-paid professionals to committed amateurs.

Applicants for the summer internship program are either graduate students or else advanced undergraduates; their scholarly background is usually in history, architectural history, historic preservation, architecture, archeology, folklore, or planning. They work during the summer months from June to September for a salary of $800 a month. What the job may lack in compensation it usually makes up for in interest and challenge. The various tasks of architectural documentation, historical documentation, preservation planning and archeological surveying place the intern on the firing line of the historic preservation process. Although there are occupational hazzards in the wide travel and multifaceted responsibility, boredom does not seem to be one of them. And the experience for young architects and historians is adjudged well worth their time.36
The state also conducts a State Register of Historic Places analogous to the national. It too attempts to identify and keep track of historic and cultural properties, often those of more local consequence than the federal project, and extends to these similar kinds of protection and encouragement. As one might expect, properties are often listed on both the state and national registers.37

**Summary**

Historic preservation in the State of Utah has been affected by forces both within and without. The federal government has exerted a tremendous influence upon state preservation through the National Register of Historic Places, Historic Preservation Grants-In-Aid, tax incentives, and the appointment of a State Historic Preservation Officer.

Utah has responded by passing enabling legislation establishing historic districts, by setting up its own register of historic places, and by organizing a state board to assist the SHPO.

Forces within Utah also affected historic preservation. The battle between modernists and preservationists came into public view in several cases involving Mormon tabernacles. The fight to save the Heber Tabernacle resulted in: 1) the founding of the Utah Heritage Foundation; 2) a more active political role for historic
preservation; and 3) a greater visibility of the Utah State Historical Society's efforts in preservation.

At the present both the federal and state governments cooperate in promoting historic preservation. Private organizations are becoming more important as well.
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CHAPTER III

CHURCH BUILDINGS

Nowhere has the conflict between "modernists" and "preservationists' in Utah been more clearly in evidence than in the struggles over the Mormon tabernacles. In pioneer Utah these buildings served a multiplicity of functions, from house of worship to town hall. Often they were the first edifices to be completed--certainly the first substantial edifices--and as the community grew and proliferated (adding numbers of individual ward houses in the process) the tabernacles actually increased in importance. They aptly symbolized the communal life of the Mormon town-centered culture. However, with the advent of the twentieth century came the forces of change. Sometimes the tabernacles were left high and dry in a stagnant inner city area, the church members having departed to the residential suburbs. More often, though, it was growth, rather than decay, that mandated change. The larger congregations of such rapidly expanding cities as Bountiful simply had to have larger and better appointed facilities. The old tabernacles, quaint and lovely in their way, were often seen as burdens to the community, and since they happened to be reposing on the best situated (and highest priced)
real estate around, they were deemed unworthy of existence for purely esthetic or cultural reasons. They had to be torn down to make room for their own replacements.

I have chosen to examine in detail the preservation battles that raged around three of the old tabernacles, Heber, Coalville, and Bountiful. There were important similarities and differences in each case. Similar were the general facts of each situation: the decision to demolish, the sense of shock and even outrage in the community, the organization to prevent destruction, the dialogue between modernism and preservationism in the pages of the local press. Different were the respective outcomes. In the case of the Heber City Tabernacle, the Mormon Church gave up title to the property and it passed into public hands. In the case of the Coalville Tabernacle, the edifice was duly torn down. In the case of the Bountiful Tabernacle, the church decided to retain the property and to expand, renovate, and modernize it.

There were several other generalizations which seem well to mention at the outset. First, the church's building committee, in whose hands lies the power of disposition of vast properties, appears almost uniformly to have been on the side of demolition and against that of preservation. Secondly, most local church leaders, possibly for different reasons, were induced to side with the building committee. Thirdly, except for the matter of financing, most pressure from people outside of the respective communities involved,
seems to have been ineffective. Fourthly, those communities which succeeded in saving their tabernacles did so by circumventing the ecclesiastical leadership and turning to city or state government. Finally, government pressure and influence seems to have been the deciding factor.

Heber City Tabernacle

As early as 1964 there were signs to the effect that the leadership of the Mormon Church was contemplating the destruction of the Heber City Tabernacle. After a season of rumor and talk, the worst fears were indeed confirmed: the old structure would be demolished to make way for a new stake center. Although it is a common saying in the LDS Church that "when the prophet speaks, the debate comes to an end," here the pronouncement by the church's First Presidency marked the debate's beginning. The debate would rage on for more than a year.

At first, efforts to save the tabernacle were only local, sporadic, and ill organized: individual voices speaking out of personal despair. But Everett Cooley, Director of the Utah State Historical Society, for one, did more than simply voice despair; he began organizing a fund-raising drive for the purpose of saving the old structure. It was this effort, and deep and pervasive commitment reflected by its success, that likely gave church leaders pause. Whatever the explanation, they did pause. Church President David O. McKay appointed a high-level committee
of Apostles to investigate possible alternatives to the proposed demolition and report back to him.¹ By May of 1965 the results of this investigation were made known.² In a letter to J. Harold Call, President of the Wasatch Stake, President McKay directed that "You are to proceed to raze the old building and to go forward in the regular way to do what will be necessary to have a new building erected on the present site."³ The first round of the preservation battle was lost.

There was, however, a certain slender ray of hope. According to a well settled policy, the church did not begin construction on any new building project until all funds necessary for the completion of the project were safely in the bank. Since the Wasatch Stake would need to come up with eleven percent of the projected cost of a new building, or some $47,850, there would have to be a season of fund-raising in Heber City before the work could begin.⁴ Preservationists had a little time.

And they put it to use. On May 31, only a week after the McKay letter was made public, the Save the Tabernacle Committee met for the purpose of mapping out strategy. The committee had met twice before, but in the days before President McKay's final destruction order, the actual possibility of the tabernacle's demolition had seemed remote, and there had been an air of somnolence about the proceedings. Now the somnolence was gone. Don Barker, chairman of the committee, read a message from Dr. Cooley
of the historical society in which the latter explained his own sense of moral and legal obligation to intervene. The message began by reviewing the criteria established by the National Trust for Historic Preservation for determining whether action ought to be taken.

(1) Is the building on a site intimately associated with the history or development of the area; (2) Have historic events transpired there; (3) Is the building unique; (4) Is it associated with the lives of historic individuals; and (5) Is it practical or feasible to preserve the structure?5

Meeting one or two of these criteria was often sufficient to justify the most energetic efforts of preservationists. The Heber City Tabernacle met them all. Accordingly, Cooley unequivocally committed the state historical society to the campaign to save the edifice.

The Save the Tabernacle Committee soon received good tidings of another kind from the LDS Church. In a meeting with the Church President David O. McKay, committee members were told that the decision to raze the tabernacle was not an irrevocable one, "if sufficient support could be found to meet specified conditions of financial and cultural development for its future."7 The church, in other words, was thinking not only of the immediate and pressing need for a new stake facility for the Heber City saints, it was also thinking of the possibility of a dilapidated eye-sore standing in the center of Heber City and announcing to the world, so to speak, that Mormonism had gone to wrack and
ruin in Wasatch County. Church leaders had effectively doubled the assignment of the Save the Tabernacle Committee.

Meanwhile, other kinds of pressure were being brought to bear on the situation. Mrs. Rodello Hicken Hunter chose this of all moments to come out with her recently written book on the Heber Valley, and in the frontice-piece was a photograph of the author standing in front of the Heber Tabernacle. Then it was learned that the Reader's Digest was planning some publication of its own: in the August issue forthcoming would be found an article clearly written in a spirit of sympathy for the preservationists. The LDS Church is sensitive to media exposure of any kind—and to national exposure most of all.

On the heels of these revelations came the arrival of the first dramatic troupe. The Committee to Preserve the Heber Tabernacle, it seemed, had been busy in its campaign. One early proselyte had been Stan Russon of the Drama Department of the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association, one of the church's youth organizations. Russon had recently presented a series of successful "road-shows"—musical stage performances—at the Pioneer Memorial Theater in Salt Lake City. At the behest of the Committee to preserve the Tabernacle, Russon agreed to bring the players to Heber City for a June 23 Performance in the tabernacle itself. As with any church program, there was no admission charge, but the Committee to Preserve the Tabernacle let it be known that donations would be welcome.
Russon made the most of the situation. He spoke nostalgically to the audience of the tabernacle and "its place in the hearts of the Heber Valley residents," and alluded hopefully to the future of cultural events in Wasatch County.\(^\text{10}\) Such a future, of course, depended in large measure on a building such as the Heber Tabernacle.

The performance marked a kind of turning point. Here was a church leader fully committed to the idea of saving the tabernacle. Other church leaders were possibly of the same mind. And the enthusiasm with which the road-show players had given their performance suggested that the wider community of Utah was actively interested in the fate of the old building. On Monday, June 28, the Committee to Preserve the Heber Tabernacle held its last meeting—and the Wasatch Historical Society held its first. If the historic edifice were indeed to be preserved and maintained, a more permanent organization than the ad hoc committee was called for. Don Barker became president of the new organization and a roster of other officers was chosen. Shaping the WHS as a chapter of the Utah State Historical Society had the effect of cementing political and social ties with that group, thus underwriting the pledges of Cooley and others behind the tabernacle campaign.\(^\text{11}\)

The Wasatch Historical Society got to work. It proceeded to mail out a pamphlet titled "Save the Tabernacle."\(^\text{12}\) This document cunningly played to Mormon sensibilities and the Mormon conscience. It quoted, for
example, from the dedicatory prayer given by Apostle Francis M. Lyman on May 5, 1889, when he asked the Lord to "Bless the foundation that it may remain firm and unmoved." It also quoted from George Q. Cannon, a member of the First Presidency, who had offered his own plea at the dedicatory service that the tabernacle should always be maintained in sacredness. No one needed to remind readers of the pamphlet that these men were regarded as "prophets" in Mormon theology, and that their pronouncements of such a solemn occasion might fairly be construed as the voice of prophecy. The brochure went on to emphasize how the tabernacle had been lovingly, carefully constructed from native red sandstone, and how it had served as the social and cultural, as well as religious, center of Heber Valley life for almost a century. "The consensus is," the pamphlet concluded, "that this fine pioneer structure should be saved and be utilized for cultural programs."

The WHS was also hard at work on the problem of financing. It had approached the Heber City Council and won a pledge of support for a major part of the necessary funding. The council agreed to sell certain undeveloped properties and use the proceeds to buy the contested site. This pledge, together with the $8,000 already raised by the old Committee to Preserve the Tabernacle, seemed to put the preservation effort on a paying basis. Of course, the city council stipulated that any such funds must be contingent on a binding agreement of the WHS to renovate, repair, and
maintain the building, but the WHS, having fought the battle to this point, was only too happy to make such an agreement. As for the more intricate problem of determining just how and for what purpose the building was to be maintained, here the thinking was a bit fuzzier. Dr. Cooley, however, had already alluded to the possibility of converting at least part of the tabernacle into a historical museum. "Every society, throughout history," he had said, "seeks to pass on to succeeding generations 'reminders' of the past. The Tabernacle serves that purpose for Heber Valley." Still, the predominant argument seemed to be the more practical one: That the tabernacle should be used as a cultural center for the community, a watering-hole for the performing arts. As if to emphasize this concept, the Salt Lake Playmakers, on July 2, presented a benefit performance of "Night Operator," a classic melodrama, at the Silver Wheel Theater in Park City, the proceeds to go to the WHS for saving the tabernacle for "productions of this nature."

Two nights later, July 4, the church was ready to throw in the towel. President Hugh B. Brown, first counselor to President McKay, met with the assembled Priesthood holders of Wasatch Stake and delivered a message from the church. The tabernacle, he said, should indeed be preserved. The projected new stake center and two-ward chapel should be constructed on an alternate site. The
members of the priesthood then voted to accept the modified proposition. The voting was unanimous.19

What followed was anticlimax, to some extent, but equally necessary. The church hedged its agreement to turn over the tabernacle property with two conditions: that a new site be purchased and deeded over for the construction of the new stake center, and that the building and grounds of the old tabernacle be properly maintained.20 Both conditions required money. With his expression of thanks to the people of Heber City, Don Barker appealed to them to honor the financial commitments they had made in the heat of battle.21 Everett Cooley in effect did the same. In a form letter sent out during the summer, he appealed for financial assistance for the restoration project. Sixty thousand dollars was the price tag for the new stake center property alone, and every penny of it (excepting the funds pledged by the Heber City Corporation) had to come from voluntary donations. A "Save the Tabernacle Fund" was duly organized under the trusteeship of Glen M. Hatch, Alyce Ashton, and John Anderson, and the proceeds held in trust by the First Security Bank.22

Eventually the appeal was successful. On September 2, 1965, in special ceremonies held on the site, the deed to the Heber City Tabernacle was presented to the city fathers, and $60,000 was presented to the Wasatch Stake.23 Still the battle was not over. There was the evident desirability of a permanent endowment fund to maintain the
property (for the deed carefully stipulated that failure to maintain it would result in its reversion to the church) and the efforts in this behalf continued into the fall and winter. Such efforts, in fact, led directly to the creation of the Utah Heritage Foundation in February of 1966.

The experience came not without its lessons. The citizens of Heber City discovered what many a community has: that historic landmarks can be threatened overnight if a community is not vigilant to preserve them. They also learned that solid and convincing arguments are worth more than emotional hyperbole, and that solid backing of the local government is crucial. They learned that outside help can be useful--but that it cannot stand in lieu of an active and committed local citizenry. Finally, they learned the value of organization. As problems became more complex and financial needs more demanding, it was necessary to elaborate more and more inclusive and broadly based associations. The state-wide Utah Heritage Foundation was the final step in this process.

And perhaps the people of Utah learned something as well. Many of them awoke with a start to the need to preserve the state's rapidly vanishing pioneer heritage. As it happened, they would soon confront another crisis--and a decidedly more difficult one.
Coalville Tabernacle

In the battle over the preservation of the Coalville Tabernacle there were both similarities to and departures from the earlier Heber City experience. The general fact situations were similar: the old pioneer tabernacle, the growing awareness of its physical inadequacies, the quiet discussions about possible demolition, the final decision to raze the building. Material differences were to be found in the personalities of the respective stake presidents involved, and in the responses of the respective communities. Then too, there seemed to be a difference in the attitude of the church leaders in Salt Lake City—a difference possibly deriving from what these leaders may have interpreted as their earlier defeat. However explained, the attitude toward the Coalville Tabernacle was almost perceptibly different. Church authorities seem never to have seriously considered compromising with the Coalville community.

As with the Heber City Tabernacle, the Coalville Tabernacle's history ran back quite a way. The edifice had been carefully and laboriously constructed over the twenty-year span of time between 1879 and 1899. The community's Relief Society has scraped together $1,500 during the depression-ridden 1890s to send to Belgium for stained-glass windows. And there were some celebrated gilded paintings of six presidents of the church, meticulously painted on the ceiling, Michelangelo-style, by the Scandinavian
immigrant, M. C. Olsen.\textsuperscript{25} At the dedicatory services on May 14, 1899, President Lorenzo Snow, evidently awed by what he saw, had prayed that the edifice would "be preserved until the Son of Man will come."\textsuperscript{26} With such credentials as these, the building, as some believed, stood in very little danger from the forces of change. Indeed, it might well have a part to play in the Second Coming.

But the forces of change materialized with alarming speed. By the 1940s, less than a half-century after its dedication, the Coalville Tabernacle had faced its first threat of destruction. It was simply unserviceable to the community's growing needs. Yet, after some pulling and hauling, a compromise was reached and with extensive modifications, the structure took a new lease on life. However, the addition of a cultural hall on the second story made the chapel area even smaller than heretofore, and there was no place to play basketball.\textsuperscript{27} Nor were there rooms for the Junior Sunday School, Relief Society, or the bishops and stake leaders. There were not even electrical outlets to be found in the classrooms.\textsuperscript{28}

Not many more decades passed before these inadequacies became unendurable. By the late 1960s the leadership of the Summit Stake, having made several studies of the situation, had decided to build a new stake center on School House Hill. Probably the leaders hoped at the same time that the old Tabernacle could be preserved as some sort of community cultural center in the pattern of the Heber City
experience. If so, they were in for a surprise. In February of 1970 they were informed by church headquarters in Salt Lake City that work could not begin on the new stake center until the disposition of the old one had been settled. And, of course, "disposition" meant "demolition." Stake President Reed Brown, a successful dairy farmer in his late 50's, had enough sentimental attachment to the old tabernacle, electrical outlets or no electrical outlets, to shrink from what amounted to an execution order. For the next several months, in fact, he tinkered with one plan after another for saving the church house. None worked. The reason, in part, was simply that the Church Building Committee seemed to lack any sort of enthusiasm for salvaging the old structure.

President Brown did have some help from others, though. As soon as it became known that the tabernacle was threatened, it was almost immediately placed on the Utah State Register of Historic Sites. Several months later, in June of 1970, Charles Peterson, Director of the Utah State Historical Society, presented a Certificate of Preservance for the Coalville Tabernacle to the authorities of Summit Stake. During that summer Brown had several meetings with Gary Forbush of the historical society and with Melvin Smith, Utah State Preservation Officer, for the purpose of discussing alternatives to the tabernacle's destruction. These exchanges went well enough. President Brown, in fact, went so far as to invite the preservation
officers to a cookout at his Hoytsville home, for the purpose of delving into the subject further. In order to foster the broad consensus Brown hoped to achieve, he included in the cookout invitations the Presiding Bishop of the church, John Vandenberg; the head of the church's Historic Arts Committee, Mark E. Peterson; various officers of the Summit Stake; and various ward leaders from Coalville. Whether an agreement would have been reached among these parties is only a matter of conjecture at this point, but the cookout probably offered the only real chance to save the condemned tabernacle. But then, quite suddenly, the cookout was cancelled. 33

Whatever the explanation for the cancellation—and no sufficient explanation was given at the time—the event itself became a kind of watershed in the unfolding of events. Afterward President Brown was never quite the same in his attitude toward preservation; in fact, the leadership of the Summit Stake realigned itself on the side of demolition. Doubtless there had been some sort of exchange between themselves and the Church Building Committee.

With renovation for church purposes out of the question, there were only two viable alternatives left for the building: it could be deeded over to Coalville City in the manner of the Heber City experience; or it could be used as a church museum or information center. With the first alternative the church itself was uncomfortable. Not only would it smack of bowing before pressure, it would place an
edifice identified with the church in the hands of non-church people. One need only note an example or two of religious buildings made over into second-hand furniture stores, to understand the concern of the Mormon leadership on this point. With the second alternative there was not much greater luck. Local church authorities liked the idea of a church museum or information center, but the Salt Lake authorities did not. There were lavish museums and information centers in the capital city, they pointed out, and it would not do to have competing facilities in nearby Coalville.34

So, in the end, the choices were narrowed down to two. Summit Stake could go on using the building indefinitely, with all its flaws and shortcomings, or they could hand it over to the wreckers. There was no third alternative. Indeed, considering the building's woeful inadequacies, there was no second alternative. It had to come down. Such was probably the point impressed on the Summit Stake leaders before the cancellation of the cookout. Thus, finding themselves between a rock and a hard place, they collectively gritted their teeth and decided on the tabernacle's doom.35

Of course, the decision was then dressed up in democratic frills. Meetings were called in which church leaders on the various levels had an opportunity to speak their minds.36 Bishops of the wards involved were duly sent around to interview each and every family in their
charge, ostensibly to invite in-put about the proposed demolition. But most of this activity was clearly for cosmetic purposes. In mid-December, when the demolition proposal was formally presented at a special stake priesthood meeting, there was not a single dissenting vote.

And, yet, certainly there was opposition, and soon it began to materialize. The first to give voice to it were two septuagenarian officers of the Coalville Camp of the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers. Mrs. Mabel Larsen, Parliamentarian, and Mrs. Bernett Smith, Captain, had both been young children when Lorenzo Snow had spoken his wish that the Coalville Tabernacle stand until the millennium. Undoubtedly, theirs was a sentimental attachment to the old building—but then the attachment of Heberites had been sentimental, too. What was distinctive here were the age differentials. In Heber City it had been the young people who had fought to save the tabernacle; here it was the old. And, more significantly, here the young people, represented generally by the local church leadership, seemed far more interested in acquiring a new stake facility.

This being the case, the role of outside parties was a little different as well. Where in the Heber City case the preservation officers of the state historical society played the role of active confederates, here they seemed more like outside agitators. On January 21, a group of them took to the pages of the Summit County Bee and tried to arouse the people of Coalville to save their
tabernacle. Dr. Peterson spoke wistfully of the early Mormon town builders and their works, lamenting that so many of these works were falling under tread of "progress."

Dr. Cooley, now curator of the Western Americana Library at the University of Utah, praised the architecture of the tabernacle with equal wistfulness. It was "one of the significant buildings of the state," he said.

Melvin Smith got in some licks too. He pointed out how often and how ardently the Coalville Tabernacle had been recognized, including its recent nomination to the national register.

But the forces of demolition were hardening. On January 31, at the quarterly conference of the Summit Stake, President Brown, himself once committed to saving the tabernacle, now asked this congregation to support their leaders. He also, and pointedly, warned the people "not to alienate themselves from the Gospel for love of a building."

President Theodore Tuttle, the visiting authority from Salt Lake City, echoed President Brown's admonitions and added a few of his own. He warned the Coalville saints not to "set their course against the leaders of the Church, but to be unified and to support the General Authorities."

If they did this, he promised, they would be blessed by the Lord. Considering that these same saints had recently approved the demolition order with absolute unanimity, such warnings sounded strange.
On February 2, a few days later, the Utah Heritage Foundation Board passed a resolution asking the LDS Church to design a plan incorporating the existing tabernacle into some sort of workable stake center. Two days after that, Bernett Smith fired off her first guns. In an article written for the Summit County Bee, she emphasized the uniqueness of the historic tabernacle and asserted that it was sacred by virtue of its dedication to the Lord.46 Other Daughters of the Utah Pioneers were soon in the fray as well. In the February 11 issue of the Bee, a group of them announced a petition strongly disapproving of the decision to tear the tabernacle down. They reminded the readership that only four years earlier they had presented a historic marker for the Coalville Tabernacle, and that Apostle Gordon B. Hinckley had solemnly dedicated it to the Lord.47

There was considerably less here of the cordiality that had characterized the dialogue between preservationists and modernists in Heber City. Both sides, in fact, were hauling out the heavy guns. This fact became evident in the fiery exchanges over the DUP petition. Just how the petition actually fared is difficult to say. Mabel Larson stoutly proclaimed that fifty-five percent of the adult church members in Coalville had signed it, but when President Brown asked to see the file of signatures, he was refused. The DUP officers then reported that Coalville bishops were warning their ward members not to sign.48
This intelligence quickly raised another issue: were the Coalville church members acting freely or not? The unanimous vote at the December priesthood meeting raised an unseemly specter of coercion, for even though Mormons generally sustain (by a show of hands) their ecclesiastical leaders by unanimous votes of approval, they do not often vote unanimously for proposed action of quasi-civic nature. JoAnn Calderwood Arnold, a former resident of Coalville, picked up on this fact immediately. In a February 11 letter to the Bee editor, she urged the membership of the Coalville wards to revive the principle of free agency and vote down the destruction of the tabernacle. "Voting Power," she said, needed to be "re-affirmed" in the church.49

By this point, the Coalville controversy had broadened into a state-wide flap of ungauged proportions. On February 17 the University of Utah Student Council came in swinging with a $1,500 appropriation to the university's architecture department to find a way to save the historic structure. The next day another Salt Laker, Mrs. Marilyn Jensen, applied for a demonstration permit from the city council and obviously meant to use it. The demonstration, she explained, was to take place in front of the LDS Church Office Building.50

Some of this activity had no doubt been ignited by Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Larsen, both of whom had been in Salt Lake City on the 16th to meet with historic preservation
groups. With them they brought the interesting story that people back home in Coalville vehemently disapproved of the razing of the tabernacle but dared not speak out or sign petitions because they feared to have their names recorded. That was enough for the DUP. By February 18 the group, virtually staunch Mormons to the last member, had retained themselves a lawyer, Thomas Blonquist, to stop the demolition in court.

Meanwhile, back in Coalville, the Bee was hearing arguments from the other side. Former Stake President John F. Hobson supported the demolition, he explained, but for no reasons as exalted as obedience to the church. Indeed, Hobson had been in favor of razing the tabernacle when it was first proposed forty years earlier. The building was inadequate, he said, and had never been anything else. One hundred eleven thousand dollars had been spent over the years for remodeling and expansion, and still the Coalville Region was obliged to hold its meetings in Evanston, Wyoming on account of the building's incapacity.

Nevertheless, preservationists in Salt Lake City were about to take to the barricades. On February 19, the day the demolition contract was to be signed, some thirty demonstrators arrived outside the church office building and commenced picketing operations. A few blocks away, at the Utah Fourth District Court, Judge Allen B. Sorenson signed a temporary injunction against the demolition and handed it to Mr. Blonquist. The latter had presented two
arguments to the court: first, that members of the Summit Stake had not had an opportunity to consent to the destruction of the tabernacle before the decision had been made, and secondly, that each member of the stake held a certain property right in the tabernacle and thus had a right to express an opinion. These hastily assembled arguments sufficed to sustain the temporary injunction, but the hearing for a permanent injunction was set for March 1—in Coalville. 54

Three days later, February 22, preservationists from around the state converged on the University of Utah campus. Many of them were from Summit County, to be sure, but by no means the majority. There were also representatives from a score of historical and architectural groups around the state. 55 The Coalville controversy was becoming a kind of preservationists' Armageddon, but it was unclear which side was battling for the Lord.

From the University of Utah meeting, a committee of six was delegated to approach the church's First Presidency. One of the six, D. James Cannon, a prominent Salt Lake banker, asked for an audience with the LDS Leadership on the day following, and the request was duly granted. Not much information on this meeting remains. We know only that the committee of six had been authorized to use funds from the University of Utah Student Council and Department of Architecture in tentative offers to work out some sort of agreement. But no agreement was apparently reached, and
the First Presidency declined to comment on the substance of the discussions. At this rather bleak moment, however, word suddenly arrived that the Coalville Tabernacle had been placed on the National Register of Historic Places.56

If the forces of preservation had not exactly stayed the execution of the threatened tabernacle, they had succeeded in challenging its legality. The church decided on still another vote, and this time the action would not be pro forma. On Saturday evening, February 27, President Brown had a signed letter hand delivered to every member of the Summit Stake. The letter explained that the entire church membership (not just priesthood holders) would be asked to vote for or against the proposed building program in each Coalville ward on the day following. There would be no discussion, only voting. Brown also took occasion to reiterate his arguments for demolition, which had been expanded to include a question as to the building's safety in the case of a fire.57

The next day, in ward sacrament meetings all over the city, the do-or-die vote was solemnly taken. This time there was an expression of disfavor, but far less of one than the preservationists had predicted. Eighty-four and one-half percent of those present and voting agreed to support the demolition; only fifteen and one-half percent voted no. It would have been interesting to know how secret balloting might have influenced the outcome of this referendum; doubtless the social and ecclesiastical
pressure of the open balloting made for its own kind of constraint. Still, 85% is an impressive margin by any standard. It is hard to indict the Coalville church leaders for a want of democracy at this point.58

All eyes now turned toward the lawyers, in whose hands lay the final disposition of the old church. The March 1 hearing on a permanent injunction was duly called to order by Judge Maurice Harding. Attorney Wilford Kirton, speaking for the church, presented his case first. He called attention to the impressive tallies of all votes taken on the tabernacle question and submitted that these alone negated the preservationists' claim that Coalville citizens had not had their say. Kirton's colleague, Raymond Gee, then added a couple of arguments of his own, the burden of which was to deny the court's jurisdiction over the case.59

Kirton had indeed cut the ground from under the preservationists' case, but Thomas Blonquist had meanwhile had time to put together another case. He now argued that since the tabernacle had been named as a national historic site, the interest of the American public overrode that of the church. This was an intriguing argument to be sure, one that raised all sorts of questions about property rights and civic obligations. But it was an argument that was alien to the case. Judge Harding could only rule on the original petition, and since that document had made no
mention of the interest of the American people, he had no choice but to let the injunction expire. It happened, however, that events of equal drama and possibly greater significance were transpiring informally at the hearing. One of the interested parties present in the courtroom was David Fitzen, a wealthy and prominent citizen of American Fork, Utah. It had been in Fitzen's name that his sister-in-law, Marilyn Jensen, had requested permission to demonstrate against the church. Now Fitzen confronted Mr. Kirton face-to-face, and the two of them had an interesting exchange. Kirton had apparently complained that those making the loudest fuss about the tabernacle had not offered to pay for the building's upkeep as a historic monument. Fitzen picked up the gambit immediately. How much, he asked the church attorney, would the imperiled tabernacle cost? Kirton, somewhat taken back, replied that the preservationists would have to ask the First Presidency about that--and that was exactly what David Fitzen decided to do. Meanwhile President Brown wondered if he might not have the makings of a riot on his hands. Tempers were obviously steaming on both sides, and the commencement of the demolition work would not improve them. Accordingly, immediately after the court recessed, Brown announced to reporters that no date had been set for the work to begin and no date would likely be set in the near future. There
would be, he promised, a "cooling-off period" first. These statements were enthusiastically reported in the press. With this sudden reprieve, the preservationists decided upon two courses of action. One of them was to resubmit their legal petition, this time to the federal court. They believed that the recent listing of the condemned tabernacle in the national register gave them some leverage, and the legal argument based upon the concept of a national interest in the building had some real possibilities. The other was to approach the First Presidency of the church and simply offer to buy the Coalville Tabernacle. More than one group may have been involved in this effort, and the individual parties may have gotten in one another's way. D. James Cannon was dispatched from the courthouse by one group with orders to contact the Mormon leadership as quickly as possible. David Fitzen waited until he arrived back home in American Fork before putting through his own telephone call.

Just what happened next is confusing and not a little foggy. Different versions were given at the time by different parties and stoutly maintained to the present. The following reconstruction of events is by no means the only one possible, but it seems to be the one most likely in view of the available evidence. Fitzen's call apparently went through directly to Harold B. Lee, a member of the First Presidency of the church. Fitzen must have been
rather excited—as indeed everyone was—and so, rather than trying to arrange an appointment with the First Presidency, he simply asked, then and there, how much President Lee wanted for the Tabernacle. Obviously taken aback and needing time to consider such a bold maneuver, President Lee asked Fitzen to submit a formal offer to purchase the building. This may have been no more than a way of buying time. But it clearly implied two things: first, that the First Presidency indeed had the authority to sell the Coalville Tabernacle, and secondly, that they would indeed consider doing so. Thus reassured, Fitzen lost no time. He immediately telephoned his office in Salt Lake City, dictated his offer to President Lee in the form of a letter, and had the document hand-delivered to the secretary of the First Presidency by five o'clock p.m. 65

Nor was David Fitzen tardy in his follow-up. Bright and early the following morning he was on the phone once again, asking Harold B. Lee how his offer to purchase had fared overnight. By this time, however, President Lee had had time to catch his breath. He told Fitzen that neither himself nor the corporate body of the First Presidency could sell the Tabernacle; such a decision would have to be made by the presidency of the Summit Stake. However true this may have been, it did little to erase the impression of disingenuousness on the part of church
leadership. The suspicions of the preservationists that they were being given double-talk was measurably increased. 66

For the time being, however, Fitzen and the preservation group had no choice but to take President Lee at his word and approach the officers of the Summit Stake. On Tuesday afternoon, March 2, Fitzen made the second of his two fateful phone calls, this one to Reed Brown in Hoytsville. Here as well the substance of the conversation is embedded in controversy. According to the Fitzen version, later spelled out in a vehement article in the Bee, he, Fitzen, offered to buy the condemned structure from the Summit Stake Presidency. President Brown replied that inasmuch as the presidency would be holding its weekly meeting that very night, they would discuss the proposal within a few hours. He was "confident," Brown added, that his counselors would agree to the sale of the building. 67

Two weeks later, when the Coalville Tabernacle was nothing but a memory, David Fitzen produced what he claimed to be a verbatim transcript of this crucial telephone conversation, and on the surface, at least, it seemed to bear out his claim that President Brown (like President Lee the day before) had in effect pledged himself to sell the building. On closer examination, however, the transcript is seen to be full of hedge-words, particularly the modal auxiliary "would" in place of "will." Thus, two interpretations are possible. Fitzen may have heard Brown saying
that he would (will) sell the tabernacle, while Brown heard himself saying only that he would (might wish to) sell it. 68 In any event, Reed Brown later denied, as vehemently as David Fitzen, that he agreed to sell the controversial building. 69 Indeed, Brown, as he later reported, had doubts whether Fitzen represented a bona fide group of preservationists. Fitzen, so it seemed, claimed to be speaking for the "Summit Stake Tabernacle Committee," but with so many organizations scurrying around, that reference was anything but clear, and Fitzen's relations with the state historical society people, the University of Utah people, and the DUP people are not extremely convincing. Perhaps Reed Brown simply believed he was humoring a crank.

And by the afternoon of March 2, humoring the preservationists was the best that President Brown could do. He had decided to proceed with the destruction of the tabernacle, not months or even weeks later, as he had intimated to the press the day before, but within the next few hours. He believed he had a strong justification for this decision. Only hours earlier, he had learned that the preservationists, despairing of their attempts to purchase the doomed tabernacle, had decided instead to carry the fight to the federal courts. Brown did not know, of course, how their suit would have fared before the U. S. District Court, but as a man of affairs he well appreciated the awesome power of legal obstructionism. (But a few years later environmentalists in the state would hogtie and
ultimately destroy a multibillion-dollar power project through just such tactics). In Brown's decision for precipitant action there was irony and, from the standpoint of the preservationists, tragedy. True enough, Blonquist had planned to carry his suit for injunction to the U. S. District Court--in fact, he had planned to enter the plea on that same fateful Tuesday. But President Brown's "cooling-off" statement had changed all that, and the preservationists, at the very moment of Brown's decision, were waiting in good faith for negotiations to proceed. This little moment in the denouement of events was missed by everyone.

Sometime between four and five o'clock a.m. on the morning of March 3, a group of some seventy volunteers assembled before the darkened tabernacle. They had been selected the evening before by their respective bishops and placed under the direct orders of the stake president. They were armed with saws, hammers, and wrecking bars and were ready to proceed with the grim task that lay before them. Just what thoughts may have gone through their minds--or how they may have felt about this blatant slealth--went unrecorded, for the most part, but the men, all of them priesthood holders, evidently regarded themselves as engaged in the work of the Lord. They held a quiet prayer and then commenced their work. First they removed the appointments and artifacts; then they moved on to the demolition proper. By the time they saw the first
gray streaks of dawn in the east, the destruction was already well under way. Surprised at their progress, in fact, some of the wreckers ventured to opine that the work had "proceeded beyond the capacity of natural man."73

As for the historic Coalville Tabernacle, the building that was supposed to have stood firm until the millennium, its death began quietly, secretly, but as some observed, with dignity.74 Among the mortal residents of Coalville, however, there was appreciably less dignity as morning light stole over the town. The first reactions to the tabernacle's destruction were shock and disbelief. Then commenced the anger. By midmorning demonstrators were marching up and down in a cold fury in front of the demolition site, and back in Salt Lake City their counterparts were similarly picketing the church office building. Tempers mounted to such a point that Summit County deputies were called out to maintain order, and before the end of the day their ranks had to be swelled by the Utah Highway Patrol.75

There were, of course, explanations of one kind and another. As the day wore on, the First Presidency issued a statement justifying the demolition.76 No new arguments were offered here, only a recapitulation of the old ones. But Reed Brown was the one who had some explaining to do. He did not get around to it until March 4, the day following, and when he did, the explanation was rather lame. Granted, he had announced a "cooling-off period," he said,
but then he had learned of the threatened court action. He had felt intimidated by the sell-or-litigate mentality of the radical preservationists, and had resolved to put the matter to an abrupt end. 77

By March 4 the drama was essentially over. Hammer and wrecking bar had given way to heavy machinery, and the Coalville Tabernacle was coming apart fast. Citizens of the town were digging through the debris for souvenirs, and the destruction workmen were suddenly learning that the elements of the old building were somehow worth money. As one woman picked up two pieces of stone and sought to make her escape with them, she was hailed by a young man wearing a hard hat and told that she must pay for such bounties. A scuffle ensued, and the woman went home empty-handed. 78

Summary of the Coalville Tabernacle Incident

The recriminations reverberated on for years afterward. The largest single dose of them were aimed at the church building committee. Writing in the pages of Dialogue (a journal of independent Mormon thought), Paul G. Salisbury blasted the building committee for what he called its cardinal rule: "Never add to an old building." 79 Salisbury buttressed his case by quoting from an open letter from the bishopric of the Salt Lake Twenty-First Ward, complaining that the church building committee had similarly forced that group to cashier its historic chapel by denying funds for renovation. 80 Doubtless, the building
committee deserved a share of the blame. But the building committee ultimately answered to higher authorities in the church, and there were a number of instances—most notably the case of Heber City—where an active and determined local stake could override its policies. As an aside, it might be noted that at 12:30 p.m. on the fateful afternoon of March 3, Mark B. Gariff, chairman of the building committee, telephoned the Summit County Sheriff and asked him to intercede and stop the demolition. Just why this attempted intervention was ineffective is not known, but it clearly demonstrates that the officers of the church building committee were not simply the villains of the peace.

The second largest dose of criticism was aimed at Reed Brown. And here again, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Brown had indeed played falsely with the preservationists, especially in the matter of the "cooling-off period." But surely not all of the stake president's actions can be described as sinister. Brown was one of the first, if not the first, to work for some equitable solution to the tabernacle problem. His good faith was clearly apparent in the cookout invitations and the talks that led up to them. True, Brown likely gave David Fitzen a certain amount of double-talk during their historic telephone conversation of March 2. Yet, even here, the facts must be put in perspective. David Fitzen was the owner of a wrecking company which itself had torn down many a historic landmark in Utah. Furthermore, Fitzen, as a collector of
antiques, had furnished his American Fork home with many of the treasures he had removed from fine old pioneer mansions. Who was to say that Fitzen was not playing some sort of perverse game, angling for the sale of the tabernacle to himself so that he could proceed to dismantle it for his own purposes? The idea does not seem credible in retrospect, but people involved in the tabernacle controversy were not calm and rational during the first three days of March, 1971. Ultimately, we must conclude that Reed Brown, like the members of the church building committee, was following what he took to be the larger policy of the LDS church.

So the real question becomes one of church policy: why was it apparently biased against the preservation of historic tabernacles? One intriguing hypothesis was offered in 1973 by Mark Leone, writing in the pages of Dialogue. "Space affects behavior," Leone asserted. "Behavior changes require spatial changes." Thus, where time passes and new modes of behavior become necessary, there is an implicit necessity to change spatial configurations as well. Artifacts of the past, especially buildings, have the power to call back the spirit of the past too vividly, binding us with their spell. 82

If the Leone thesis struck readers as a bit too metaphysical, that of Edward Geary was more down to earth. Writing soon after the event itself, Geary noted that questions of saving the Coalville Tabernacle were often
answered by church authorities with a resounding: "We're not going to have another Heber City." What that meant, as Geary went on to explain, was that the church leadership did not want to lose control of the destiny of a once-sacred structure and have that control pass into the hands of people antithetical, or even simply apathetic, to the church. As Reed Brown had put the case to David Fitzen during their fateful telephone conversation: "We don't want another Heber. We don't want the building just sitting there, rotting away and going to ruin."84

Whether the Heber City Tabernacle indeed rotted away and went to ruin is another issue, of course, one with which this paper will not deal—but the perception of its having done so was an important element in the thinking of church authorities. Far from being inimical to the old tabernacles, the church fathers may have been so respectful of them that they preferred to see their quick and clean destruction to their slow degradation.

There were other reasons why demolition made sense. Renovation cost considerably more, if mindful of the building's historic integrity, and delivered considerably less in functionality. In the specific case of Coalville, the threatened lawsuit in federal court cast a long and exceedingly dark shadow over, not just the disposition of one obsolete building, but the fundamental rights of ownership of all buildings—indeed, over the basic question of separating church and state.
Still, however much the demolition may have made sense to the Mormon church, it was a tragedy for preservationists in the state of Utah, one from which they have not yet fully recovered. What was to be learned from the experience? First, that where local support is lacking, preservation is almost certainly doomed to fail. Time and again, the people of Coalville voted freely to do away with their tabernacle. No amount of external pressure could save for them what they would not save for themselves. Secondly, that where government will not bear a hand, the efforts of private individuals and organizations easily go awry. Here the comparison between Coalville and Heber City is most instructive. By offering to bankroll the purchase of the condemned building, the Heber City Council effectively gave focus to the efforts of all parties concerned. Coalville City offered to play no such role. Accordingly, the preservationists ran in a dozen different directions, some of them at cross purposes. Thirdly, that threats of legal harassment can be a two-edged sword. Intimidating though such a weapon can be, it may only have the effect of stampeding the owner of the historic property into rash action. This clearly happened at Coalville. Finally, that preservationists, if they are to succeed in their task, must come forward with viable and persuasive alternatives to the threatened demolition. Most people, so it seems, are not yet ready for preservation for preservation's sake.
Cornerstone

One of the aftershocks of the Coalville Tabernacle controversy was the founding of a new organization for historic preservation called "Cornerstone." Established in December of 1971 under the auspices of the Utah State Historical Society, Cornerstone's avowed purpose was the preservation of other imperiled LDS buildings. Among its membership were non-Mormons as well as Mormons, and its separation from existing preservation authorities was emphasized by the distinctive membership of its board of trustees. 85

Just how the new organization was to accomplish what other, better-financed organizations had failed at remained to be seen. Its announced program spoke of identifying historic church buildings, finding alternative uses for them, and educating the public as to their value and importance. 86 Understandably, the Mormon Church regarded the newcomer warily. After a meeting between church and Cornerstone officials in mid-January, N. Eldon Tanner of the First Presidency stated cautiously that the church neither supported nor opposed the organization--but "was glad to be informed of the organization's aims." 87

Whether the group scored any specific triumphs is also open to doubt. It battled to save the Washington Chapel in Washington County and decisively lost. It lost again in its attempts to prevent the demolition of the Eighteenth Ward Chapel in Salt Lake City. 88 With two such
defeats chalked up to its record and evidence of an increasingly apathetic public, Cornerstone gradually faded from public view. In all likelihood, the aims of the organization were too narrow and its sources of funding too uncertain to permit anything like effective action. By 1975 it was a dead letter, its officers hired away by the state historical society or--significantly--the church historical department. Perhaps its real influence was to be felt later through these institutions.

**Bountiful Tabernacle**

The story of the Bountiful Tabernacle presents a number of contrasts to the earlier stories of Heber City and Coalville. Everyone, so it seemed, was learning. Preservationists were learning to be more objective in their thinking and more sophisticated in their appeals. Local leaders were learning to be more flexible in their dealings with the preservationists and more creative in their thinking about historic structures. And the church itself seemed to be gaining greater respect for the relics of its own past. The Bountiful Tabernacle was a happier story all around.

Situated on its broad campus in the center of downtown Bountiful, the tabernacle, with its whitened stucco finish and graceful spire, imparted an almost New England feeling to the townscape. As Bountiful had been among the first of the pioneer settlements, the tabernacle was among
the oldest of the pioneer buildings. Prominent among the early families that had founded the town and built the tabernacle was that of Heber J. Sessions--and Heber J. Sessions was to be extremely influential in saving it.

Functionally, the tabernacle soon became dated. Bountiful grew faster than any other community in the state, effectively becoming a suburb of Salt Lake City, and as it did so the church itself mushroomed. In 1950 there were seven wards in the city. By 1970 there were more than fifty. One family in that same twenty-year span of time lived through eight separate ward divisions, commencing with the old Second Ward and winding up the Thirty-fifth. Needless to say, the Bountiful Tabernacle could not keep up with the pace of change.

Still, stake leaders tried to. They had the building renovated and attached a new wing to its east side in the mid-1920s. In the mid-1940s they had repeated the process. Going into the 1970s, the tabernacle thus had a number of the amenities lacking in the Heber City and Coalville buildings, including a recreation hall, classroom, Relief Society room, offices and kitchen. Nevertheless, its inadequacies were still readily apparent, and there was a creakiness to it that could be downright haunting. With ever greater insistence, the question of doing away with the old structure came repeatedly to the fore.

But, then, so did Heber J. Sessions. This great, great-grandson of the original founder of Bountiful had
something that the Mabel Larsens and Bernett Smiths of Coalville had decidedly lacked: connections. Himself both a church and civic leader of broad experience, Mr. Sessions knew the important people of Bountiful by their first names and many leaders in Salt Lake the same way. So in December 1972, when Sessions published an article in the Davis County Clipper about rumors of an impending decision to demolish the tabernacle, few readers were likely to regard him with the suspicion that David Fitzen encountered in Coalville. Here was a pillar of the community with an important message. 91

Then, too, the tone of Sessions's plea was considerably moderated in comparison with the all-or-nothing hysteria of earlier preservationists. He explained that he was impressed with the European example of preserving the old beside the new and using that relationship to define the meaning of experience. The value of the old, as Sessions pointed out, was particularly evident in the Bountiful Tabernacle. It was an edifice that its builders obviously intended to be permanent, built in such a way as to allow for expansion. Inside its chapel, looking at the congregation from behind the pulpit, was a sacred painting of the Prophet Joseph Smith beside the templelike inscription, "Holiness To The Lord." This artifact itself, said Sessions, justified the preservation of the tabernacle. 92

Stake President Edger M. Denny apparently agreed. By the following year he had appointed a committee to
investigate the problem of adding modern facilities to the
building; architect Richard Stringham had drawn up a set
of plans; these plans had been approved by the Church Build-
ing Committee; and the stake was well on its way to raising
the $210,000 necessary for its share of the cost. In
essence, what Stringham proposed were two new wings to be
added to the building in place of those added earlier in the
century. It seemed to be a good plan.93

But as the renovation blueprints became better
known, they began to raise questions. One question
cconcerned the sacred painting. Apparently, remodeling or
no remodeling, there was no way to save it. In any
conceivable reconfiguration of space, the organ pipes must
be relocated in front of the existing wall and the wall
itself must be covered up.94 Heber Sessions was moved to
restate his philosophy of preserving the old beside the new,
this in the words of Brigham Young: "Build, build and do
not destroy. Build with the materials to be found in your
areas in such a manner as will serve all future needs and
use."95 Other questions were being raised by the Church
Building Committee, which was evidently beginning to have
second thoughts about the renovation idea. Emil Petzer of
the building committee, himself a professional architect,
had serious doubts about the technical feasibility of the
plans. One problem had to do with the five-foot elevation
of the existing chapel floor. How did one connect the
ground elevation of the new wings to an elevation five feet
Other questions concerned the placing of the new organ pipes and the fundamental design of the proposed new wings. Fetzer himself was not responsible for all of these objections—he admitted that as a package they were pretty "jumbled up"—and not all of them made equal sense. If one read over the report of the CBC, in fact, it was easy enough to wonder whether the committee was not deliberately throwing a wrench into the whole works.

If so, the result was completely successful. When the new stake president, Harold L. Yancy, met with a conference of ward and stake leaders in March of 1975 to reconsider the renovation, the group decided that the only reasonable solution was to build a new stake center from scratch. On Sunday, March 9, this proposal was publicly presented to the assembled priesthood-holders of the stake. The vast majority of them voted to accept it. Another vote was taken in the individual sacrament meetings of the stake in order to assure the concurrence of the women, and again the vote was nearly unanimous. It looked like an open-and-shut case for demolition.

Care was taken to announce the decision in such a way as to avoid another Coalville. On Monday the 11th, first counselor Lyle L. Williams called a press conference and carefully explained all rationales and justifications for the move. "The decision to demolish the Tabernacle," he said, "was made by stake members, not by higher authorities." He added that no date for the demolition had yet
been set nor had plans for it yet been approved.\footnote{101} This, as the stake authorities doubtless believed, should have sufficed to defuse any popular outcry. But such reckoning was premature.

Indeed, the outcry was swift and loud. Within the week objections and obstructions were homing in upon the embattled stake presidency from every quarter. The Bountiful Planning Commission met and passed a resolution urging the Bountiful City Commission to deny a demolition permit until all alternatives could be explored.\footnote{102} Melvin Smith of the state historical society wrote a letter reminding the stake leaders the the church had a proud history—and a responsibility to honor the sacrifices of forebearers. At the same time it was learned that the condemned building was soon to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.\footnote{103} President Yancy and his counselors soon heard from the University of Utah's Graduate School of Architecture, too, Dean Robert A. Bliss explaining to them that ramps would easily and safely eliminate the problem of the two elevations. Still others pointed out that there was absolutely no cost advantage in the new plan and every sort of cultural disadvantage.\footnote{104} Even the Bountiful senior citizens got into it, with a hastily debated proposal to use money recently appropriated for a new senior citizens center to buy up and preserve the threatened property.\footnote{105}
Such an outpouring of spirit was not long in producing a political result. Day after day, reported Mayor Morris Swapp, the telephones of the city council were jangling constantly, and the Mayor himself was clearly on the spot. On the one hand, Swapp was a Mormon himself and believed in following the lead of the Brethren, he said, but on the other hand, here was this problem. He suggested that a historic district might be created, with the effect of banning the threatened demolition. 106 Meanwhile the city council had met and was considering maneuvers of its own. One council member, Dean S. Stahle, was assigned to keep in touch with the preservationist groups that were beginning to troop into the city, while Lane Forbes, city attorney, was asked "to study the legal aspects of denying a demolition permit and the possibility of declaring it [the Bountiful Tabernacle] as a historical district." 107

Soon even the State of Utah had come in swinging. On March 15, the state Senate passed by a unanimous voice vote a resolution urging the Church Building Committee to "reconsider its recommendations so that the tabernacle may be preserved for the delight and edification of future generations." 108 Before a fortnight had passed, it was clear that President Yancy had a capital mess on his hands.

And yet, for all the interest and concern over the Bountiful Tabernacle, there was appreciably less of the head-to-head confrontation which had marked the Coalville experience. The trustees of Cornerstone, for example,
rather than trying to whip up the excitement of the general populace, worried instead about ways to cool it down. The idea was to allow both sides to extricate themselves without embarrassment. Cornerstone also directed its efforts along the lines of preserving the tabernacle as a functional meetinghouse, rather than as a cultural center or museum. Here, as well, they had learned important lessons from the Coalville experience.109

Heber J. Sessions exercised his own influence in the same quiet way. Rather than confronting the First Presidency with a ultimatum, as the Coalville preservation-ists had essentially done, he contacted them as a friend and loyal church member. Considering Sessions's stature among them, they had little choice but to reply in kind.110

The day they received the Sessions letter, in fact, President Spencer W. Kimball and his first counselor, N. Eldon Tanner, intervened in the controversy. By means of an official statement, they came down foursquare on the side of preservation. "Because of its relationship to our sacred pioneer heritage," they said, "the Bountiful Tabernacle is the legacy and responsibility also of others beyond the Bountiful, Utah Stake . . . It is a cherished treasure of the entire church."111

Everyone spoke approvingly of the outcome. President Yancy, visibly relieved, promised that new plans for renovating the building would duly be submitted to the priesthood.112 Allen Roberts, state architectural
historian, spoke for the preservationists when he said, "This is the best possible solution to the problem." A year later, almost to the day, ground breaking services were held for the commencement of the renovation work. Thereafter, the Rex Stallings Construction Company of Salt Lake City demolished the existing wing additions and began work on the proposed new ones. Renovation work was to include a replacement of the woodwork. A new rostrum was to be crafted by artisans in the manner of the pioneer forefathers—-but the painting of Joseph Smith eventually had to be sacrificed. Even here, however, the church displayed a sensitivity to the artifact that had been lacking in the earlier episodes. The sacred painting was professionally removed from the tabernacle in 1978. The plaster wall on which the fresco had been painted was hardened through the use of a special canvas, and then the entire panel was carefully removed and sent to New York where it was further strengthened and treated for preservation. By the summer of 1977 the restoration of the Bountiful Tabernacle was complete.

Summary of the Bountiful Tabernacle Controversy

Happy endings, like sad ones, can teach important lessons, and the Bountiful episode taught a number of them. One, surely, was that the conspicuous absence of demonstrations, court challenges, and groups demanding audiences with the First Presidency made it easier for the two sides
to talk to one another. Another pointed up the value of informal connections, such as those utilized by Heber J. Sessions. Such connections allowed a case to be effectively presented to the church authorities without exactly "presenting a case." A third lesson had to do with the role of city and state government, both of which got behind the efforts for preservation. When a city is willing to go to the extreme of declaring a special historic district in the face of publicly announced plans to demolish a building, it is using very effective weapons. It would have been difficult for the church to counter such weapons. The fourth lesson was an economic one. Relative costs of the two alternatives ran nip and tuck in the Bountiful situation, unlike that of Coalville. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the people who counted seemed to feel different about preserving the Bountiful Tabernacle. On the church level, both Spencer W. Kimball and N. Eldon Tanner seemed much more favorably disposed to saving the pioneer building than their predecessors had been. And on the stake level, though there was ample evidence of acquiescence to the Church Building Committee early in the controversy, stake members and leadership alike clearly wanted to preserve their tabernacle. In the end they succeeded.

Preservation Trends in the L. D. S. Church in Utah

As late as the early 1970s, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, one of the great pioneers of
western settlement, had not developed a mature and carefully thought out policy of historic preservation. When church leaders debated the impending demolition of the Coalville Tabernacle with historic preservationists, they enunciated the beginnings of such a policy—but only the beginnings. Two criteria were presented. If the building in question had been associated with "unusual church history," or if its architecture were truly "unique," then it might be thought worth saving. Since the Coalville Tabernacle was declared to meet neither criterion, it was demolished. Later on, when another pioneer tabernacle was threatened with destruction in Bountiful, church authorities stepped into the situation personally, but they did not really elaborate better criteria for their action. Except their suggestion that the historic tabernacle belonged in a sense to the whole church, there was no statement of guiding principle to which future preservationists might repair. Indeed, the fact that the church, on the same day as the Bountiful announcement, reportedly had financed a study of its historic buildings for the purpose of averting future controversies, suggests that church leaders had not really learned very much about preservation as a moral principle. Still, there were certain movements in the direction of preservation, if only grudging, halting ones. In June of 1973 the church set up a Historical Arts Committee under the supervision of Florence Smith Jacobsen, and
eventually this committee established contact with historical arts correspondents in each stake. The thrust of the historical arts committee was to save, not buildings as such, but antiques, relics, and historical objects of art. Even so, there was an indication here of new respect for the past.120

And there were any number of people willing to urge this respect along. One of them was Allen D. Roberts, state architectural historian. In 1974 Roberts undertook an exhaustive study of historic structures of the Mormon Church in Utah. The study was aided by the Utah Division of State History and by Cornerstone, but it was also—and significantly—aided by the church itself.121 Nor was Roberts' work mere antiquarianism. He believed that "contemporary church buildings did not truly reflect the beliefs, principles and standards of the Church," and he wanted to find out why.122 The completed report identified five distinctive historical styles unique to Mormonism and gave at least one good example of each. It also documented what Roberts termed "the evolution of L. D. S. Gothic Revivalism," and related that evolution to intellectual developments in the church. One could not read the Roberts report without acquiring a measure of respect for Mormon contributions to architecture—and vice versa.123

The following year, Roberts collaborated with Paul Anderson, an architectural designer and historian then working as a summer research fellow for the Historical
Department of the church, on an exhaustive survey of LDS buildings. For reasons unexplained, the survey was never completed. Its significance lies rather in its announced purpose, which was "to be used as a guideline for evaluating preservation questions like that raised by the Bountiful Tabernacle." On some level, at least, the church was groping toward a clearer conception of historic preservation.

Preservationists continued to urge this development along. In the summer of 1975 the Utah Historical Quarterly devoted an entire issue to the subject of historic architecture in the state. Both Roberts and Anderson contributed essays on church architecture, Anderson celebrating pioneer architect William Harrison Folsom, and Roberts further exploring his earlier theme of building styles as expressing states of mind. He now proposed an answer to the question of why Mormons, boldly and fearlessly experimental in their early architecture, had now come to settle for drab uniformity. Their own increasing conservatism, he suggested, demanded buildings with towers, steeples, and Gothic windows—buildings that "looked like" churches. With less emphasis on the unique doctrines of Mormonism, there was less emphasis on the unique design. Quietly, persistently, Mr. Roberts has continued to goad church members into reassessing the aesthetics and worth of their distinctive architectural heritage.
Where the goading will lead—if indeed it leads anywhere—remains to be seen. Perhaps the February, 1980 issue of the *Ensign* presents us at last with the long-awaited signal of change. At any rate, it presents us with a beautiful photographic excursion into some of the finest examples of early LDS architecture in the American West, the first such exposure in a church magazine. One cannot look through the pictures without reaching the same conclusion urged by Allen Roberts—that architecture was the great unsung Mormon Pioneer.
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CHAPTER IV

HISTORIC HOMES

In terms of its widespread opportunities for the average individual, the preservation of historic homes has become the most important area of preservation activity. In Utah the activity has been encouraged by both the Utah Heritage Foundation and the Utah State Historical Society, which, as joint sponsors, have made available through workshops and conferences information concerning preservation aids and benefits, and preservation techniques. Also helpful have been local, state, and national governments, willing to extend generous loans and grants for the work of preservation and to allow its often onerous costs to be exempt from taxation. Beyond these institutional forms of assistance, there are some noninstitutional factors influencing the present vogue to private preservation activity. The interest of the people at large has grown steadily in recent years, reflected in such movements as the forming of historic homes (as apposed to simply making house museums available to the public) has acquired a fashionability of its own, and the fashionability has been enhanced by the relative costs of restoration versus new home construction.
One cannot drive through the state's residential neighborhoods without noticing the effect of a major transformation.

**Historic House Museums**

Before the present decade, however, historic homes were more typically house museums, often associated with famous individuals or well-known events. Utah boasts several landmark dwellings of this type, the most notable of which is the Beehive House in Salt Lake City. The Beehive House was designed by its first owner, Brigham Young, and his brother-in-law, Truman O. Agnell. President Young used the house as a family residence for himself and two of his wives between the years 1854, when the house was completed, and 1877, when he died. It remained in the family thereafter, being expanded and extensively renovated in the late 1880s by Brigham's son, John W. Then the house fell upon evil days. It was sold at public auction and transferred through default on a couple of occasions, ultimately winding up in the ownership of the church in 1898, where it was again used as a residence of the church president. During the twentieth century there were several more uses for the Beehive House, including that of a home-away-from-home for out-of-town working girls, and each of these uses necessitated further remodeling and alterations. By 1937, when the edifice was named as a national shrine in
the Historic American Buildings Survey, it did not look much like the old residence that Brother Brigham had known and loved.6

In 1959 the church decided that the Beehive House should be restored to the days of its prime. A blue-ribbon committee was appointed to undertake the restoration work, and all of its members happened to be descendants of the original owner. But they were no less qualified for that. Don Carlos Young, chairman; George Cannon Young, supervising architect in charge of construction and interior decorating, were all members of the American Institute of Architects. Probably the most important contribution, however, was made by Gwen Young Wilcox, the antiquarian and researcher of the committee.7

The Beehive Restoration Committee early decided that the house must be restored as authentically as possible.8 This meant restoring the main part of the dwelling to the early Victorian 1850s and the additions of John W. Young to the late Victorian 1880s.9 To this end the research began immediately. Old manuscripts were dug up and consulted for factual detail. Diaries and family correspondence were checked. Treasures-of-truth books compiled by Clarissa Spencer, an early resident, were carefully combed for information.10 A particularly valuable find was the building's original plans, filed away in the church's historical library.11 No stone was left unturned in the quest.
Then began the work. Partitions, false ceilings, and many layers of paint and plaster had to be stripped away. The remodeling work of the 1880s, not always of the highest quality, was carefully repaired, and the structure as a whole was made safe and secure. The workmanship was of the finest quality. When it was finished, the Beehive House stood forth bright and shining, as it must have on the day of its first housewarming.  

But the restoration committee still faced the problem of furnishing the building with the same painful authenticity. Careful planning had assisted this work. Modern heating had lighting had been hidden away from view so that the old facilities could be prominently displayed. Furniture from the 1880s was still more or less readily available; the committee obtained roomfuls of it from the Gardo House which Brigham Young had built across the street for entertaining guests. Thus, the John W. addition was furnished to perfection.  

Collecting relics from Brigham Young's period was more difficult, but here as well there were some unexpected bonanzas. Gifts poured in from descendants of the pioneer families, and samples of the original fabrics covering the furniture were found stashed in an attic, wrapped in tissue paper, and neatly labeled. But the real contributions here were made by Gwen Young Wilcox. She had the natural antiquarian's love of the old, the quaint, and the authentic. While house-hunting with her husband one day, she had
come upon a salty old dwelling that so captivated her, she bought it on the spot; it later turned out to be Brigham Young's farmhouse. With this instinct, Mrs. Wilcox began searching for furnishings for the Beehive House. In the endeavor she crossed the North American continent four times, but in the process she turned up some impressive antiques—as once, at an auction outside Kirtland, Ohio, where she bought two silver salt holders which later were identified as the one-time possessions of Brigham Young's wife, Mary Angell. Through her tireless efforts, Gwen Wilcox eventually succeeded in furnishing all fifteen rooms of the Beehive House, and with such grace and flair that visitors to the historic monument could truly feel, as a church spokesman put it, "the spirit of those who lived in rooms" and "the atmosphere of wholesome family life of those who worked and played in the gardens." To this latter end, the grounds of the Beehive House were landscaped in a riot of colorful flowers, each of them symbolizing in some way the transformation of the desert accomplished by the original Mormon Pioneers.

**Lion House**

In restoring the Beehive House, an inordinate amount of attention was given to authenticity; both the substance and spirit of the past were the objectives of the undertaking. But restoring the past for past's sake is not a principal theme of preservation efforts in the Mormon
church, as we have already seen. Accordingly, while the purists won out in the discussions over the Beehive House, theirs were not the only voices heard. More practical-minded church officials would have preferred to see the old Young residence restored for some modern functional purpose, however such purpose might do violence to the integrity of the building's history. These officials were to have their day, as soon as the restoration of the Lion House came under consideration.

Like the Beehive House, the Lion House, situated due west of the earlier structure, was a primary residence of the Brigham Young family. (A man who had seventeen wives needed more than once place to live.) Also like the Beehive House, the Lion House was designed by Truman O. Angell in the mid-1850s. But there the resemblance ceases. Where the Beehive House was made of wood and was styled after the unpretentious dwellings of Jacksonian America, the Lion House was much larger, was made of stone and stucco-covered adobe, and was designed to resemble nothing less than an English country mansion of the late Renaissance. Accordingly, the edifice stood three stories high and ran almost a hundred fifty feet in length. Its long file of dormer windows (ten on each side) looked out over the Wastach Mountains to the east and the Great Salt Lake to the west, giving the building an almost Palladian effect. Above the main entrance reclined a British lion, carved in the sandstone that was used for the foundation and ground-level
walls; hence the name "Lion House," (Brigham Young evidently liked such touches. Atop the Beehive House reposed a dome-shaped beehive, symbol of Mormon industriousness.)

After President Young's death in 1877, the Lion House became the domicile of other presidents of the church, the home of the old LDS University, and finally a kind of all-purpose auxilliary of the Young Women's mutual Improvement Association. The last role was especially appropriate since the association was founded in the front parlor of the Lion House in 1869 as a "Retrenchment Society" for Brigham Young's many daughters. Finding nothing more specific for the building, the YWMIA used it as a social center, a place to give teas and luncheons in the afternoon and dances in the evening. One could join the center for a dollar a year and go there to gain instruction in art, needle work, dress-making, magazine writing, even conversational English.

The building was still functioning as a cafeteria by day and reception center by night when it was closed in 1964. In 1966, the church announced that the Lion House would be remodeled and restored to resemble the residence of its first owner. Said President David O. McKay upon viewing plans for the restoration, "We want it standing just as it was when President Brigham Young lived in it. It will be a wonderful thing for the community to build it up and restore it for posterity's sake." Unsurprisingly, the work of restoration was committed into many of the same hands that
labored so well on the Beehive House, including George Cannon Young and Gwen Young Wilcox. The same interest in authenticity and historical integrity was evidenced in the early stages of planning.\textsuperscript{22}

But then somehow other people got into the project. One of them, Mark B. Gariff, chairman of the Church Building Committee, seemed to have a little different idea of the restoration than that voiced by President McKay. Rather than transporting the Lion House back to the days of Brigham Young, Gariff spoke of remodeling to "suit the purposes of the people in this day, keeping in mind the architecture and structure as designed by Brigham Young." That was a rather different aim indeed, and it was the aim that carried the day. Before long, Florence Jacobsen, president of the YWMIA, began detailing the uses of the restored building as an all-purpose social center, precisely what it had been hitherto.\textsuperscript{23}

Still, the actual work of renovation was undertaken with high seriousness. Decayed beams were carefully removed and replaced with steel girders. Steel supports were used to buttress the original dovetailed joists. Partitions were removed from the second floor to make larger rooms. However, a good deal of the fixing had more to do with expanded functionality than historical veracity. A modern cafeteria was installed in the room where the Young family had taken its meals. Handy kitchens were built on every floor. An outside stairway was added from the third floor court in
order to facilitate the movement of food and guests. A special room was designed for children's parties. 24

Such quasi-commercial orientation seemed to dampen the enthusiasm of the decorators. Gwen Young Wilcox undertook a number of her peregrinations for antiques and objects d'art, and ladies of the Relief Society slaved away for two years on the hand-woven carpet, but the old singleness of purpose seemed to be gone. 25 There was even a distinctly sour note in the announcement, in August of 1968, that the renovated Lion House would not be open to the public, only to those who held memberships to the new private restaurant located in the basement or who had invitations to a bona fide reception upstairs. 26 Some people were distinctly unimpressed. Theron H. Luke, writing in the Provo Daily Herald, commented drily that the Lion House may have been renovated, but it had certainly not been restored. 27 This observation, together with the ironies and ambiguities it represents, goes a long way toward describing the dilemma of historic restoration in the State of Utah.

Forest Farm Home

The Forest Farm Home was built in the southern reaches of Salt Lake City for Brigham Young in 1860. The farm itself was a sort of agricultural experiment station, but the house, liberally festooned with decorative wooden gingerbread, suggested a more recreational spirit. The heritage of the dwelling was entirely forgotten until 1954
when Frank and Gwen Wilcox stumbled on to it.  During the next fourteen years, while the Wilcoxes lived in the Forest Farm Home, they restored it completely and furnished it with antiques, including 42 items that had belonged to Brigham Young. In 1968 the Wilcoaxes deeded the historic dwelling over to the Mormon Church. It was the third significant contribution to historic restoration that this uncommon couple had made.

The church, however, had its eye on heirlooms more important than the Forest Farm Home, which, in its restored pink and white colors, looked more like something out of an amusement park than the residence of a historic figure. So in March 1974 a trade was worked out whereby the Forest Farm Home was given to the State of Utah in exchange for Brigham Young's winter home in St. George and John Jacob Hamblin's home in Santa Clara. Thereafter, the new owner carefully dismantled and moved the Forest Farm Home from its location in Salt Lake County to a new site at the pioneer village in Pioneer Trail State Park.

Such historic house museums as the Forest Farm Home are still being established in Utah, but their importance seems to be diminishing. As with the case of the Lion House, the idea of preserving authentic detail in period rooms is being eclipsed by the newer idea of restoring for some specific modern function. One of the more interesting and successful of these efforts is the recently restored carriage house of Dr. Samuel H. Allen in Provo, which
presently exists as the McCurdy Historic Doll Museum. Here is a case where the fascinating McCurdy collection of dolls from around the world (including antique dolls from pioneer Utah) is decidedly more edifying than old harnesses and empty horse stalls. Other notable examples of historic house museums include the John Carron House in Fairfield, the Lester F. Wire House in Salt Lake City, and the Little Rock House in Vernal.

**Homes That Were Destroyed**

Not all historic mansions were lucky enough to become enshrined as house museums. Indeed, a far greater number simply vanished in the manner of the Coalville Tabernacle. There are two general reasons for the attrition: the curse of wealth and the curse of poverty. The former means that the historic house was unlucky enough to have been built on property whose value has become disproportional to any cultural countervalue. The latter means that the owner, however well intentioned, lacks the means to bring the structure up to city code requirements. In order to show the operation of these twin forces, I will discuss three instances in which the fight for preservation ended unhappily.

**McCornick House**

The McCornick Mansion was built in 1888 by mining magnate William S. McCornick. Its location on the corner of Second North and Main Street looked out regally over the
city center and caused many a passerby to stop and stare respectfully. McCormick spared no expense in the construction and furnishing of the twenty-room house. After putting $88,000 into the building proper, he took his wife on a world tour to secure the appropriate appointments, lavishing another $50,000 in the process. 35

After McCormick's death in 1921, the family continued to occupy the house until the 1930s. Thereafter it was used in a desultory fashion for commercial purposes, most often as a reception center. The structure was of such quality that it might well have survived into the present decade as a successful house museum, but its marvelous location proved to be its undoing. In June of 1960 it was torn down to make way for a seven-story "luxury" apartment hotel. There was simply no forestalling the importunities of the developers. 36

Cosgriff Mansion

The building that became known as the Cosgriff Mansion was built around the turn of the century by another mining tycoon, Thomas Weir. From its location on the corner of Fifth East and South Temple Streets, there was no sweeping vista of the city as in the McCormick case, but there was an equal disadvantage. South Temple, or "Brigham Street" as it was then known, happened to be Salt Lake City's "Beacon Hill" and "North Shore" all rolled into one; on Weir's block the Second Empire mansions stood shoulder to
shoulder. Eventually the residence passed down to Mrs. Mildred D. Cosgriff, who died in 1961.\textsuperscript{37}

Precisely because of the neighborhood's qualities, the Cosgriff Mansion was purchased by the Steiner American Corporation, a commercial linen supply company, in May of 1965, presumably to be used as an office for the company—or else to make way for a new office building. Richard Steiner, company president, was in charge of deciding which of those two alternatives would ultimately apply to the Cosgriff property. His original inclination was the former. Accordingly, he had architects examine the building carefully and develop sketches for interior renovation. But by December it had become apparent that the necessary alterations would be equal in cost to a new building. Given that choice, Steiner opted for the new building.\textsuperscript{38}

In order to mollify preservationists, who thought that for equal money the decision should surely have gone the other way, Steiner American made rather a to-do about its own historical and environmental sensibilities. It announced, for example, that the new office building would blend in with the existing mansions on South Temple, would employ similar masonry and even columns calling the vanished grandeur of the Cosgriff estate back to mind. "And while an illustrious mansion bites the dust," commented one unmoved observer, "not a single tree will be touched. Steiner American is carefully preserving these masterpieces of nature to retain the charm of the corner at 505 E. South
The new proprietors had cause to wonder about their reception in the neighborhood, as well. Their next-door neighbor, occupying the old Kearns Mansion, happened to be the Utah State Historical Society, and as the bulldozers moved in, its officers did not exactly send around the welcome wagon. The bulldozers, by the bye, happened to belong to the Utah Demolition Company, whose proprietor was one David Fitzen. 40

**Dern Mansion**

Further up Brigham Street stood the Dern Mansion, another striking example of architectural exuberance in the age of enterprise. Originally built in the late 1880s by Jeremiah C. Conkline, the imposing edifice soon passed into the hands of John and Elizabeth Dern and their distinguished family. (A son, George Dern, became Governor of Utah and then Secretary of War under Franklin Roosevelt. A great-grandson, Bruce Dern, is presently a talented and much sought-after film actor in Hollywood.)

After the Derns surrendered occupancy of the mansion in 1936, it passed through several hands and saw a brief career as an apartment building. Ultimately, it wound up in the possession of a development company, Woodbury Realtors. This, of course, was the worst kind of omen for the old structure. Woodbury now faced the dilemma of preservation squarely. It could retain and restore the Dern Mansion—many preservationists would have rejoiced at that—but if it
did so it must pay the heavy costs of bringing the property up to code. Or it could dismantle the building and face the preservationists. That the company really did agonize over the choices is evident in its erratic and contradictory behavior from that point onward. In November of 1967 it announced that the mansion "might" be replaced by an office building. At the same time company officials said there was no threat of immediate destruction. However, it was pointed out by the Deseret News that Woodbury was already soliciting occupants for the new building.

Then somewhat shame-facedly, Woodbury began dismantling the Dern Mansion piecemeal, sending off a piece here and a piece there. The carriage house and stable, along with a number of other items, were bequeathed to the Sons of the Utah Pioneers. The interior wood paneling wound up in the lobby of Woodbury's Ben Lomond Motor Hotel in Ogden. The banister turned up in a movie theater. All the while Woodbury people continued to talk out of both sides of their mouth about demolition. In April of 1969 the company vacated the premises, stating that it hoped an insurance agency would eventually move in. Orian Woodbury added, for what it was worth, that the "handsome interior appointments" would be salvaged regardless of what happened.41

What happened, of course, was demolition. In May of 1970 representatives of the real estate company met with members of the governor's Historical and Cultural Sites Committee to discuss the historic value of the mansion.
Only then did the Woodburys come out and state flatly that its restoration was financially out of the question. By month's end the Dern Mansion was gone.42

What destroyed the McCormick, Dern, and Cosgriff residences was the same general plexus of economic and cultural forces. Each edifice lay too close for comfort to the expanding commercial center of the city, and each offered a tempting target to developers. Each, moreover, may also have been the victim, in part, of faulty zoning laws that allowed and perhaps even invited commercial development at the price of cultural destruction. Each was at some point weighed into an economic balance and adjudged to be short. On the other end of the balance were not only the obvious benefits of development but also the costs of restoration and maintenance. Each property was being taxed according to its potential, not actual, value in terms of commercial investment, and each was subject to building code requirements that were ruinous to the owners. In this latter connection, it may be noted that Provo City, for example, has actually ordered the destruction of historic dwellings which could not meet its standards.

Yet, there is another common denominator worth mentioning. Each of the three victims discussed here met its doom in the year before the State Historic Register became genuinely effective. Here lies a solid hope, at least for those dwellings that find their way onto the register. Where destruction continues to threaten, as is in the case
of those homes, perhaps equally historic, equally beautiful, equally unique, that for one reason or another do not reach that safe harbor.

**Government Intervention**

The turning point for historic homes came in 1966 with the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act. This legislation catalyzed not only federal but state intervention in the wholesale demolitions. The expansion of the national register, the appointment in each state of a State Historical Preservation Officer, and the advent of a state register to complement the national all expanded the area of this intervention and made it more effective.

Just how the new governmental influence was felt can be illustrated with a hypothetical example. Let us consider the case of the old Smith Mansion. No one knows much about the Smith Mansion except that it is very old and very dilapidated, and that if Mrs. Jones, the present owner, who is using the mansion as a boarding house, cannot get some money to bring the structure up to fire code specifications, it will soon make way for another Howard Johnsons. Then, suddenly, the federal historic preservation interns arrive. They talk to Mrs. Smith and some of the oldest of her boarders. They talk to the old-timers of the neighborhood. They research back into city histories, tax and sewer records, government archives. They find out the historic name of the building, how it was built, by whom, for what
purpose, by what design, by which architect. They learn how the building has been altered down through the years and what the original structure probably looked like. They learn something of its social and cultural role in the community, and of historic events with which it may have been associated. In the case of our hypothetical Smith Mansion, let us say they learn that the great railroad baron, Jeremiah Smith built the home in 1889 with funds gained in a famous stock swindle; that the home served not only as his family residence but also as a gathering place and water hole for an informal political club called Sons of the Union in the 1890s; that a fire destroyed most of the structure in 1901 and that a new structure was built on the site by an early associate of Frank Lloyd Wright; that this new structure made extensive use of limestone quarried in Vermont and marble from the great quarry near Aspen, Colorado; that new principles of design and construction were used in it; that it was owned for a time by an eccentric back-yard tinkerer who later invented the fluid clutch for automatic transmissions; that Alf Landon delivered one of his more notable campaign speeches from its front porch in the fall of 1936; and that NAZI saboteurs were said to have used it as a base of operations in 1943. In consequence of these discoveries, the old Smith Mansion takes a new lease on life. It is promptly placed on both the national and state registers of historic homes. Howard Johnsons' front men now learn with dismay that the mansion
will be much more difficult to acquire—if indeed they can acquire it at all. More importantly, Mrs. Jones is now eligible for tax write-offs and for grants-in-aid which will enable her to undertake the necessary renovation work. The Smith Mansion has been saved.

The story may seem improbable, but in just such a manner were the Alfred W. McCune Mansion, the John Platts House, and the historic Kearns Mansion (all located in Salt Lake City) saved from the wreckers in the 1970s. The McCune Mansion, located directly across the street from the ill-fated McCormick House, received $14,615 in federal grants to help clean the exterior brick walls, restore the wooden trim, and renovate the elaborate ballroom and banquet hall inside. There repairs put the old landmark on a paying basis as an art gallery, office building, and reception center. Before the grants were received, it was touch and go for the McCune Mansion. Even more extensive were the grants to the Kearns Mansion, grants totalling some $107,257. These underwrote a massive program of restoration which removed the huge structure from the endangered species list and allowed it to become once again the official residence of the Governor of Utah.44

Government Preservation At Local Level

In addition to the direct assistance to historic homes, government—especially local government—gives a variety of indirect assistance. Federally sponsored (but
locally administered) programs of urban renewal have measurably checked the deterioration of inner city areas and arrested the slide into slums. By assisting older residents to maintain, renovate and modernize older homes, and by helping younger residents to buy and restore them, these programs improve the tone of endangered neighborhoods and help stabilize their social structures. Although none of the targeted areas are historic per se, in practice the salvaging of the old city center districts operates to save historic dwellings as well.45

**Historic Districts**

Another major impetus to the preservation of historic homes in Utah has been the creation of historic districts. On the heels of the 1967 Act to Permit the Creation of Historic Districts in the State of Utah, many municipalities began to pass ordinances which had the effect of creating such districts. Salt Lake City, for example, set up a Committee on Historic Buildings and asked it to identify (and justify the designation of) every historic building within its jurisdiction. To each edifice so identified, the committee was to propose attaching a marker, the display of which entailed certain contractual agreements with the city. These agreements bound the owner to grant the city first option to purchase if the property came up
for sale or demolition; and forbade the owner to alter the building's exterior without permission from the city engineer. 46

While tightening up on the sale, modification, and demolition of historic homes, Salt Lake City moved at the same time to loosen up on the use of such homes. In a subsequent ordinance (October, 1973) the board of commissioners altered the zoning laws of the city to permit the commercial use of historic buildings, even in residential areas. Of course, strict regulations were applied to the commercial use, but these were less important than the basic fact that Salt Lake City had acted decisively to identify its treasures from the past, to restrict their defacement and demolition, and to put them on a paying basis. Here was the wherewithal for genuine historic districts. 47

The first such district to be officially recognized was the South Temple Historic District, running from the forlorn Devereaux House west of Main Street (the headquarters and equipment yard of a coal company) to the stately mansions bordering the University of Utah. Along this mile or so of thoroughfare are located two National Historic Landmarks (the Lion House and Temple Square), six listings on the National Register, and 16 listings on the State Register. 48 Next to be recognized was the Capitol Hill Historic District, looking down on the city center from a Wasatch Mountain foothill. Here are to be found adobe houses, among the first in the city, brick houses, and
mansions from the turn-of-the-century fortunes. Architectural styles range all the way from pioneer Jacksonian to gothic revival. Capitol Hill was not as directly threatened by developers as the South Temple district, but it was in a more advanced state of disrepair. Declaring the area to be a historic district has done much to arrest the tide of demolition.49

Nestled in the shadow of Capitol Hill and enjoying cool breezes in the summer evenings is the City Creek Canyon Historical District, the third area to receive special protection. Lying directly below Memory Grove in the eighty-acre district are some fifty-two structures, at least six of which have been designated as historic sites. Here, too, is a broad range of architectural styles, from High Pioneer to Eastlake Victorian.50

The historic district movement seems to be continuing. At present two more districts are in the process of formulation, one of them located around Twenty-fifth Street in Ogden and the other centered in the avenues in Salt Lake City. In these areas, as in those mentioned earlier, the controversy of land use and development has run nip and tuck with preservation efforts. But there seems to be every reason to hope that the decade of the 1980s holds out at least a fair promise for historic preservation.
Commercial Use of Historic Homes

One reason for hopefulness is the increasing vogue of using restored buildings for business and commercial purposes. An excellent example of this trend is to be found in the restoration and commercial use of the old David Keith Mansion in Salt Lake City. What seems particularly significant about the story is its obvious parallel to the ill-starred Dern Mansion, which was located only a few blocks away. The fortunes of both homes began with their purchase by real-estate companies.

The David Keith Mansion was built at 610 East South Temple in Salt Lake City in 1904. M. H. Walker, founder of the Walker Bank and Trust Company, was the original owner, but the structure took its historic name from its second owner, David Keith, one of the beneficiaries of the Park City silver bonanza, who purchased it in 1923. There was a succession of other owners down through the years until 1969, when Mr. and Mrs. Ross Brown announced that they had leased the mansion for twenty-five years to Terracor, a local land development company.

So far the story seemed to go according to the fates of demolition. But Terracor, happily enough, was not Woodbury and Company. It was a young company resulting from the recent merger of the Johnson Land Company and the Ivory Boyer Company. Johnson Land had recently developed the Matthew Walker Estate--often known as the Aviation Club--into business offices which tastefully preserved the
original architecture and decor. Ivory-Boyer was run by two young whiz-kids from the University of Utah and Harvard Business School, who had advanced ideas about real estate development. Accordingly, Terracor approached the Keith Mansion as an intellectual as well as financial challenge.

The first step was to find the right architect, one whose respect for the past could accommodate an imaginative use of the present. William Nelson was their man. His efforts were complemented by the equally talented interior designer, Richard Assenberg. Together they had to decide how to thoroughly modernize the building, install efficient heating, lighting, and air conditioning systems, and bring the structure up to the requirements of the fire code—without doing violence to its beauty and integrity. Obviously the job called for a high degree of sophistication and skill, and a large outlay of money. Nelson set the original estimates at a whopping $260,000. Before he was finished with the Keith Mansion, however, he had run the bill up to a half-million dollars.

But the work justified the cost. Existing rooms and halls of mahogany and walnut were skillfully blended into the new decor. The old pantry and ice box were left exactly as they had stood in David Keith's day, a reminder of the mansion's domestic past. Stained glass windows were carefully protected from the shocks of renovation. Offices of the president and vice-presidents retained their original woodwork, fireplaces, and chandeliers. Even the carriage
house was left essentially intact, remodeled to the needs of Terracor's decorating subsidiary, Environmental Design Group.\textsuperscript{57} Such was the quality of the work that when Terracor held its open house in October of 1969, the event was co-sponsored by none other than the Utah Heritage Foundation. Developers and preservationists had literally joined hands.\textsuperscript{58}

There were other examples of the intelligent and felicitous use of historic homes for contemporary purposes. In Provo in 1975, Doug Hardy, owner of the highly successful DeVon Chop House and an antique buff in his own right, purchased the dilapidated and mortally threatened R. Spencer Hines House, originally built in 1895 by a wealthy druggist.\textsuperscript{59} Hardy was no ordinary restauranteur; he was a demonic perfectionist who had long dreamed of creating the perfect restored home and the perfect restaurant in one single embodiment. For years he slaved away at his quest, living in the basement or in a furnished attic room while by day he peeled off layer after layer of paint to get down to the original woodwork. Then came the furnishings: elegant china, sterling silver, authentic antiques in every room.\textsuperscript{60} Dinner guests were often taken aback to see Hardy's wife and child washing dishes in the kitchen while Hardy himself prepared the meals, and Provoans, it must be admitted, were something less than ready for a dining experience of just this pizzaz--but Hardy hung on, through years of disappointment and frustration, through a divorce, until his work
stood forth as one of the most impressive examples of historic restoration in the State of Utah.

Also impressive is the Simon Peter Eggertsen House, another Provo home restored to the condition of its prime. Built in 1876, the house remained in the possession of the Eggertsen family until 1945. Later it was purchased and privately restored by Mr. and Mrs. Craig M. Call, who used it for a restaurant along the lines of the R. Spencer Hines House. Presently the Eggertsen House is an antique shop and, once again, private residence. In it, patrons encounter little of the junk-shop atmosphere so common in the trade. Mrs. Pearl Fowlke, the present owner, believes with Doug Hardy that a respect for the past can only be expressed in a high seriousness of purpose.

These three examples in no way exhaust the list of modern uses for historic homes. Purists might decry such uses, might point to the essential violation of historic purpose that the present-day use and function entail. But the question that must be posed is a far more practical one: is it better to have these structures standing in their original splendor for a less-than-altruistic purpose—or is it better to have them not standing at all?

The State Legislature and Historic Homes

Difficult as they may be, the efforts of private citizens to restore historic homes are not generally encumbered by the complications of politics. Not so, however,
with public efforts. Here, as the cases of the Devereaux House and Kearns Mansion show, the battles for preserving and restoring historic dwellings can be only a little less grueling than the church battles over the tabernacles.

The Devereaux House was built in 1857 in Salt Lake City by William C. Staines. Staines, a Mormon immigrant from England, had visited a French chateau before embarking for the United States and vowed to build a house like it in pioneer Utah. The name "Devereaux," however, did not quite complete Staines's French connection; it was given to the house by its third owner, William Jennings, another English immigrant, who was reminded of Devereaux Estate at Yardly, near Birmingham.63

William Jennings also served as mayor of Salt Lake City between 1882 and 1885, a fact that probably had much to do with the final disposition of the Devereaux House a century later. For, as mayor, he entertained lavishly and extensively, numbering among his house guests President and Mrs. Ulysses Grant, President Rutherford B. Hayes, Generals Sherman and Sheridan, William Henry Seward, Lord and Lady Dufferin, and many others.64 Whatever else the Devereaux House possessed, it certainly had a "Washington-slept-here" atmosphere.

Thus, in 1974, when preservation-minded Salt Lakers looked at the Devereaux House and beheld the nitty-gritty workings of a coal company, they could not put past grandeur from their minds. Since in that year the American
Bicentennial celebration was fast approaching, and since as a part of the celebration the federal government had agreed to help restore (to the tune of a million dollars) one single historic site in each state, these preservationists, speaking through the Utah State Bicentennial Commission, decided that the Devereaux House should be the one. 65

Four years later these plans were much matured. Seven hundred fifty thousand dollars had been appropriated by the state legislature for the purchase of the property, and by mid-summer the Governor's Advisory Committee for the Restoration of the Devereaux House was meeting to determine how best to proceed. 66 These four years had also materialized some obstacles, however. Some Utahns, viewing the Devereaux House from the street, could scarcely believe they were paying three-quarters of a million dollars for such a derelict, and they were beginning to inform their congressmen of the fact. And J. J. Coan, owner of the coal company, was not at all sure that three quarters of a million was enough, especially after capital-gains taxes. On the other hand, if the state could officially condemn the property, Coan would reap a number of ancillary tax benefits. He was still open to negotiation. 67

And the plans were still moving ahead. Two different plans, in fact, were considered during the month of June. State representative Gerald L. Woodmansee, speaking for a recently organized Citizens Committee for Restoration, urged that the work be accomplished through nonprofit groups
like his own, groups which could produce retired craftsmen
to work on the project de gratis. The alternative proposal
was presented, logically enough, by Terracor. John Lear,
speaking for the development company, proposed to combine
public and private means imaginatively. Terracor would
restore Devereaux House with funds generated through develop-
oping the remainder of the block. The landmark itself would
thus become the center of—and impart an air of authenticity
to—a Trolley Square-like constellation of shops, restaur-
ants, and theaters in a garden setting. Funds for the
development would be somewhat easier to come by on account
of the tax advantages associated with the historic site.
Also, of course, there may have to be some condemnation
involved. Thus were inter-mixed altruism and self-interest.68

Terracor's presentation was far and away the more
impressive, and ultimately Terracor's plan was the one that
was accepted. Governor Scott Matheson was about to set the
machinery of purchase in motion when the first real snag
appeared. Joseph P. McCarthy, assistant attorney general
for the state, suddenly ruled that the state could neither
condemn the Devereaux House property nor exchange the state
property for it. Not only did the ruling undercut
Terracor's plans, it undercut Coan's offer to sell. He
would settle for the $747,500, he had said reluctantly,
because of the tax advantages of selling condemned property;
but no condemnation, no sale.69
Legal maneuvers ensued. On September 22, the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency included the Devereaux House in its downtown survey area, thus establishing the power of the city to condemn the property. At the same time, Salt Lake City Mayor Ted Wilson met with officials of the Federal Economic Development Administration and secured a pledge for federal funds to help develop the whole Devereaux block, up to $2,000,000 if the city and state could match it. Suddenly the project was on track again.

Or so it seemed at the time. Three months later no one was quite sure again whether the Devereaux House was going to be restored or not. Opponents of preservation had been busy from the beginning; indeed, the adverse legal opinion of Mr. McCarthy had possibly been politically inspired (it had not been uncontentious at least). In February of 1979 the opponents came out in the open and challenged the Devereaux House scheme in the state legislature. At the center of the debate was a bill to repeal the $750,000 appropriation for purchasing the property. Representative Merrill W. Harward, sponsor of the measure, posed the classic question about historic preservation. "Should the legislature," he asked, "be party to the purchase of every relic and derelict someone feels is of historic significance?" Harward also wondered, and possibly with greater cogency, whether the state should be party to an essentially private development project.
The opposing case was most clearly stated in committee hearings. John Lear, representing Terracor, gave a two-day presentation in which he carefully laid out all of the expenditures and projected returns, both for the public and the private sectors. His main arguments were that the restoration of the historic home would stimulate massive private investment in the area (Terracor alone planned to put a twenty-million-dollar building on the Devereaux block), and that tax revenues from the improved property would bring in $500,000 a year to city and state. Lear also pointed out that his firm was going to provide twice as much money ($1,500,000) as the state of Utah for the restoration proper, which was not even a money-making proposition. These arguments, together with the loudly expressed support of the state historical society, the South Temple Commission, the Salt Lake City Commission, the Utah State Board of Parks and Recreation, the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, and the Utah Heritage Foundation carried the day, but not before Harward and the anti-preservationists had tried several other tactics to halt the project. (One of these was an attempt to impose conditions on the restoration and development which would be all but impossible to meet.) What probably saved the Devereaux House in the end was the announcement, on February 27, by the Utah State Bicentennial Commission that it would proceed with the condemnation of the property with or without the approval of the state legislature. The condemnation proceedings gave
Coan the tax advantages he needed, and Coan accordingly agreed to accept $732,500 for the property. By March 2 it was all settled.78

After the breaking of the final logjam, the restoration and development work proceeded apace. By March 23 the State Building Board had selected architect Burtch W. Beall, Jr. to begin work on the restoration designs. The same day, by coincidence, real estate developer Charles W. Akerlow announced that he would be purchasing property directly across the street from the Devereaux House for a development of his own.79 Thus was dramatically borne out the principal economic argument of the preservationists: that historic preservation is good business.

In the associated case of the Kearns Mansion, located on South Temple just east of the Cosgriff Mansion, is far and away the most physically imposing private residence in the state of Utah. It was designed by architect Carl M. Neuhausen and built between 1900 and 1902 by Thomas Kearns, another of the mining princes and eventually U. S. Senator as well.80 Such was the splendor of the giant edifice that no career of slow decay seemed thinkable for it. So in February of 1937, Mrs. Jennie J. Kearns, widow of the now-deceased senator, offered the mansion as a gift to the State of Utah for the official residence of the Governor.81 In that capacity, it continued to function through the administrations of Henry H. Blood, Herbert B. Maw, and J. Bracken Lee.82
By 1955, however, the legislature had decided that the Kearns Mansion, imposing though it was, was not really good enough for the governor of the state, and plans were executed for a modern new rambler to be built in the upper avenues on Fairfax Road. The Kearns Mansion was then handed down to the state historical society, which was believed to prefer old buildings anyway.\(^{83}\) The historical society was more than at home in the towering old edifice, but the building itself needed constant attention. Its stone walls tended to absorb moisture and then to crumble. Treatments for weather resistance thus began in the early 1960s and continued sporadically throughout the decade.\(^{84}\) They were renewed in the early 1970s with a six-year project of gradual restoration anticipated to cost a quarter of a million dollars.\(^{85}\)

Then, in 1976, Democrat Scott Matheson was elected governor, and whether he brought to his office a new respect for historic preservation or simply, as he said, found the Fairfax Road quarters insufficient for the needs of his family, he decided at any rate that he wanted to move back into the Kearns Mansion.\(^{86}\) Obligingly, state senator Haven J. Barlow introduced legislation contemplating the sale of the Fairfax Road House and the use of the money for restoration of the old Governor's Mansion.\(^{87}\) The bill passed both houses in March and the "for sale" signs went up on Fairfax Road.\(^{88}\) By late September the house had been sold for $329,000 (nearly twice the expected sum) and another
$10,000 in forfeited earnest money had been gained. That should have made the transfer of official residence nearly painless. As it happened, however, the transfer was anything but painless. 89

The problem, as is so often the case with historic restoration, was uncertainty about the actual cost. The weatherproofing of the exterior walls was still in progress, and the building lacked a number of essentials for adequate fire safety. 90 If in addition the mansion was to be made accessible to the handicapped, that would entail another $36,000 for an elevator and $23,000 for alterations in the west porch. 91 The bill was mounting up fast. Its full extent was not known until the bids came in. By November of 1977, the official estimate of the cost had grown with the addition of this and that to some 418,000. But the bids were higher still. The lowest one, in fact, offered by Rocky Mountain Contractors of Salt Lake City, was a dizzying $529,181, and the highest topped $600,000. 92

Architect William Nelson of Environmental Associates (the architect of the David Keith restoration) was then put to work weeding out a hundred thousand dollars worth of extras, but the political damage was already done. 93 How in earth, asked the skeptical-minded, could preservationists justify spending a half million dollars on a building that was going to wrack and ruin? The issue was joined in earnest when the legislature convened in January of 1978. The division was essentially partisan, with Democrats supporting the
Democratic governor and Republicans challenging him. On January 6, four of the challengers prefiled a bill to kill the renovation and turn the Kearns Mansion back to the historical society. If this measure carried, the governor would receive a five hundred dollar a month allowance for living expenses instead of a mansion. For official entertainment he could use the Kearns Mansion, the Gold Room in the Capitol Building, or some private facility.94

Backers were quite serious about the bill. They claimed to have received sheaves of angry letters in support of their position, and more reasonable, they claimed that the actual cost of restoration might go as high as $1,200,000 if the process of adding an item here and an item there continued. Democrats took to the floor to refute these charges, of course, and even the Building Board Director, Glen R. Swenson, got into the fray, with an angry vow that no request for over $400,000 would be contemplated.95 Happily for the cause of historic preservation, the Republican bill failed to win serious consideration, and the plans for restoring the Governor's Mansion proceeded apace.

Nevertheless, appetites for historic luxury were considerably trimmed back. For example, when the interior design phase of the project was reconsidered, means were found to cut out a great deal of unnecessary expense. Designer Bert F. Vieta assembled a blue-ribbon committee of ten designers, each of whom would design a designated room and critique the work of the others; all of them donated
their time to the project.96 And in order to further shave expenses, the individual committee members, who were all professional decorators, bought the necessary appointments at their own discount prices and resold them to the state at cost.97 In October of 1978 the U. S. Department of the Interior contributed $19,000 to the refinishing of the exterior stonework, and Utah Assistant Attorney General G. Blaine Davis ruled that all donations to the restoration project were deductible from state and federal income taxes. The project was still some $125,000 in the red, but it was being undertaken in a genuine public spirit.98

Not only in dollars but also in time were the estimates for the project a little too optimistic. In May of 1979 the contractors were solemnly predicting a move-in date of July 24; this proved to be wide of the mark by about nine months, demonstrating that contractors speak no differently to public than private clients.99 But finally, on March 2, 1980 the Mathesons moved in at last. Weighing together all of the time and all of the costs, donated as well as paid for, the restoration project had come to a staggering $3,000,000.100 Yet motorists passing by on the crowded South Temple and seeing the stately mansion in its setting of trimmed lawns and tall trees, might well conclude that the price had been worth it.
Historic Homes as Private Residences

The most important trend in historic homes is to find means to extend and renew their function as family residences. Government and business cannot save them all. A brief glance at three examples of domestic restoration shows that private families who seek to restore historic homes have little of the pulling and hauling associated with business or government endeavors, but they have their difficulties nonetheless.

The old Charles Bell Home, built on the avenues in Salt Lake City in 1888, was purchased by Geoffrey and Hilda Glover in the early 1970s. The Golvers were people who had lived the conventional suburban life for eighteen years in Riverton, Utah when they were suddenly possessed to fulfill their life's dream of restoring a fine old home. 101

Immediately, the new owners took up carpentry, plumbing, and electrical work, as is the case with so many buyers of historic houses. This kind of remodeling in an old house is so difficult, complex, and protracted, that calling in outside professionals is often simply not feasible. The Golvers also learned to respect the integrity of their new abode. When they wanted to add a downstairs bathroom, their problem was one of harmonizing the new appendage with the house's existing design and materials. Three and one-half months were spent in locating just the right siding. Decorations and fixtures were salvaged from second-hand and antique stores, even from demolition sites around
the state. The constant searching for this and that led to another characteristic development in the Golvers; they became antique buffs. In fact, they took to buying antiques whether or not they happened to fit their house and reselling those that were unsuitable. Antique collecting became a family sideline. 102

For all its work and worry, the Glover home is an enjoyment to its owners. Like virtually all people who buy antique houses, the Golvers are as much in love with the process as the product. They do it because they would rather do it than anything else.

The experience of the Golvers was somewhat akin to that of the young couple who purchased the William H. Culmer House, just off South Temple in Salt Lake City. The house had had a long and apparently downhill experience since its construction in the 1880s, ending up as an apartment house condemned by the city as a firetrap. But the young couple sailed zestfully into the tasks of plumbing and wiring and stripping paint. When they began to remove the many layers of wallpaper, they found stenciling and hand-painted decorations on the walls of three different rooms. Research revealed that the wall paintings had been done by Henry L. A. Culmer, neighbor and brother of the original owner and a nineteenth-century landscape artist of considerable renown. By the time the young couple finished their task of renovation, sold the Culmer House, and moved on to other
challenges, the house had been placed on the National register of Historic Places.  

The experience of Earl and Pat Beattie in Provo is decidedly more prosaic than that of the Glovers, but it is by no means atypical. The Beattie home would perhaps more accurately be characterized as an "old house" than as a "historic home." It has no illustrious original owner nor long historical pedigree. It is simply a good, solid pioneer adobe house, probably built in the 1890s, and it presently needs a good deal of work. But because of the difficulties to be encountered in the housing market of 1980, the Beatties decided to buy it. They expect to do a great deal of repair work before the house is really livable; in addition to plumbing and wiring installations, the front proch is settling, there are cracks in the plaster, and the staircase will have to be widened. But there are special loans available for housing of this variety, depending on the family income and the precise use of the funds. The Beatties, too, look forward to the challenge ahead of them.  

Conclusion of Chapter

The most notable activity in preserving historic buildings presently lies with the renovation and restoration of historic homes. The first attempts at preserving historic homes were made by the L. D. S. Church, the state of Utah, Sons of the Utah Pioneers, and the Daughters of the
Utah Pioneers. These groups saved historic homes by making them into historic house museums. The most successful historic house museums were those restored by the L. D. S. Church.

After the passage of the Federal Historic Preservation Act in 1966, two new trends developed in the preservation of historic homes while the historic house museum lost importance. One new trend was the use of historic homes as private residences. This was made possible because of federal grants to help keep down restoration costs and because of the comparatively high cost of financing new homes. Couples who bought historic homes had several traits in common. They liked to "fix-up" homes as a hobby. They tended to like antiques. They developed strong ties with preservationist groups and with other couples who owned historic homes.

The second major trend was the developing use of historic homes for commercial purposes. Many firms in the early 1970s had the necessary cash, coupled with special tax advantages, which made it possible to renovate the historic homes tastefully and effectively. The commercial use of historic homes was also made possible by changes in zoning codes in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There may be some question about the duration of the preservation-for-profits movement. The economic downturn in the late 1970s has brought about rapid change in the ownership of some historic homes used as commercial establishments. There are also
rumors that owners of some historic homes are thinking of selling out because of the high cost of upkeep.

As more historic homes have been identified in Utah, there has been a slow increase in the creation of historic neighborhood districts. This trend will probably be slow in its development but it has the potential to have a more lasting effect upon society in Utah.

A canvass of 62 historic homes in Salt Lake County reveals the following interesting facts:

Sixty percent of the historic homes are listed on the state register.

Fourty-two percent of the historic homes are used as private residences.

Nineteen percent of the historic homes are used for commercial purposes.

Five percent of historic homes are used as museums.

Sixty-five percent of the historic homes were built in the 19th century.

Thirty-four percent of the historic homes were built in the 10th century.

Fifty-five percent of the historic homes were saved because of their architecture.

Thirty-two percent of the historic homes which were listed on the National Register were nominated during 1978.

These data tend to show that a locally significant home is more likely to be saved because of its architectural rather than historical significance. For further information, see Appendix A.
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CHAPTER V

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

Another promising trend which has developed in historic preservation in Utah is the commercial use of historic business buildings. This trend will probably be of more importance and of longer duration than the commercial use of historic homes.

At present there seem to be three major movements in the preservation of historic business buildings. The most visible movement involves the renovation of warehouses, factories, and other large buildings into malls with various historic themes. Examples of such development are Trolley Square and Heritage Square, both located in Salt Lake City. The second movement involves the renovation of historic stores, schools, or in some cases, the renovation of a run-down section of a city's downtown into a mall with a historic theme. Examples of this are Arrow Press Square and Exchange Place Historic District of Salt Lake City. Academy Square is a similar type of development which is located in Provo. In this type of development more emphasis is placed upon leasing office space to businesses rather than the operation of stores and restaurants. The third movement is one in which an entire geographical area is
given a historic theme. An example of this is downtown Payson. The three examples which will be studied in detail are Trolley Square, Academy Square, and Payson's downtown district.

Trolley Square

Trolley Square occupies the square block of Salt Lake City which is located between Fifth and Sixth South Streets and Sixth and Seventh East Streets. When the city was first settled, Brigham Young designated the block as the Tenth Ward Square. Later, in 1888, it became the site of the Territorial Fairgrounds. Then, in 1906, E. H. Harrison bought the property for his Utah Light and Railway Company, constructing several large trolley barns and a water tower to complete the facilities. The trolleys continued to ply the streets of Salt Lake until the Second World War; after that the trolley barns became the home of the city's bus system. This, too, eventually fell into decline, and what greeted the eye of the passerby in the late 1960s were only a few broken-down buses and the cavernous trolley barns, badly in need of repair.

What transformed this eyesore into one of the most appealing—and rewarding—commercial ventures of contemporary America was an idea. The "Ghiradelli Idea," as it might be called, impressed itself forcefully upon Wallace Wright, Jr., a realtor from Salt Lake City and co-developer of the city's Roadway Inn, when he visited San Francisco in
the late 1960s. Other Salt Lakers had seen Ghiradelli Square, of course, but had not made the connection between that marvelous enterprise and the greasy, yawning car barns along Seventh East. Wright made it immediately. He looked at the landscape of desolation and saw Trolley Square.  

While working on the Salt Lake City Downtown Development Committee, Wright met his neighbor, I. J. Wagner. The two of them went up to the old trolley yard and examined the barns, each of which was 57 feet wide and 420 feet long. The brick structures were painted a sickly cream color and resembled nothing so much as windowless army barracks. But because they stood literally shoulder to shoulder, they created a potential interior space that was mammoth in size. Besides, the site was located on a major street, was close to downtown Salt Lake, and had plenty of parking space. I. J. Wagner grasped the idea himself. In the ensuing months, the two of them pooled ideas and capital, and talked six other friends into joining the venture. By 1969 they were ready to incorporate Trolley Square Associates.  

The group bought the property in question from the Utah Light and Traction Co. for the cost of the land alone, $1,000,000. Because most bankers were skeptical in the extreme of the new venture, only short-term financing could be arranged, from First Security Bank. Nevertheless, a construction company, Trolley Square Construction, was formed for the purpose of renovation, and the syndicate was
ready to go to work. Their choice of an architect was most fortunate. Albert Christensen of Architects Planners Alliance had remarkable powers of vision. He sketched the trolley barns on paper and soon was turning them into a multilevel and multiaxis shopping center with a turn-of-the-century theme. Wright and Wagner described the concept in these words:

Trolley Square will be defined as streets rather than aisles. Instead of open department areas, the square will have individual specialty shops with doors. "It will be like strolling down a narrow European village street of quaint two-story shops, each with a distinct personality and style of its own to be discovered by the shopper . . .," the developers say.

There will be four theaters, several restaurants and a night club with a "Gay Nineties" theme. Power lines now overhead will be put underground. And antique lighting fixtures will be installed to give Trolley Square an inviting glow at night.

As the construction work began, it was accompanied by a curious phenomenon, one that would give Trolley Square its mark of individuality. Wright found an old trolley car somewhere, bought it, and had it hauled back to the square. He promptly christened it "Desire" and had it rehabilitated as a flower shop. In time there would be other trolleys, refurbished as banks, shops, and boutiques; and there would be other antiques as well. It was this process of hauling in that made the venture something really new.

In the meantime sandblasters had worked their way through the sickly cream paint and revealed the mellow red
of the original brick. This would establish a unity of color throughout the entire square. At the same time the buildings themselves were strengthened and reinforced so as to meet fire and earthquake standards. In some of them whole walls were cut away for the vast expansion of interior space; and here too reinforcement was called for. Trolley tracks and tons of debris were cleared out of the buildings, and the enormous grease pits were bricked over with used brick from dozens of demolitions. The new floors would be treated with preservative and then polished to a high shine. Then came the building of the individual shops. These were conceived as buildings within buildings, as Wright had explained, a conception that imparted a good deal of charm but created enormous difficulties of engineering. Additionally, there were stairways, balconies, catwalks, bridges, and an arrangement of vertical space that was as cunning as the horizontal.

By the spring of 1971 the first tenant was ready to move in. Appropriately, the cashier's office of the Trolley Gas Station was a trolley itself. Other tenants soon followed. Two architectural firms (one of them Architects Planners Alliance) and an advertising agency opened offices in the car barns in late summer. It was fortunate that these tenants did not require walk-in business, for the renovation work was still going on apace. Over a thousand trees and shrubs were then being planted around the square. Even without the throngs of tourists which would
eventually haunt the square, however, it was easy to see in
the fall of 1971 that something distinctly successful was
under way. First Security Bank, which had hedged its finan-
cial participation with all sorts of restrictions, now
decided that it would move a branch office into the old
heating plant of the repair station.\textsuperscript{14} Another bank, State
Savings and Loan, moved into two series 510 trolleys joined
together.\textsuperscript{15} The Trolley Square boom was on.

For Memorial Day of 1972, several of the new busi-
nesses were ready to open their doors. In addition to the
tourist, clothing, and novelty shops, there was an ice
cream parlor, a couple of restaurants, and a furniture store
set up by the world-renown furniture designer Milo Baughman.

For the celebration there were hot-air balloon flights, a
marathon radio broadcast, and assorted flea and farmer's
markets set up in the as yet unrenovated sections. But the
focal point was the old water tower, which had been conver-
ted into an observation platform. Adorned with some six
thousand tiny lights, the tower stood against the night sky
like a welcoming beacon.\textsuperscript{16} And the visitors to the square
fairly thronged along the byways below, some sixty to
seventy thousand of them weekly. First Security Bank
volunteered to convert the financing to long-term.\textsuperscript{17}

Still, Messrs. Wright and Wagner were only just
going started. The high creativity did not materialize
until the fall of 1972, when the developers embarked upon
what they called "adaptive preservation." By this time
Wright had hauled in eleven trolleys, enough to suit most people; he needed something new. Suddenly he got the idea of bringing in salvage items from the demolition of historic homes and buildings then in full course. By the summer of 1973 he had rescued from the wreckers elements from three demolished mansions, a stained glass sunburst from the Upland Hotel, forty downtown streetlamps, and the old cage elevator from East High School. Just how one put such things to use was limited solely by the imagination. The streetlamps had to continue to function as streetlamps, of course, but the elevator Wright converted into a women's handbag boutique. He incorporated large chunks of the H. L. A. Culmer Mansion (owned by the brother of William L. A. Culmer) into several stores. The cupola was converted into the Handmaker's Gift Emporium. The proprietors of the Emporium, Steve Bontejer and Gene Seiler, were bitten by the bug themselves; they laboriously sandblasted the interior of the cupola and added stained glass windows. "It's a labor of love for us," Bontejer told visitors.

The front doors, carved staircase, dormer windows, and bay window of the Culmer Mansion were incorporated into the Chalk Garden, a store for women. As one passes along the store's exterior (inside the carbarn), it is very much like passing a fine old mansion. Wright had a little more difficulty with the walls of the Culmer Home, but not much. When he learned that H. L. A. Culmer had painted lavish murals on the interior walls of his house, Wright rushed up
to the demolition scene to see for himself. He and his son were frantically peeling off accumulations of wallpaper to find the murals while the bulldozers were warming up for the final destruction. When he saw the Culmer paintings for himself, Wright got out his checkbook and sent the wreckers home. The murals are now on display at the First Security Bank at Trolley Square. 20

Once having begun this strange pack-rat career, Wright apparently could not stop. He began hauling in pieces of the old Dinwoody Mansion, once located on upper South Temple, as he had with the Culmer. The staircases, stained glass, gingerbread reliefs, light fixtures, cabinets, and fireplaces of the old mansion turned up in one Trolley Square store after another, most of them in the Glad Rags. Shoppers entered the store through the Dinwoody front porch. Then Wright got hold of a church in Los Angeles, placing its crucifix-emblazoned doors outside a Trolley Square tavern called The Pub and its stained glass windows in the Spaghetti Factory Restaurant. 21 The church's altar wound up in Nannette's Bridal Salon, and its twenty-five-foot dome was shipped in sections to be carefully hung over a European-like amalgamation of food shops known as the Open Market. 22 Preservation purists were not at all sure how they reacted to this omnivorous cannibalism, but the public loved it. Each time the trucks pulled up with another hunk of architectural anatomy, the Trolley Square clientele increased.
The spring of 1973 brought to a close the first phase of Trolley Square development. Subsequent phases would move into the southern bays of the main building and into the north building, then occupied by Utah Power and Light. The project, as the most casual observer could see, was a stunning success. Even so, it began to run into difficulties. Trolley Square Associates had already been to court once, in the summer of 1972, for the purpose of stopping what they conceived to be the pirating of their now valuable name for a competing shopping mall. But other difficulties were more serious. In May TSA clashed with Salt Lake City's chief electrical inspector, who was appalled, as he put it, by wholesale violations of the city's electrical code. Ornamental lighting was hazardous and not in compliance with the code; outside lighting and electrical signs were not wired properly; temporary wiring in the construction areas was exposed to the public; open wiring on the heat and air handling units posed a fire hazard; and the illuminated water tower was an electrical accident waiting to happen. Some of J. D. Cronin's complaints were aspects of the construction-in-progress nature of the square, but others definitely pointed toward loose and incautious management. The Trolley Square experiment would not be helped by an accidental electrocution. TSA, however, did not see the matter in those terms; it persisted in believing that J. C. Cronin represented the forces of reaction. Ultimately a confrontation was headed off by
cool heads on both sides, and the wiring problem was tucked into place.

By September the old exuberance had returned, and Trolley Square, long a financial success, was being recognized as a cultural success as well. On the seventh, Governor Calvin Rampton named the square as a historic site and placed it on the state register. At the same time, the construction journal *Buildings* awarded TSA the Building Magazine Award for Modernization and Excellence, while the Utah Heritage Foundation bestowed its annual Merit Award upon the developers. The latter were far from ready to rest back on their laurels, however. They were soon at work on an ambitious project to duplicate the old Gardo House which had once stood across the street from the Eagle Gate. The re-creation would be part of the new development in the south bays. And Wallace Wright had found another prize. The arch-like Capitol Theater sign that for years had spanned Second South Street below Main had been condemned by the city under a new sign ordinance. Wright had no particular place in mind for a sign that said "Capitol Theater," but he found one, over the entrance to a parking lot.

In November of 1975 TSA announced the opening of a new "street" in the fourth and fifth bays, of which the Gardo House facsimile was a part. Trolley Square was now quite large enough for shoppers to become lost in. In the next four years, the new axis would eventually boast a
reconstruction of the old ZCMI facade, complete with cast iron fluted columns and revolving brass door from the original, an amphitheater, and a "street" that resembled an old English shopping village. The fifth bay was connected by an elevated walkway to a new parking lot on the south side of Sixth South, and for the elevated walkway Wallace Wright dug up nothing less than a conveyor tube from a Tooele bauxite mine, which he fitted with tinted glass and then carpeted. Someday he hoped to build a luxury hotel on the site of the parking lot and use the walkway as an access to the lobby.\(^\text{32}\)

Meanwhile, the development continued. A three-level underground parking plaza was begun in late 1976 to accommodate the constantly swelling throng of visitors. (Tourists were being hauled up from downtown by the trolley-fulls in specially designed buses, so acute was the parking problem.)\(^\text{33}\) Trolley Square also began to spill across the streets on three of the block's four sides. Owners of buildings in the run-down neighborhood were only too happy to sell them to developers for "trolley" banks, "trolley" confectionary stalls, and "trolley" pizzerias, but there were no mammoth carbarns to turn into more income space. Architects Planners Alliance solved the problem by designing and building Trolley Corners, large new buildings created to look exactly like renovated warehouses or mattress factories. These became the domicile of more Trolley Theaters.\(^\text{34}\) The word "Trolley" by this point was becoming
a trade mark; eventually there were Trolley Theaters all over Salt Lake City.

In the summer of 1978 there were more accolades for TSA. On June 15 it was announced that Trolley Square had won an award for innovative development from the prestigious International Council of Shopping Centers. Sixty judges had combed through a competition of 72 entries to make the award. But TSA was almost too busy to notice. Wallace Wright was trucking in such things as tower domes and arched windows from the old Western Trading Company Building; a brass lighting fixture that had once hung in the Tabernacle; and the entire facade of an historic mansion cum apartment building in Ogden. By the time he had passed the $10,000,000 mark in invested capital, it was necessary to post 26 different historical markers about the burgeoning development. "The Square" said Elizabeth Schoenfeld in the Deseret News, "stands as one of the finest examples of adaptive preservation." The four million yearly shoppers (that is four times the population of Utah) seemed to agree. They have continued to the present to maintain Trolley Square's 118 shops and services on a paying basis. Nevertheless, most would agree with dreamer--and now millionaire--Wallace Wright that the achievement "cannot be measured in dollars alone; but must include consideration of the contribution to the architectural legacy of the community as well."
Academy Square

Academy Square came as a kind of godsend to Provo, Utah. The Provo downtown business district had never been the healthiest, and with the aggressive competition of the merchants of neighboring Orem--and especially the University Mall--it seemed to be dying on the vine. With the phenomenal success of Trolley Square in Salt Lake City, several of the more harrassed businessmen began looking with hope to the old campus of the Brigham Young Academy, which now existed as a part of Brigham Young University. The old campus, on the corner of Fifth North and University Streets, appeared to be out of a nineteenth-century picture book. Reposing in the shade of tall elms, it seemed to be recalling the Victorian splendor of happier days. What a shopping mall it would make!

The university, which was now situated in sprawling facilities atop "Temple Hill" to the north, looked at the Academy campus with loving nostalgia, but also with a sense of doom. The creaky old buildings were a fright to maintain; they were far off the beaten path for most students; and--significantly--there was inadequate parking in the area. Although there was some talk of renovating the "lower campus" as a historical museum of some kind, there was really little hope of doing so. When the university had a chance to build a new high-rise building on its main campus and thereby consolidate all facilities, it decided to put the old Academy up for sale.
Terms of the agreement concluded in May, 1975 with Academy Square Associates included a promise by the latter to maintain the structural integrity of the former college. Thus, as a university spokesman put it, the Academy would not only be preserved, it would be given a "new life." And Philip A. Brady, the principal backer of ASA, was a man capable of doing just that. His Brady Development Company of Denver had successfully undertaken other commercial restorations, notably Larimer Square in Denver, and the man himself had both the right financing and the right attitudes. Said he:

We are fully conscious of the memories, nostalgia, and sentiment which are associated with the lower campus and we intend to preserve, restore, secure and communicate Academy Square's cultural heritage.42

Another good omen was to be found in the architect selected for the renovation design: Albert Christensen of Trolley Square fame.43

Moreover, Christensen's plan was certainly adequate to the needs. The complex of six college buildings would provide 100,000 square feet of floor space, which the architect proposed to augment to 150,000 through the use of a glass envelope over the courtyard. As a part of the restoration, Christensen planned an alumni hall, stocked with scenes and artifacts from the university's past. He also planned two movie theaters, a live theater featuring
historical drama, an athletic club, and an international bazar, in addition to the usual run of shops and restaurants. 44

For a year and more the development of the plans went well. The only difficulty for which the developers had no ready answer was that of parking. The problem was simple, if obdurate. All around the Academy Square block were homes and small businesses; there were no vacant lots waiting to be transformed into multitiered parking terraces. So there were really only two options available to the developers: They could raze one or more of the college buildings in order to provide parking space, or they could use the power of eminent domain to secure parking elsewhere. The first alternative was closed on account of ASA's promise to BYU that structural integrity of the buildings would be protected. That left only Provo City. 45

To say the very least, Provo City was not a forward-looking community insofar as development was concerned. Over the years the city fathers had allowed one business after another to slip away to Orem, and of the big new merchants and retailers moving into Utah Valley, Provo had not succeeded in attracting a single one. Academy Square thus had no energetic Ted Wilson with whom it could deal. Nevertheless, in April of 1976 the developers sat down with Provo's Redevelopment Agency to see if a solution to the parking problem could be worked out. Two plans were proposed: a parking terrace and a parking lot. The terrace
plan would involve construction costs as high as $7,000 per parking space, so the lot seemed to be the preferable option. This would involve less construction, to be sure, but a good deal more real estate, and even if eminent domain were invoked to secure the land, it still had to be paid for. So Provo now had to devise a system of financing. One option was to set up a parking district and assess all the merchants in the area so much per head in order to pay for the improvements. This, however, seemed uncomfortably like making the already unsuccessful businesses of downtown Provo pay for increased competition. The better recourse, then, was judged to be tax increment financing, whereby bonds would be issued against the proposed improvements and then paid for out of the increased property tax of the improved property. In other words, the merchants of Academy Square would wind up paying for the parking lot themselves. Eugene Jacobs, a California attorney specializing in tax increment financing, was hired to go to work on a plan for Academy Square.46

Just why Philip Brady and his associates found this plan unsuitable was never clear, but apparently they did. Thus, as the Provo Redevelopment Agency carefully considered and tested approach after approach to the parking conundrum, ASA blindly insisted that one of the college buildings would have to be torn down instead. It was the old dilemma of development versus preservation in a new guise.
Of course, there was a great deal of pressure from the community to keep the developers from tearing down any of the old college buildings, and for a while the developers and the community seemed to be at loggerheads. E. Odell Miner, one of the more effective Provo City Commissioners, suggested that the parking problem might be circumvented by proceeding with the renovation first and worrying about parking afterward, when the square itself could pay the bill. He was concerned that no serious consideration had been given by the developers to the parking terrace or the external lot ideas, both of which had been used successfully by Trolley Square. 47

But ASA was not the only group dragging its feet. Residents and businesses of the surrounding area were equally unenthused about being displaced by the developers, and they began to make their voices heard as well. In April, Lewis Swain, leasing agent for the developers, undertook a small public relations campaign to convince Provoans of the larger good which would flow from the Academy Square project. Swain even volunteered that actual residents would not be displaced by the proposed parking areas, only "absentee landlords." 48 He also put in a plug for tax increment financing, which he said would provide a much-needed boost to the hard-pressed developers. 49

By summer of 1976 the situation was as confused as a French comic opera. Who exactly stood for or against this or that parking proposal was anything but clear. What
was clear was that the buildings of the old Brigham Young Academy were still standing peacefully on their now not-so-well-manicured lawns, and nothing at all was happening to Academy Square. In July the Provo City Council held a public hearing to consider protests against the redevelopment proposal. Here all of the advantages of the external parking lot were reviewed again, and a plan was made public whereby businesses which were dislocated would have first choice of relocating in the square. But apparently the opposition remained adamant. So, too, apparently, did the developers. They were still thinking primarily of a parking lot within the square itself. Melvin T. Smith, Utah State Historic Preservation Officer, wrote to them on August with a friendly reminder that the Brigham Young Academy had been placed on the National Register of Historic Places earlier in the year. He said he hoped they would bear that fact in mind.

In November a possible compromise presented itself. Lewis Swain wrote to Milton L. Weilemann of Utah Development Services and suggested that since tax increment financing more or less obliged the developers to put the parking lot on their own land, the best way out for everyone was for ASA to locate the lot on the sites of the old women's gym and book bindery, both of which (though part of the college) were beyond the bounds of the square proper. But this course posed another problem. Demolishing any building that happened to be listed on the National
Register imposed tax penalties. Swain was writing, in fact, to see if Weilemann could have the penalties lifted in the present case. But once again he met a dead end.

The Academy Square parking problem was not solved and it did not go away. Throughout the remainder of 1976 the essential impasse continued. Meanwhile leases for the renovated building were running far behind schedule. As of September, 1977, only 40% of the space had been leased. The reason, once again, was the parking problem: tenants would not sign leases for commercial space if no parking facilities were available. Here the rope of cause and effect started to become tangled: without 60 to 75% of the available space leased, lending institutions would not lend money for construction; and without money for construction, ASA, apparently, could do nothing about the parking problem. The Gordian Knot was complete.

Brady, for one, began to lose interest in the whole idea. His optimistic predictions of shopping and dining at Academy Square by Christmas of 1977 had long since given way to stony silence. His Larimer Square development in Denver was now absorbing much of his time and energy, too. His fellow developers, principally Collier and Heinz of Salt Lake City, decided to offer to buy him out. Brady jumped at the chance.

And yet still the parking problem was not solved. The agreement with Provo City that was to have been signed in September of 1977 fell through, and there ensued another
season of desultory pulling and hauling. With Philip Brady out of the consortium, the developers had lost both experience and financial muscle; construction costs were escalating; and inflation was eating ragged holes in the existing funding. Ed Parker, the project manager, now spoke vaguely of the work beginning in the summer of 1978.55

And even this was optimistic. Provo City still maintained that it could not guarantee parking until given assurances of financing; the developers still claimed that financing depended on leases; and would-be lessees still vowed that they would not sign contracts without parking spaces.56 Such a state of affairs could obviously not continue indefinitely, and the eventual collapse of ASA was only a matter of time. In September of 1979 all of the original developers sold out to the Great Northern Development Company of Provo.57

For its part, Great Northern started over from scratch. It substantially modified Albert Christensen's working drawings and eliminated the glass envelope. The high ambition of the original project was scaled down considerably, and more importantly, its character was fundamentally altered.58 The way to cut the parking knot, so it seemed to Great Northern, was to change the style of the development. Instead of offering shops and restaurants, the new developers proposed to use 80 percent of their floor space for offices and only 20% for shops and restaurants, thereby greatly reducing parking needs. The new people also
decided to approach the work in separate phases as Trolley Square had done, thus allowing one part of the development to help pay for subsequent parts. With a new time line in view, Great Northern has, as of June, 1980, finally begun work on Academy Square. It hopes to occupy the first renovated building by the fall of the year and to finish the entire project by 1982. With the right combination of luck, easy tax write-offs for historic restoration, lower construction costs for renovation, and goodwill from the citizens of Provo, Academy Square may become a reality yet.

Payson Shopping Park

Payson, Utah lies at the southern end of Utah Valley. Like many a rural western town, it began to feel the pains of slow decay in the mid-twentieth century, and by 1960 it seemed verging upon ruin. Dawna Stewart, owner of The Cloth Shoppe on Main Street, looked around one day and saw six empty buildings in the business district. She thought about moving her own business to Spanish Fork or Provo. But then, instead, she decided to do something about Payson's problem.

As secretary of Payson Chamber of Commerce, Ms. Stewart had a platform from which to speak. Her organization, however, was not solely responsible for the remarkable risorgimento that followed. On June 27, 1968 there was a mass meeting held in the Payson Stake House,
and one of the topics discussed was the question of restoring Payson's pioneer heritage.\textsuperscript{62} Groups of people all over town began wondering about the paradoxically connected problems of modernizing their community and preserving its past.\textsuperscript{63}

Amid the ferment many individual questions and issues were discussed. One question was whether to refurbish the old "White Way" streetlights of the early century or to install new mercury-vapor lights instead. Another concerned irrigation water and whether or not to continue its course down the ditches of Main Street.\textsuperscript{64} Still another problem concerned parking and the flow of traffic through the city.\textsuperscript{65} But the really fundamental issue was that of deciding which way Payson should go. Should it return to the turn-of-the-century when many of its downtown buildings were constructed; or should it imitate the successful example of several Arizona towns and return all the way to the pioneer West, complete with boardwalks and hitching posts; or should it step confidently into the space age?\textsuperscript{66} Understandably various Paysonians came down differently on each of these questions, and in the months that followed they often pulled every which way. But one thing was certain: they were going to change the face of Payson, Utah.

Generally, the city council spoke in the accents of modernization. It wanted to repave Main Street and get rid of the old lighting system.\textsuperscript{67} The Chamber of Commerce, on the other hand, which had sponsored that first mass
meeting in June, leaned toward preservation, the immediate symbol of which was the White Way. 68 Their efforts were measurably assisted by an informal committee of concerned business people who, meeting in the Christensen Shoe Store on warm July evenings, decided that preservation was the right direction and the turn-of-the-century was the right time. This group designated one of its number, Roy Broadbent, as finance chairman, to bring forth a plan for assessing Main Street merchants according to the length of their store frontage. 69 Although the Chamber of Commerce people leaned more toward the western town approach, for the time being, at least, the two groups worked together. 70

Greatest consensus was achieved on the parking-lot issue; almost everyone agreed that Payson had to have one. Least consensus was obtained for the streetlights. 71 Modernists decried what they saw as a return to horse and buggy days. But since most people agreed that something had to be done, there was an abiding spirit of comity in the discussions, and by late September Paysonians were ready to make some choices. On the twenty-sixth the Chamber of Commerce made the three alternative proposals (western, Victorian, and modern) known to the populace. Debate and discussion were further invited. The Payson Chronicle even included a suggestion blank in its weekly edition, asking citizens to fill it out and turn it in to the committee. 72

In the end, happily enough, a compromise plan was adopted which included something for everyone. For the
triditionalists in the Chamber of Commerce, there was an eclectic return to the past in the physical aspect of Main Street, with western storefronts, and brick walkways. A proposed sign ordinance spelled out in great detail:

Signs may be painted, stained, gilded, smalted, routed, burned or etched and should convey a handicrafted appearance. Signs should be kept in good repair and be properly maintained. Material such as wood, wrought iron, steel, metal grill work and the like which were used during the period of the late 19th century are encouraged. Simplicity and restraint in material selection is important. Materials should be in a natural state or be colored in subdued natural earthtones.73

Irrigation water still coursed through the business district, but in a craftsmanlike arrangement of fountains and sluices and pools.74 For the modernists on the city council there were the inevitable mercury-vapor streetlights, plus an array of planters and benches.75 Over the whole was applied so much scrubbing and fixing and painting that it imparted to the town a luster and freshness almost unique. For what it was worth, the community effort won Payson the Distinguished Achievement Award in the National Clean Up Contest of 1968.76 More importantly, perhaps, the collective bout of historic preservation left a town very different from the ramshackle Payson of 1965. In 1980 there are no empty buildings on Main Street.

Conclusion

Historic preservation of commercial buildings has gained more widespread acceptance in Utah since the opening
of Trolley Square. Trolley Square was the first shopping mall to emphasize a historic theme. Since its advent, many malls in Utah have adopted such themes. Most of the developers of historic commercial buildings have attempted to imitate Trolley Square's success. The original developers of Academy Square, for example, used the same architectural firm which had designed Trolley Square.

What has developed from this pattern? Most of the malls which have followed Trolley Square's example tend to be quite similar in appearance. They occupy an old factory, garage, or warehouse, and present to the public an array of specialty stores and tourist boutiques. This, apparently, is the winning formula.

But the vast majority of historic commercial buildings cannot imitate the example of Trolley Square. Like Academy Square, they will be forced to rent out space for business offices rather than retail businesses. A combination of economic and cultural forces simply militates against most would-be Trolley Squares.

The case of Payson's business district indicates one possible way for small communities to shore up their sagging fortunes. While such a solution may not be possible in larger towns, it might be possible to develop neighborhoods of historic commercial buildings into historic districts with a unique historic theme.

The biggest problems encountered in the development of historic commercial buildings are finances, parking, and
city codes or uncooperative city officials. The financial problem may stem in part from the negative view towards historic preservation which is held by many businessmen in Utah. This attitude can partially be overcome through education but education will not change the cultural equation between newness and progress. That, like the poor, will be with us always.

The trend towards renovating historic commercial buildings has its limitations. The realities of having too many shopping malls in one area can destroy the commercial advantages of a mall in an historic building. If the federal government drastically reduces its support for historic preservation, it might become economically unrealistic to renovate older commercial buildings. The movement to preserve historic commercial buildings will have to prove itself by its economic validity and its duration over a long period of time.
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Even though historic preservation has become well established in the state of Utah, it has little impact in the lives and consciousness of most citizens. Most Utahns, like most fellow Americans, still regard newness per se as evidence of "progress" and hence come down on the side of modernism. To such a viewpoint, historic preservation seems backward and even obstructionist. This attitude is reinforced by the boosterism of real estate agents and developers generally, who not only equate newness with progress but with their own personal well-being. And since new development usually brings in higher immediate returns, bankers, too, generally seem to support it. Even public officials often fail to appreciate the special conditions necessary to preserve historic structures.

The Utah situation is further complicated by the Mormon Church, which has enormous influence on the social and cultural life of the state. Mormon leaders appear to be of two different minds on the subject of historic preservation. On the one hand, they often look back to a proud pioneer heritage which it is their direct interest to preserve and enshrine. On the other hand, they seem steeped
in the doctrines of modernism themselves, and in a dollars-
and-cents utilitarianism which often cannot see beyond the
ledger books. In the narrowest of economic terms, the
simple, adaptable, useful, and often uninteresting "inter-
national" style of church building seems preferable to the
individuality and imaginativeness of historic chapels and
tabernacles.

Even so, times are changing. With the growth of
population, wealth, education, and demographic age, Utahns
are coming to understand the importance and uniqueness of
their own native culture. Cultural maturity always
includes such an understanding. Thus, as the United States
as a whole comes to terms with the meaning of its past, so
too the people of Utah are beginning to see their heritage
through new eyes.

As we look back upon the twenty-year period
covered in this study, we see that Utah has responded in
its own way to many of the national trends and movements.
Generally the response has been less emphatic than in the
older states of the Atlantic seaboard. In the case of the
outdoor museum concept, for example, Utah eventually adop-
ted variations of it in Lagoon's Pioneer Village and the
Pioneer State Park of the 1970s, but these were late
developments in the movement as a whole, and they were not
attended with the enthusiasm meted out to "living history"
establishments in the East. With the case of historic
house museums, too, the developments in Utah between 1960
and 1975 came well on the heels of national developments, and they seemed to have a narrow, tourist-dollar sort of justification.

Two major events helped to bring public attention to historic preservation in Utah during the decade of the 1960s. The first of these was the formation of the Utah Heritage Foundation. This organization was founded in direct response to the attempts to destroy the Heber City Tabernacle. There can be no doubt about the fact that the uncompromising attitude held by the Mormon Church Building Committee led people to join together in opposition to the drive to systematically destroy historic church buildings. A new church policy which has allowed some historic church buildings to be saved has been the result of such popular forces--and intervention by the General Authorities.

The second major event in the 1960s was the passage of the Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This led directly to the appointment of a State Historic Preservation Officer and the appointment of the Governor's Historic and Cultural Sites Review Committee, both of which were necessary to nominate buildings to the National Register. The governor also made the Utah State Historical Society responsible for the implementation of historic preservation programs. At the direction of the governor, a state register of historic sites was begun. The passage of federal historic preservation laws prompted the Utah State legislature to pass both the Act to Permit the Creation of Historic
Districts in the State of Utah and the Utah State Antiquities Act.

Since the foundation of the Utah Heritage Foundation, the foundation and the Utah State Historical Society have cooperated closely. Each May is designated as Preservation Month and the two organizations jointly sponsor a 3-day conference on preservation. Often, both the Utah Heritage Foundation and the Utah State Historical Society receive federal funds to preserve historical structures in Utah. The Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966 helped to magnify trends which saw the Utah State Historical Society become more active in fights involving historic buildings.

With recent budget cuts in historic preservation funds by the federal government, the Utah State Historical Society has had to eliminate its Intern Program. These budget cuts will probably result in the privately funded Utah Heritage Foundation becoming the leading promoter of historic preservation in the state.

The most significant trend in historic preservation in Utah is the preservation of historic homes. The most highly publicized battles to preserve such homes involve the turn-of-the-century mansions on South Temple Street in Salt Lake City. Of far more significance to historic preservation is the quieter preservation of the architecturally significant old homes found in all communities in Utah. These homes must be renovated by younger couples and
used as normal family residences if they are to be saved. Historic family residences comprise the largest group of buildings which are listed on the State and National Registers. This trend is being encouraged by the formation of historic districts and by the use of low interest loans by local housing authorities.

The commercial renovation of historic homes was widely proclaimed as the best means of saving such structures during the early 1970s. Salt Lake City even altered its zoning laws to permit commercial development of historic homes in residential areas. Although there were some notable successes in this activity--such as the David Keith Mansion--this mode of preservation seems to have limited appeal. Due to the economic downturn in the late 1970s and the attitudes of officials who control the enforcement of city building codes, some owners of renovated historic homes are finding that costs outweigh benefits.

In Utah, many different religious faiths have their buildings listed on the State or National Registers. The Mormon Church, however, has no real preservation plan for its buildings. Even though the Church Building Committee favors demolition of most historic church buildings, they have been successfully opposed by three methods. First, no building can be demolished unless an application in favor of demolition is completed by the local church authorities. Opposition by the majority of people on the local level can generally dissipate local leaders. Secondly, appeals to the
General Authorities have stopped planned demolition, even though the final decision rests with local church leaders. Thirdly, a combination of community pressure, action by a local government to deny a demolition permit, and official objection by the state government have been effective in halting demolition of a historical church building.

The future will bring more battles over the preservation of historic church buildings. No clear pattern has yet emerged. The buildings in question may either be sold or leased, drastically renovated, or demolished. Only very important buildings will probably be renovated. Most historic buildings in a growing community will be demolished. Church buildings remaining in areas which have lost church population will possibly be sold, but there will be several stipulations on the use and upkeep of the buildings.

The renovation of old commercial buildings will primarily depend upon the attitudes of people in the local communities. City officials will generally follow the expressed will of the majority of the community. Although there may be a few more historic malls, such as Trolley Square and Heritage Square, if the local population can not easily support such malls, then problems like those that bedeviled Academy Square may be encountered. Most historic commercial buildings will have to be saved on a one-by-one basis. They will either need to be renovated as business offices or as retail stores. The experiment undertaken in Payson, Utah points in one promising direction for smaller
communities in the state. If business districts can capitalize on their unique points of interest, they may be able to succeed.

Another large area in historic preservation will involve government buildings or the governmental use of historic buildings. Some government buildings, such as Council Hall in Salt Lake City and the Old State Capitol Building in Filmore, are used for tourism. Some historic buildings, such as the Denver and Rio Grand Railroad Depot in Salt Lake City, are presently used by government agencies. At the present time more old county buildings are still in use. Unfortunately, these lovely old edifices are vulnerable to those who want to "modernize." The Utah County Building in Provo is in special danger because the county government has outgrown the building.

The historic preservation movement has enjoyed some notable successes in Utah, but its appeal is still limited. As social attitudes mature, historic preservation will doubtless gain additional favor. At the present time, new construction costs about the same as renovation (there is only about a $10 difference per square foot). If the difference becomes even greater in favor of renovating older buildings, "progress" will no longer be determined by newness.

In the future, historic preservation will cease to be viewed in Utah as exotic. It will doubtless continue
in the next few years to be controversial as it has been in the past. Historic preservation, however, is here to stay.
APPENDIX A
TABLE I

HISTORIC HOMES FOUND IN SALT LAKE COUNTY, THESE HOMES ARE ON THE STATE OR NATIONAL HISTORIC REGISTER, PERCENTAGES OF TYPES OF HOMES PRESERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Register</th>
<th>National . . . 40%</th>
<th>State . . . 66%</th>
<th>Both . . . 7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District . . . . 5%</td>
<td>Public . . . . 5%</td>
<td>Occupied . . . . 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings . . . 74%</td>
<td>Private . . . 81%</td>
<td>Unoccupied . . . 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure . . . 5%</td>
<td>Both . . . . 3%</td>
<td>Work in Progress . . . 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site . . . 2%</td>
<td>No list . . . 11%</td>
<td>No list . . . 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object . . . 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No list . . . 11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Present Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Restricted . . 68%</td>
<td>Agriculture . . 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Unrestricted . . 3%</td>
<td>Commercial . . 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No . . . 19%</td>
<td>Educational . . 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No list . . . 11%</td>
<td>Entertainment . . 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 1 &amp; 2 . . . 2%</td>
<td>Government . . 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial . . 3%</td>
<td>Transportation . . 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military . . . 0%</td>
<td>Other . . . . 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No list . . . 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table I
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Significance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeology-Prehistoric 0%</td>
<td>Engineering 0%</td>
<td>Politics/Government 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeology-Historic 0%</td>
<td>Exploration/Settlement 10%</td>
<td>Religion 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 3%</td>
<td>Industry 2%</td>
<td>Science 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture 55%</td>
<td>Invention 2%</td>
<td>Sculpture 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 2%</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture 8%</td>
<td>Social/Humanitarian 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce 11%</td>
<td>Law 2%</td>
<td>Theater 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications 0%</td>
<td>Literature 0%</td>
<td>Transportation 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning 0%</td>
<td>Military 2%</td>
<td>Other 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation 2%</td>
<td>Music 0%</td>
<td>Historic 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics 0%</td>
<td>Philosophy 0%</td>
<td>No list 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Utah State Historical Society File drawer on State and National Historic Registers, located in Salt Lake City, Utah (patterned after National Register Form).

a Figures were rounded off to nearest whole number, thereby creating discrepancies in percentages.

b Only historic homes included in figures.
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ABSTRACT

Historic preservation in Utah from 1960 to 1980 has reflected major national trends and trends peculiar to Utah. The most important event which increased the influence of the federal government in preservation activities in Utah was the passage of the Federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This law influenced the Utah State Historical Society to become active in preservation in Utah. The battles to save the L. D. S. tabernacles in the 1960s and 1970s led to the formation of the Utah Heritage Foundation. This organization has been responsible for the heightened awareness of historic preservation in Utah. During the 1960s and 1970s, the major fields of preservation activity occurred in restoring church buildings, homes, and commercial establishments. No clear direction has emerged from the effort to save church buildings. Historic homes are now primarily being saved on an individual basis or in historic districts. Historic commercial buildings have generally been saved by being converted into modified malls with historic themes. Historic preservation has been slow to grow in Utah, but preservation appears to be firmly rooted in the state.
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