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ABSTRACT

In "Between Mountain and Lake: an Urban Mormon Country," I identify a uniquely Mormon urban tradition that transcends simple village agrarianism. This tradition encompasses the distinctive ways in which Mormons have thought about cities, appropriating popular American urban forms to articulate their faith's central beliefs, tenants, and practices, from street layout to home decorating. But if an urban Mormon experience has as much validity as an agrarian one, how have the two traditions articulated themselves over time? What did the city mean for nineteenth-century Mormons? Did these meanings change in the twentieth-century, particularly following World War II when the nation as a whole underwent rapid suburbanization? How did Mormon understandings of the environment effect the placement of their villages and cities? What consequences did these choices have for their children, particularly when these places rapidly suburbanized? Traditionally, Zion has been linked to a particular place. This localized dimension to an otherwise spiritual and utopian ideal introduces environmental negotiation and resource utilization. Mormon urban space is, as French thinker Henri Lefebvre would suggest, culturally constructed, appropriated and consumed. On a fundamental level, Mormon spaces tack between the extremes of theocracy and secularism, communalism and capitalism and have much to reveal about how Mormonism has defined gender roles and established racial hierarchies. Mormon cultural landscapes both manifest a sense of identity and place, as well as establish relationships with the past.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Clearly, the city owes much to the Mormons. But Mormonism is profoundly indebted to the city for what it is today.

--Dale Morgan

I am from northern Utah’s Wasatch Front, a narrow sliver of green encased between mountains and lake. The direction east means the Wasatch Mountains that tower over the valley floor in steep jagged peaks and fault scarps. West is where the sun dips, melting into the Great Salt Lake to the north and Utah Lake, its freshwater twin, to the south. Up means north and down means south. We travel up to Brigham City, but down to Provo. The towns in between sit astride alluvial fans that bridge the canyon mouths. This matrix, lake and mountains, up and down, north and south, is engrained in me. I become disoriented each time I leave the Front and must learn to navigate less predictable landmarks.

Ironically, I know the Wasatch Front best through an automobile passenger window, traveling up and down Interstate 15, visiting grandparents, taking piano lessons, going to school. Because there is limited space to put in alternate infrastructure systems, I-15 serves as the lifeline, the jugular vein, for the Wasatch Front’s urban system. The same exits and interchanges pass in predictable sequence while the dotted lines tick by like the second hand on a clock. The mountain skyline and low-lying lakes anchor the moving panorama in geologic time that trivializes the houses and asphalt roadways.

On trips south to Salt Lake City, my mother often related the somewhat hagiographical story of Brigham Young, who, overlooking the valley for the first time and foreseeing its future greatness proclaimed, “This is the Place. Drive on.” Sometimes she related the story as we climbed Victory Road off Beck Street, Salt Lake City’s northern industrial strip, to the extent that for a time I believed the Mormon pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley via the low lying hillsides northeast of town. As I looked out on Beck Street’s oil refineries, gravel pits, and the miles of interstate and houses, I marveled. Brigham Young saw all of this?

Nineteenth-century explorer Jedediah Smith called the Salt Lake Valley his “home in the wilderness.” ² I feel that same connection. But for me, the Wasatch Front is an urban homeland molded by the region’s physical geography. My ancestors, most of them Mormon converts from Great Britain and Scandinavia settled along the Front and up the nearby canyon hamlets, Huntsville and Morgan. Apparently none of them were “called” to the southern settlements, or if they were, they chose to remain in the fertile valleys of the Wasatch. Some of them practiced polygamy, but most did not. Many of their descendants, 150 years later, live remarkably close to the original farmsteads in one of the many suburban Mormon villages that line the Front like a string of beads.

Yet, a network of suburban villages seems to defy Mormon Country’s traditional agrarian communal image, which itself ignores the very uncomfortable fact that most Mormons who continue to live in what cultural geographer D.W. Meinig termed the Mormon Culture Region, an area that encompasses southeastern Idaho, Utah, and

² Quoted in Dale Morgan, The Great Salt Lake (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1947), 87-88.
northern Arizona, do not dwell in isolated, agricultural villages. Many of them most likely never did. Historically, the number of Utahans living along the Wasatch Front has always hovered between 60 and 70 percent. The 2010 census continued this tradition. In many respects, then, Mormon Country’s Wasatch Front has always been, if not fully urbanized, remarkably interconnected and, while initially agricultural, never experienced the same degree of remoteness as other Mormon settlements, scattered as they were throughout the Intermountain West. Nor was Mormon settlement along the Wasatch Front necessarily planned or centrally coordinated.

This dissertation is largely my response to those who persist in seeing the Mormon village as the only authentic landscape type capable of communicating Mormon cultural identity and religious traditions. Indeed Mormon village studies, like those that focus on New England or any other identifiable cultural region, have become an established genre, replete with expected narrative forms and content. While I certainly do not discount this fairly lengthy literature on Mormon agrarian life, I hope to offer a more nuanced story. But before I tell that story, it helps to understand where and how the Mormon village myth (and reality) developed.

Certainly the imagery of Mormon village life originated with Joseph Smith’s 1833 City of Zion plat, in which the prophet laid out his vision for a spiritually sanctified

---

society in terms of gridded streets, large lot sizes, and well-maintained gardens. But the popularization of that image seems to have come from those largely outside the faith, whose descriptions likewise served to validate and further inspire the virtues of village life among Mormons. Nineteenth century travel writers intent on capturing Mormonism’s peculiarities often commented on the villages’ well laid out streets and irrigated gardens. Even the most hardened critic expressed a degree of pleasant surprise. In *Mysteries and Crimes of Mormonism* (1870), Cincinnati reporter J.H. Beadle remarked, “On first impressions Utah seems to me to have the perfection of climates, and Salt Lake City the finest natural site in the West.” Beadle compared the city’s grid to “the even squares of a checker-board, the rows of trees lining the streets, and the crystal streams of water which seem in the distance like threads of silver, combining to give a strange and fanciful beauty to the scene.” As if to echo Beadle’s observations, Brigham Young enjoined the saints two years later to new heights of industriousness, “Gravel our streets, pave our walks, water them, keep them clean and nicely swept, and everything neat, nice and sweet.”

By the turn of the century, travel writing gave way to more scientific ethnographies. Indeed, it may have been the rural sociologists of the 1920s and 1930s,


men like Lowry Nelson (who was a Mormon) and later Edward Banfield, Thomas O’Dea, and others, who looked for an authentic Mormon culture in the villages and small farming communities dotting Utah that really established the village as the quintessential Mormon landscape type. Following in the footsteps of Charles Galpin (later head of U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Rural Life Studies) many of these men analyzed Mormon life far from the bustling core of the Wasatch Front. For their part, Banfield and O’Dea embraced the romance of Utah’s red rock country. From their studies it would appear that a “real” Mormon could only be found in the Colorado Plateau or some other far-flung locale. Thus over time the Mormon village came to be as much a part of the faith’s heritage as covered wagons and handcarts and is even replicated at Salt Lake City’s This Is the Place Heritage Park, which features gridded tree-lined streets, empty irrigation ditches, and rows of replica historic buildings and homes.

Once a Mormon village’s economy shifted away from agriculture, it seemed to lose its rural authenticity. A classic example of this attitude can be found in Wallace Stegner’s *Mormon Country*. On the CBS radio show, “Of Men and Books,” which highlighted *Mormon Country* in December 1942, Stegner and host John T. Frederick discussed this issue. Stegner observed, “Here’s what happened in the Mormon Country: into a region whose population is under a million, the war has injected a hundred thousand new workers, almost all non-Mormon; hundreds of bomber pilots and crewmen training at the big airfields near Salt Lake and dropping bombs on the…desert; ten

---

thousand interned Japanese.” He continued, “The same thing, with greater or less social
disruption, has occurred in all the other regions; they have been bled of their manpower
or overrun by strangers, and some highly cultivated isolations are scheduled to be
trampled on.”¹⁰ In Mormon Country, Stegner foreshadows these changes, suggesting that
because small Mormon towns are disappearing, Mormon Country itself might one day be
irrelevant, a thing of the past. “The cities of the Mormon country have…become almost
indistinguishable from other American cities,” he writes.¹¹

While more recent work like Chad Emmett’s article, “The Evolving Mormon
Landscape of the 21st Century” and articles in Mapping Mormonism: An Atlas of Latter-
day Saint History (2012) recognizes that today’s Mormon landscapes are overwhelmingly
urban or suburban in character, other authors remain wedded to the agrarian Mormon
village.¹² For instance, in Believing in Place: A Spiritual Geography of the Great Basin,
Richard Frankaviglia notes Salt Lake City’s absent “Mormon character.” “Even the
church office building appears like…any other high-rise building, and its placement
seems to both dwarf the Mormon Temple and isolate the building from its granite

¹⁰ Northwestern University, On the Air, 2, no. 12, (December 19, 1942): 3. University of
Utah, Marriott Library Special Collections, Wallace Stegner Papers, MS 676 Box 203.
Wasatch Mountain roots,” he laments. Francaviglia cuts his stay short, heading south along I-15 “to look for that vanishing face of Mormonism—the utopian, self-sufficient villages that Church leaders encouraged.” Village life, Francaviglia believes, does not jive well with modern Mormonism.13

In contrast to these interpretations I identify a uniquely Mormon urban tradition that transcends simple village agrarianism. This tradition encompasses the distinctive ways in which Mormons have thought about cities, appropriating popular American urban forms to articulate their faith’s central beliefs, tenants, and practices—from street layout to home building and decorating. Mormon urban space is, as French thinker Henri Lefebvre would suggest, culturally constructed, appropriated and consumed. As “a set of relations between things (objects and products),” these urban spaces tack between the extremes of theocracy and secularism, communalism and capitalism. On a more fundamental level, Mormon spaces have much to reveal about how Mormonism has defined gender roles and established racial hierarchies. This is because constructed spaces can never “be separated either from productive forces, including technology and knowledge, or from the social division of labor which shapes it, or from the state and superstructures of society.”14 As “history made visible,” Mormon cultural landscapes both manifest a sense of identity and place, as well as establish relationships with the past.15 But if an urban Mormon experience has as much validity as an agrarian one, how

15 Quoted in Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, “J. B. Jackson and the Discovery of the American Landscape,” in Landscape in Sight: Looking at America by John Brinckerhoff
have the two traditions intersected and been articulated over time? What did the city mean for nineteenth-century Mormons? Did these meanings change in the twentieth-century, particularly following World War II when the nation as a whole underwent rapid suburbanization? Traditionally, Zion has been linked to a particular place. This localized dimension of an otherwise spiritual and utopian ideal introduces environmental negotiation and resource utilization. How did Mormon understandings of the environment affect the placement of their villages and cities? What consequences did these choices have for their children, particularly when these places rapidly suburbanized? As Mormon Apostle Boyd K. Packer iterated, “Our lives are made up of thousands of everyday choices. Over the years these little choices will be bundled together and show clearly what we value.”

By choosing to build and live in cities, Mormons became self-conscious architects of their own religious, even eternal destiny. Early on Mormons articulated their urban traditions in terms of redemption. Joseph Smith’s unique conception of an American Zion, a sanctified society whose covenant mission actively prepared a people and an earth fit for Christ’s millennial reign, overshadow how Mormons later thought about urban life. The Mormon Zion came to be defined as a concept, ideal, even a cause. Simply put, Zion

---


refers to the physical gathering place of the righteous, a quality of life, and the elect of
God, the “pure in heart.” The covenant people gather in the place Zion so that they
might receive spiritual power and protection; there they consecrate or dedicate
themselves to the Kingdom of God; in the process, they are spiritually sanctified and
purified.

Building Zion also meant redeeming the earth through careful cultivation and
industry. Settled security matched an equal need to farm and be near the earth’s soil.
Although they built homes in towns or villages, “hives in the middle of clover fields,”
Wallace Stegner quipped, Mormons embraced a kind of spiritualized agrarianism that
held that the earth must be redeemed, cultivated, and watered, its resources righteously
harvested and used for the building up of the Kingdom of God. Moreover Mormons paid
close attention to aesthetics, selecting settlement sites and laying out towns in such a way
that took advantage of the physical landscape, places that could “please the eye and
gladden the heart.” Concentrated settlement and cultivation merged seamlessly with
imposing natural features like mountains and rivers, which often framed cities and
villages and created arresting backdrops for the Mormon pageant to unfold. Thus
Mormons farmed and gardened, carefully tending their orchards and vineyards,
beautifying their stewardship and demonstrating their industry and self-reliance. Given
Brigham Young’s stern sermons, there may have been plenty of slackers, but eventually
only the laborer in Zion would eat the good of the land.

Chapter one focuses on Joseph

17 Doctrine and Covenants 97:21. See also The Pearl of Great Price, Moses 7:18.
18 Doctrine and Covenants 59:18.
19 Brigham Young issued a particularly strong rebuke in October 1855. “I have this to say
to every man in this congregation and throughout this Territory, and from this time
Smith’s redemptive vision for his American Zion and the attitudes towards the land this vision evoked.

Although cities were gathering places, they had also been sites of violence and pillage, which no Mormon who trekked eastward across the frozen Missouri prairie in 1838 and 1839 or fled Nauvoo several years later, slogging westward across muddy Iowa ever forgot. Thus while Mormons always saw their cities as centers of refuge, once they gathered to Utah, leaders emphasized this doctrine all the more. No one articulated this vision better than Brigham Young. According to him, the Wasatch Mountain range providentially served as a protective fortress, an impenetrable rampart, redeeming the saints by physically segregating them from outside Babylonian wiles. The Mormon city would exist on its own—a magnetic microcosm, gathering not only people, but also the very best in ideas, knowledge, governance, and industry. Thus for nineteenth-century Mormons, Zion was to be first and foremost a city where the faithful might gather to receive their spiritual and temporal inheritance and nurtured by association with other

henceforth, know my feelings, if you will sell grain to the Gentiles, or to your enemies, for the sake of their money when it is needed to be distributed among this people, I wish you would take your property and leave this Territory, for you are not worthy of belonging to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, you are unworthy a citizenship in the kingdom of God.” “Necessity of Home Missions,” Journal of Discourses Vol. 3, 117-118. http://jod.mrm.org/3/115. Accessed Jan. 14, 2014. See also The Book of Mormon 2 Nephi 26:31.

like-minded individuals. Chapter two focuses on Brigham Young’s urban vision as an appendage to Joseph Smith’s City of Zion.

Chapter two also recognizes that the Wasatch Front’s physical geography, more so than any other place, influenced Mormon urban traditions. While Mormons first began building cities in the well-watered regions of the Midwest, their urban experiment reached full maturity along the craggy Front, between mountain and lake. This unique topography, marked as it is by a series of spurs and sandy spits, created an inverted image of the Holy Land. Of these spits, the Jordan Narrows, or the Point of the Mountain, is the largest. The Lake Bonneville sandbar reaches out across the valley floor like an outstretched arm, dividing the Front and creating a basin that Utah Valley fills. The Jordan River drains out of freshwater Utah Lake (the Galilee) and threads northward through the narrows on its way to the Great Salt Lake (the Dead Sea). This physical landscape shaped the forms Mormon urbanism acquired, thus warranting a comparison between the two principle settlement regions and their associated lakes: Utah Valley to the south and the small, but now densely populated, Davis County north of Salt Lake City.

Moreover this divided topography also influenced the ways in which the Front’s primary Native Americans peoples, the Utes and Shoshones, worked out tribal borders and boundaries. The nature of encounters and exchanges between Mormons and Native Americans likewise shaped Mormon settlements. In Utah Valley Mormon settlers and Utah Lake Utes lived in close proximity and competed heavily for the valley’s resources. A series of deadly conflicts underscored the Mormon need for fortifications and tight village complexes. Settlements in Davis County did not experience this level of conflict.
Here Mormons lived in scattered farming clusters, which gradually coalesced, generally around the local meetinghouse or school, and were eventually platted into the familiar city of Zion grid.\textsuperscript{21} In theory Mormons were charged with a mission to redeem Native Americans from their fallen state and restore them to greatness. Building settlements near Native Americans facilitated this process. Tragically Mormon urbanism had the opposite effect—the complete depopulation of Native Americans from their traditional Wasatch Front homelands.

When Babylon eventually broke through the mountain rampart with shiny rails and steam locomotives, the meaning behind Mormon urbanism experienced a dramatic shift. Railroads and highways linked Utah Valley towns with those in Davis County and created a single “line village” along the Wasatch Front’s base.\textsuperscript{22} In Utah Valley and Davis County, commercialized irrigation expanded regional agricultural opportunities while local canning operations breathed new life into the now-struggling Mormon village economy. In short, the early twentieth century saw the privatization of Mormonism’s redemptive mission. By 1940 there were upwards of 30,000 farms in Utah, nearly half of which were located along the Wasatch Front.\textsuperscript{23} Chapter three emphasizes that the Mormon village depicted by Wallace Stegner was the product of enterprising Mormon men who, with the blessing of the church hierarchy, combined their resources to create

\textsuperscript{22} Lowry Nelson, \textit{The Mormon Village: A Pattern and Technique of Land Settlement} (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1952), 209.
powerful water boards and cannery cooperatives in a new urban vision that tempered the excesses of capitalism with a new vision of communal volunteerism.

This privatized nature of Mormon urbanism became all the more apparent following World War II, when new defense industries and interstate highways began to replace Mormon farms. Hill Air Force Base’s construction in Davis County and Geneva Steel Mills opened up operations at the edge of Utah Lake, not far from the town of American Fork. For the next sixty years these federal institutions dominated Utah Valley and Davis County’s economy and character. In the 1950s, the American Fork Chamber of Commerce came up with a new title for the town: “Steel City.” In the last ten to twenty years, American Fork has evolved from Steel City to a coveted spot for high tech startups, located as it is near the Utah Valley Business Park. For the most part, communities in Davis County have shed their Base image and successfully transitioned into respectable bedroom communities for Salt Lake City commuters. As chapter four suggests, in this new suburban-based economy Mormon real estate developers replaced irrigationists as the primary shapers of the post war Wasatch Front now marked by curvilinear roadways instead of the measured Mormon grid.

The piecemeal development of Mormon farms and villages continued apace with a renewed emphasis from church hierarchy on the spiritual well-being, or redemption, of the Mormon family. Rhetoric appropriated popular post war American gender roles and

25 “Community Profile, American Fork,”
values as gospel truth: men provided and presided, women nurtured. Mormons heard about this emphasis during General Conferences and the message was reiterated in hundreds of articles and stories found in church magazines and books. Tasked primarily with the spiritual well being of their children, women were to create appropriate environments for their families. Through home decorating, women displayed their overt devotion to church and family. Similarly in this new suburban village environment, Mormon wards functioned as places of religious worship on Sundays and community centers the rest of the week. The organizational structure of the ward family mirrored many of the gender distinctions present in Mormon homes. Chapter five examines the implications and consequences for this evolving definition of Mormon urbanism, which, while on the one hand remained wedded to redemption, came to center on the individual home, rather than the community at large.

Today signs indicate new trends within Mormon urbanism, which seem to reassert the church’s overt role in city planning and urban revitalization, or redemption under a different guise. Mormon temple construction and maintenance lie at the heart of this new ethic, suggesting both a return to Joseph Smith’s City of Zion (which always included a village temple) and controversial, large-scale downtown redevelopment projects. At the same time, with the blessing of church hierarchy, Envision Utah, a largely Mormon initiated non-profit agency, harnesses the faith’s tradition of cooperative planning to present pragmatic growth scenarios for Wasatch Front towns and cities. Chapter six assesses the relative merits and challenges this developing urban tradition presents, particularly as it gets exported outside the Wasatch Front Mormon stronghold.
Grounded in both time and space, “Between Mountain and Lake: an Urban Mormon Country” articulates the experiential, even visionary, political aspects of place making. It tells the story of the Wasatch Front, a place whose distinct topography shaped Mormon cultural landscape meaning and creation. At the same time, Mormon cultural landscapes continue to reinvent and re-articulate themselves environmentally, socially, and culturally through the organizational forms and structures these landscapes encourage and adopt. In approaching such an undertaking, I do so cautiously. As Yi Fu Tuan observes, “Abstract knowledge about a place can be acquired in short order if one is diligent. But the ‘feel’ of a place takes longer to acquire. It is made up of experience, mostly fleeting and undramatic, repeating day after day and over the span of years. It is a unique blend of sights, sounds, and smells, a unique harmony of natural and artificial rhythms such as times of sunrise and sunset, of work and play.”

CHAPTER 2

VISIONS AND REVELATIONS

When this square is thus laid off and supplied, lay off another in the same way and so fill up the world in these last days, and let every man live in the city, for this is the city of Zion.

--Joseph Smith, “City of Zion Plat,” 1833.27

Joseph Smith first laid eyes on Missouri’s rolling prairie in July 1831. The revelation earlier that summer commanded Joseph and others to make a journey to Missouri, promising them that in return for their faithfulness they would discover “the land of your inheritance.”28 The idea of an inheritance, a place where the Lord’s covenant people might again gather to establish Zion or the New Jerusalem, consumed Joseph and demonstrates the extent to which Biblical imagery shaped his developing sense of mission and prophetic role.29 On the journey west, the lack of cities and cultured society clearly troubled him. The land needed settling and redemption in order to “blossom as the rose.”30 Yet when Joseph arrived in Jackson County, the region’s quiet splendor awed him. “Beautiful rolling prairies lie spread out like a sea of meadows; and are decorated with a growth of flowers so gorgeous and grand as to exceed description,” Joseph’s history records. The mild climate offered unprecedented advantages. True, trees only

28 Doctrine and Covenants 52:3-5.
clumped near water sources, but the soil was rich and dark and the prairies offered excellent summer graze land. Touched “by the hand of industry, the refinement of society, and the polish of science,” the region promised to be “one of the most blessed places on the globe.” Certainly this was Zion, “the heritage of the children of God.”

Mormonism’s urban tradition owes its origins to Joseph Smith’s localized conceptions of Zion. Once he identified and defined Zion as a specific place, Joseph soon set about preparing a master plan for his new city. In the process Smith expanded and clarified the ends and purposes for his doctrine of spiritualized gathering and redemption. At every turn Joseph confronted Jacksonian-era individualism and responded to the unpredictable economic undercurrents then sweeping the nation. On the one hand, Joseph’s frontier town planning and business ventures are representative of the period. But his prophetic social and economic revelations cast a radical alternative to American nationalist energy and identity. He saw himself functioning in the same tradition and role as the Old Testament prophets of old, sent to restore or renew God’s covenant with Israel and the land. Smith’s urban forms and functions reflected the kind of millennial society he hoped to establish, one whose sole mission would be to prepare the earth for Christ’s Second Coming. At the same time, much to the alarm of non-Mormon neighbors, Joseph and his followers legitimized their claims to the land through their overt use of biblical narratives and imagery. The progression and evolution of Mormon urban theology found its expression in Joseph Smith’s own life experiences as a child and young man. As

---

Smith and his followers gathered first to Kirtland, Ohio, then to the Missouri prairies, and finally Nauvoo. Mormon urbanism became increasingly complex and nuanced, intermingling biblical eschatology with a sense of theocratic, or church-driven capitalism, over raw Republican individualism.

Mormon urban traditions are both squarely rooted in the Jacksonian era’s swaggering speculation and boomtown building and in the early Republic’s sense of American exceptionalism and restive revivalism. By the time Joseph Smith’s life ended in a jail at Carthage, Illinois, the United States had undergone profound economic and social revolutions. The development of international trade, made possible through advances in transportation and communication, fueled the growth of cities and encouraged frontier expansion. Between 1820 and 1850 New York City’s population alone easily doubled.32 About the time period in which Joseph Smith lived and worked, historian Daniel Walker Howe observed, “The nature of the expanding economy constituted one of the most frequently debated issues: Should it remain primarily agricultural, with manufactured products imported, or should economic diversification and development be encouraged with economic growth?” These debates grew alongside and even encouraged powerful religious awakenings and revivals, as people sought “stability and moral order amidst rapid social change.” Revivalists hoped for a moral marketplace, and embraced “private property and commercial order but not ruthless

Protestant-based post-millennial attitudes proved especially attractive to Christian revivalists. Post-millennialism saw the new economy as a sign of God’s providential favor. “Material improvements, political democratization, and moral reform all provided encouraging signs that history was moving in the right direction,” confirming Americans’s sense of exceptionalism and “choseness.” Others, both religious and otherwise, found a home within utopian communalism, harnessing the possibilities of the new age to revolutionize society. The religious ones simply hoped to bring about “Heaven on Earth.”

Everyone saw the American frontier as a site of experimentation and possibility. The Puritans had often referred to the wilderness as a promised land. As New Israel, they were divinely inspired to redeem and make the land productive. For many, the American Revolution further confirmed the new nation’s divine mandate; its recently opened frontier appeared vast and empty, offering the perfect setting for communal experimentation and reform. By October 1840, Emerson quipped, “Not a reading man but has a draft of a new Community in his waistcoat pocket.” Speculators in particular dreamed of an urban West. Each looked to establish the great American city on the boundaries of settled society. Located somewhere in the central part of the nation, a sure

---

34 Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, 286, 289, 293  
population focal point, this city would connect western with eastern markets via canal and later railroad networks. For instance, Cincinnati booster, S. H. Goodin conceived a system of cities that radiated out from one central metropolis in a series of concentric spheres of influence.\textsuperscript{37} Common gridded street plats merely reflected and encouraged these aspirations. With the 1785 Land Ordinance, newly acquired territories integrated easily into the national grid system of townships, ranges, and sections.\textsuperscript{38}

The experiences of Joseph Smith’s early family life are a microcosm of the economic and religious forces that so dramatically affected early American life, and certainly impacted how he viewed and thought about cities. As Joseph Smith’s mother, Lucy Mack Smith tells it, the family hoped to make good on the seemingly plentiful opportunities the new economy seemed to provide. Instead they fell prey to bad luck and market unpredictability. Early on in their marriage, Joseph Smith’s parents rented out their farm in Tunbridge, Vermont, to take up storekeeping in nearby Randolph. To supplement the store’s income, Joseph’s father harvested and processed ginseng roots, hoping to break into the international market by shipping the crop to China. Unfortunately a merchant cheated Smith out of his hard won crop, leaving him heavily indebted to Boston suppliers for his store’s inventory. To pay their creditors, the Smiths sold the Tunbridge farm for $800 and for the next several years were on the constant move. By 1816 illness and successive crop failures eventually drove the family from

Vermont to seek their fortunes in western New York near the bustling Erie Canal town of Palmyra.  

Lucy Mack Smith’s account of her family’s abject circumstances carried with it providential overtones. In the first part of her narrative, Lucy worried at least as much, if not more so, about the state of her soul than she did her family’s pocketbook. The implications behind the meaning she gave her family’s destitute circumstances are clear: had the family not been forced to leave Vermont and move to Palmyra her son might never have become a prophet. She may have been right. Although the Smiths remained poor in worldly goods, the religious revivalism that swept through the area profoundly affected their young son Joseph, whose prophetic visions produced a new, distinctly American, religious movement. Through their son the Smiths at last claimed a stake in the brave new world—a means to salvation, something for which Lucy desperately yearned, and the unabashed prominence (and hounded persecution) that went with it.

Joseph Smith’s religious experiences began in the spring of 1820, a few years after the family settled on a farm outside Palmyra. In the canonized account, fourteen-

---

40 Early in her history, Lucy described a period of illness during which time she nearly died. “I did not consider myself ready for such an awful event, inasmuch as I knew not the ways of Christ; besides, there appeared to be a dark and lonesome chasm between myself and the Savior, which I dared not attempt to pass,” She explained. In the end, Lucy asked God to spare her, promising “to serve him according to the best of my abilities.” Following her recovery, she began her quest “to find someone who was capable of instructing me more perfectly in the way of life and salvation.” *The History of Joseph Smith by His Mother*, 33-34, 35.  
year-old Joseph was deeply confused by the various religious denominations. Like his mother, Joseph worried about his personal salvation, noting, however, the troubling sectarian controversy and hypocrisy he saw around him. “When the converts began to file off, some to one party and some to another, it was seen that the seemingly good feelings of both the priests and the converts were more pretended than real,” Smith recounted. Although he was partial to Methodism and his mother and others in his family joined the Presbyterians, Joseph took to serious Bible study and reflection. After reading a passage in James instructing supplicants to ask God for wisdom, Joseph went into the woods near his home and prayed. In a divine manifestation, which he recounted much later, Joseph stated that he saw “two personages,” one of whom he identified as Jesus Christ. In answer to his question, Joseph was told that he must join none of the religious sects around him—“they draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me.”

______________________________

42 Pearl of Great Price, Joseph Smith History 1: 6-19. http://www.lds.org/scriptures/pgp/js-h/1?lang=eng. Accessed November 21, 2013. There are several accounts of Joseph Smith’s First Vision. In the 1832 account, Joseph only mentions that Jesus Christ appeared to him, assuring him that his sins were forgiven. http://josephsmithpapers.org/paperSummary/history-circa-summer-1832?dm=text-only&zm=zoom-inner&tm=expanded&p=3&s=undefined&sm=none. Accessed December 2, 2013. In 1835, Joseph stated, “I called on the Lord in mighty prayer, a pillar of fire appeared above my head, it presently rested down upon me and filled me with joy unspeakable, a personage appeared in the midst, of this pillar…another personage soon appeared like unto the first, he said unto me thy sins are forgiven thee, he testified unto me that Jesus Christ is the son of God.”

subsequent visions, he received his prophetic call and learned the location of an ancient book of scripture, known as the Book of Mormon, buried near his home, which he was commissioned to translate.43

With the Book of Mormon, Joseph Smith offered an alternate mission for the newly established United States. The Book of Mormon largely recounts the history of a group of ancient Israelites, later known in the narrative as Nephites and Lamanites, who left Jerusalem prior to its destruction in 587 B.C.E. and founded a new colony in the Americas. It also contains a shorter history of an earlier people that migrated to the Americas that dates back to the Tower of Babel.44 Throughout the book, America is repeatedly cast as the Promised Land and a land of liberty, but only for those who serve God and keep his commandments.45 Yet this uniquely American body of scripture did not advance the usual national narratives of revolution and republican virtue. Instead, as the title page states, the Book of Mormon’s express purpose is to restore the House of Israel, God’s ancient covenant people to the true gospel, “[convincing]…the Jew and Gentile that Jesus is the Christ.” Although Puritan exegetics and Republican rhetoricians had long referred to America and the United States as New Israel, the Book of Mormon took a more literal stance that reflected its biblical overtones. With Christianity as a whole in a general state of abject apostasy, the text required a complete restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel before Christ’s millennial reign could commence. The Book of Mormon served as a sign to the world that God had begun his work of restoration. At a time of

44 Bushman, *Joseph Smith*, 84.
45 See The Book of Mormon 2 Nephi 1: 5-7.
particularly intense debate over Indian removal, the book promised special blessings to the Lamanites, who Mormons quickly identified as the ancestors of nearby Indian tribes, provided they converted to the new gospel and forsook their wild, unsettled ways.

Numerous prophecies in the Book of Mormon indicated that the Lamanites, once restored to the true gospel of Jesus Christ, would become a great people, regaining their rightful inheritance upon the land.\(^46\) In the end, as historian Richard Bushman effectively summarizes, “The story of Israel overshadowed the history of American liberty. Literal Israel stood at the center of history, not the United States. The book sacralized the land but condemned the people. The Indians were the chosen ones, not the European interlopers.”\(^47\)

Moreover the Book of Mormon is also replete with references to Zion.\(^48\) Though most are either directly quoted or paraphrased from Isaiah, they demonstrate the extent to which Biblical concepts of Zion impressed Joseph. “And blessed are they who shall seek to bring forth…Zion at that day, for they shall have the gift of the Holy Ghost; and if they endure unto the end they shall be lifted up at the last day, and shall be saved in the everlasting kingdom of the Lamb.”\(^49\) Passages like these must have factored into Joseph’s developing sense of mission as the prophet for the new, revelatory dispensation.\(^50\) When


\(^{49}\) The Book of Mormon, 1 Nephi 13: 37.

\(^{50}\) B. H. Roberts’s definition of dispensation in *A Comprehensive History* (1930) is of interest and at least provides insight into how early twentieth century Mormons articulated their sacred history. “The word as connected with the gospel of Jesus Christ means the opening of the heavens to men; the giving out or dispensing to them the word
he officially organized the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on April 6, 1830, Joseph Smith identified himself as “inspired to move the cause of Zion in mighty power.”

He spent the remaining fourteen years of his life articulating and defining, both for himself and for his early followers, exactly what Zion meant. In doing so, he tapped into a much longer tradition within western Christianity stretching back at least to St. Augustine, who cast heaven as a city of saints, the New Jerusalem. This idea ignited the imagination of countless religious thinkers and reformers; its allure certainly remained relevant for revivalists and millennial thinkers of Joseph’s day who declared that God specifically chose America as the nation to prepare the world for Christ’s Second Coming. But, as always, Joseph took things a step further. His Zion offered redemption and promised to unite heaven and earth in a covenant society that blended temporal and spiritual salvation.

Zion first had to be located. According to a revelation dated September 1830, the City of Zion was specifically located “on the borders by the Lamanites” so as to better facilitate interaction between the two peoples, indicating the important role Native Americans would play in the establishment of the consecrated society. In the fall of 1830, early Mormon converts Parley P. Pratt, Oliver Cowdery, Peter Whitmer Jr., and Ziba

\footnote{of God; the revealing to men in whole or in part the principles and ordinances of the gospel; the conferring of divine authority upon certain chosen ones, by which they are empowered to act in the name, that is, in the authority of God, and for him. That is a dispensation as relating to the gospel; and the ‘Dispensation of the Fullness of Times’ is that which includes all others and gathers to itself which bear any relation whatsoever to the work of God in our world. Also it is the last dispensation, the one in which will be gathered together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth.” B. H. Roberts, \textit{A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints} Vol. 1 (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1965), xxiii.}

\footnote{Doctrine and Covenants 21: 7.}

\footnote{Daniel Walker How, \textit{What Hath God Wrought}, 286-289.}
Peterson traveled into the Kirtland area en route on a mission to Native Americans on the Missouri frontier. Pratt and the others experienced little success among the Indians, meeting a few Shawnees and Delawares before Indian agent Richard W. Cummins ordered the Mormons to leave. They did, however, find a ready reception from Sydney Rigdon and his congregation of Disciples of Christ near the town of Kirtland, Ohio.

Originally a Baptist minister from Pittsburgh, Rigdon was preaching Alexander Campbell’s version of primitive Christianity throughout northern Ohio. Once Rigdon was baptized in November, many of his congregation soon followed him along with 130 others living in Kirtland. Suddenly Ohio, not New York, was the new focal point for Joseph’s expanding congregation. A revelation dated December 1830 directed Smith to leave New York and settle in “the Ohio.” A church wide gathering to the Kirtland area commenced that spring. At the same time, Pratt and the others continued on their journey to preach to Native American tribes, entering Jackson County, Missouri, in January 1831.

Joseph Smith seems to have first been impressed with Zion’s urban possibilities in the northern Ohio town of Kirtland, where he settled in February 1831. Part of the Western Reserve, Kirtland was the product of real estate speculation. In 1795, the state of Connecticut sold a large swath of northeastern Ohio to the Connecticut Land Company,

---

which subsequently began selling to smaller developers like Judge Turnhand Kirtland, to whom the town owed its name.  

In the midst of acquiring new converts and preparing for his move to Ohio, Joseph Smith had a vision of the biblical prophet Enoch some time in December 1830, which profoundly influenced his developing concept of Zion. In Smith’s account, Enoch constructed Zion, a holy city where the people “were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness; and there was no poor among them” to the extent that “in the process of time, [the city] was taken up into heaven,” to be the Lord’s “abode forever.” Enoch fascinated Joseph. In several of his revelations, he even used Enoch’s name to mask his own identity. 

Literary critic Harold Bloom observes, “It is characteristic of Joseph Smith that his Enoch founded a city, Zion, and gathered a people together there, and then took city and people up to heaven with him. In the fullness of time, Joseph prophesied, Enoch and his city would descend, to be fused into Joseph Smith’s Zion, the Mormon New Jerusalem that shall gather in all the Latter-day Saints throughout the globe.” The vision emphasized that a true Zion society had no poor; all labored for the welfare of the whole. Not surprisingly Joseph called his new economic system the United Order of Enoch. Subsequent revelations encouraged members to deed or consecrate property to the church; in return they received an inheritance or

---


57 Olsen, “Zion,” 25.

stewardship, property, and material possessions appropriate to their needs and temporal well being.\textsuperscript{59}

Additionally, Joseph’s revelations dated February 9 and 23, 1831, instructed the newly organized church to purchase lands “for the public benefit of the church, and [build] houses of worship, and [build] up of the New Jerusalem which is hereafter to be revealed—That my covenant people may be gathered in one in that day when I shall come to my temple. And this I do for the salvation of my people.”\textsuperscript{60} While Joseph had yet to reveal the full extent of his theology, temples quickly occupied a central place within the developing Mormon urban tradition and served as the focal point for gathering, a cosmological nexus uniting heaven and earth, this world and the millennial end of days.\textsuperscript{61}

Construction on the Kirtland temple commenced in July 1833. The temple was dedicated in early 1836 amidst an outpouring of spiritual manifestations that included visions of Jesus Christ and the Old Testament prophets, Moses and Elijah.\textsuperscript{62} These manifestations enhanced and legitimized Joseph’s prophetic role and heightened a sense of election among early Mormons.

These revelations determined that Kirtland was not to be the city of Zion, but would function instead as a stake or appendage to the chosen site, which, during a visit to Missouri in July 1831, Joseph identified as Jackson County, Missouri.\textsuperscript{63} When Joseph returned to Kirtland, he left Edward Partridge in Missouri with the charge of acquiring

\textsuperscript{59} Olson, “Zion,” 24.
\textsuperscript{60} Doctrine and Covenants 42: 35-36. Quoted in Steven L. Olsen, “Zion,” 23.
\textsuperscript{61} Olsen, “Zion,” 25.
\textsuperscript{63} Olsen, “Zion,” 25.
lands for the new population center. Partridge proved an able agent, buying up 2,136 acres of land and setting up fewer than five settlements throughout Jackson County. By 1833 there were two sites of Mormon gathering: Kirtland and western Missouri. Initially Joseph Smith did most of his thinking about cities from Kirtland, not Missouri. Between 1831 and 1837, the years Kirtland functioned as church headquarters, Joseph received forty-six revelations outlining church doctrine and organizational procedures and practices. Smith’s developing sense of Zion included both temporal and spiritual provisions. Three threads—temple building, communal consecration, and gathering—would come together in his City of Zion plat, drawn up in the summer of 1833 for the Jackson County site.

In addition to his revelations and visions, Smith first witnessed large-scale urbanization for himself in October 1832 when he traveled to New York City. This experience undoubtedly influenced and may have even solidified the urban vision Joseph laid out on paper a year later. Smith’s friend and recent convert Newel K. Whitney needed supplies for his Kirtland store and Joseph decided to accompany him to New York. The two followed the seasonal stream of bargain-hunters hoping to replenish their inventory with goods at cut-rate prices. What Joseph saw undoubtedly left an

65 Robert L. Millet observes that priesthood power legitimized and authorized Joseph Smith’s attempts to build Zion. “Zion was Zion because the powers of God were present and because those having authority to act utilized the divine powers for the blessing of the citizens of the community.” “The Development of the Concept of Zion in Mormon Theology,” 213.  
66 Craig S. Campbell, Images of the New Jerusalem, 48.  
impression. New York’s population at the time easily numbered over 200,000, making the city the nation’s financial and mercantile capital.\(^6^8\) Newel and Joseph boarded at the Pearl Street House, a well-known gathering place for merchants and shopkeepers from western New York and Ohio. Whitney knew his business. By the 1830s, Pearl Street was an established warehouse district, a nerve center for wholesale trade.\(^6^9\)

In a letter home to his wife Emma, Joseph likened New York to the Babylonian city Nineveh, where “the inequity [iniquity] of the people is printed in every countenance.” Yet the city’s architecture and infrastructure fascinated him. “This day I have been walking through the most splendid part of the city of New York. The buildings are truly great and wonderful to the astonishing of every beholder.” Like countless other would-be city builders who dreamed of replicating New York’s grandeur on the American Frontier, the three story buildings, shops, and four-square street grid incited Joseph’s imagination. Doubtless he heard about the railroad then under construction linking upper and lower Manhattan.\(^7^0\) “Can the great God of all the Earth maker of all things magnificent and splendid be displeased with man for all these great inventions sought out by them?” Joseph asked, concluding, “My answer is no it cannot be, seeing these works are calculated to make men comfortable, wise, and happy.” New York was a true gathering place of the nations. But like other religious revivalists who visited the

\(^6^9\) Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 335, 338.
city, he could not ignore the flagrant wickedness he observed around him. (On account of
their overwhelmingly male clientele, Pearl Street House management emphasized their
establishment was not “for the accommodation of families or ladies.”)\textsuperscript{71} Considering
New York’s teeming masses, Joseph exclaimed, “My bowels [are] filled with compassion
towards them and I am determined to lift up my voice in this city and leave the event with
God who holdeth all things in his hands.”\textsuperscript{72}

In contrast to New York City, Joseph Smith’s 1833 City of Zion plat map
reflected his desires to establish a refined, orderly society, whose consecrated communal
life created the proper environment for spiritual sanctification and salvation. His plans
blended utopian thought with his own fascination for the opportunities created by
America’s emerging market economy. In short he became a sort of prophet-booster who
actively sought ideal gathering places for his growing flock of faithful. Commenting on
his 1833 City of Zion plat, Joseph directed, “When this square is thus laid off and
supplied, lay off another in the same way and so fill up the world in these last days, and
let every man live in the city, for this is the city of Zion.”\textsuperscript{73} Joseph located the City of
Zion in Jackson County, Missouri, near where he identified the biblical Garden of Eden.
While the earth had to be cultivated, redeemed from its fallen, wild state, Mormons were
not to live in isolated farmsteads, but rather, gather to a city. In what would have been the

\textsuperscript{71} Quoted in Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 340.
\textsuperscript{72} Joseph Smith to Emma Smith, October 13, 1832. The Joseph Smith Papers Project.
\textsuperscript{73} Joseph Smith, History of the Church Vol. 1, 357.
central business district, Joseph planned a temple complex, made up of no fewer than twenty-four temples, to be used for religious and ecclesiastical purposes. As citizens of the city of Zion, Mormons had a mission to return the earth to its “paradisiacal glory” or pre-fallen state, building a city and people fit for Christ’s millennial reign.

Joseph located farm ground, including barns, outside city limits. “No one lot in this city,” he wrote, “is to contain more than one house, and that to be built twenty-five feet back from the street, leaving a small yard in front, to be planted in a grove, according to the taste of the builder; the rest of the lot for gardens; all houses are to be built of brick and stone.” Smith envisioned wide, gridded streets and generous lot sizes, reflective of the kind of spiritual and temporal order he hoped to establish. Perhaps after his experience in New York City, Joseph may well have wanted to guard against

---

74 It is important to note, as Benjamin Park does, that temples had not yet acquired the same meaning for members as they do today. “Put simply, they were to serve as multi-purpose public buildings for religious, secular, social, and political purposes.” “To Fill up the World: Joseph Smith as Urban Planner,” Mormon Historical Studies 14, no. 1 (Spring, 2013): 22.

75 See the Tenth Article of Faith: “We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion (the New Jerusalem) will be built upon the American continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.” The Articles of Faith were part of the Wentworth Letter, a published letter Joseph Smith wrote to John Wentworth that appeared in March 1, 1842 issue of Times and Seasons.

76 Richard Lyman Bushman, Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling, (New York: Vintage Books, 2005), 220-221. Glen M. Leonard observes, “In Zion and her stakes, the Saints sought to achieve oneness, harmony, and order. To eliminate confusion and to shape themselves as a Zion people, they sought to be of one heart and one mind…The foursquare cities of holiness in which they lived represented the personal order and harmony the Saints sought for in their spiritual lives as a people.” Glen M. Leonard, Nauvoo: A Place of Peace, a People of Promise (Provo and Salt Lake City: Brigham Young University Press and Deseret Book, 2002), 174.
overcrowding. After all, he was planning a large city. “The whole plot is supposed to contain from fifteen to twenty thousand people.”

In adopting gridded streets for the city of Zion, Joseph Smith tapped into a much longer tradition of urban planning within Western culture and society that had its roots in Renaissance Europe and colonial administration. Spanish imperialists first introduced the grid to North America in 1502 with the founding of Santo Domingo. In 1573 the Laws of the Indies adopted gridded streets and plazas as the general pattern for planning across New Spain. But it was William Penn whose Philadelphia plat first introduced the grid in any significant way to England’s North American colonies. As historian John Reps observes, Philadelphia’s wide, gracious streets created “a compact yet uncrowded settlement,” offsetting the town’s bustle from outlying agrarian simplicity. Thomas Jefferson’s later urban conceptions likewise provided for gridded streets and city blocks where each house faced a public square. The Land Ordinance of 1785 enshrined the grid as a tool to survey and claim territory and effectively carved the new nation into a giant checkerboard of townships and ranges. Later New York City replaced Philadelphia, becoming what Reps terms the “apotheosis of the gridiron form.” The grid impressed hundreds of other would-be city planners, who, like Joseph Smith, encountered New

York for the first time in the early 1830s and, taking the memory with them, platted
gripped towns across the west.\textsuperscript{81} Some of these would-be planners included utopian and
religious groups like the German Harmonists, who founded gridded communities in
Pennsylvania and Indiana. Like the Mormons, the Harmonists saw the grid as a way to
establish a community that effectively blended spiritual and temporal life and distributed
land in an equitable fashion.\textsuperscript{82}

The City of Zion only ever existed on paper. It is an idealized vision that existed
outside of lived, or even geographical, reality. The plat’s neatly squared blocks and
roadways were drawn in complete disregard for the already growing town of
Independence, Missouri. While the Missourians may never have seen Joseph’s plat, it
proved symptomatic of the larger troubles between the Mormons and Missourians.
Historian Benjamin Park observes, “It was this very mindset of ignoring non-Mormon
neighbors that caused many of the problems…that led, at least in part, to the expulsion of
Mormons from the county in late 1833.”\textsuperscript{83}

Between 1833 and 1836, Mormons sought
refuge in nearby Clay County until once again their numbers and aspirations for land
threatened the status quo. Missouri slaveholders did not take kindly to their Yankee
neighbors, nor did they appreciate Mormon landholding aspirations. Moreover,
Missourians complained that the Mormons were in “constant communication” with
nearby Native American tribes. Mormons, they attested, “[declare] even from the pulpit

\textsuperscript{81} John Reps, \textit{The Making of Urban America}, 294-296.
\textsuperscript{83} Benjamin Park, “To Fill up the World: Joseph Smith as Urban Planner,” 9.
that the Indians are a part of God’s chosen people, and are destined, by heaven, to inherit this land, in common with themselves.”

More troubling to other Missourians was Mormon control over the land market. In a letter home to his family, Thomas Wilson of Clay County Missouri observed, “[The Mormons] have been flocking in here faster than ever and making great talk what they would do. A letter from Ohio shows plainly that they intend to emigrate here till they outnumber us. Then they would rule the country at pleasure.” Wilson continues, “Another letter shows that they are borrowing all the money they can to procure land here and they buy all on credit that they can get and they promise the most enormous prices ever heard of. They have offered 1000 dollars for a tract of 80 acres sold 12 months ago for 250 dollars. This was to get a hoalt (sic) in a neighborhood and then they would harang (sic) the rest away and get theirs at their own price.” Although he realized that forcibly removing Mormon settlers from their property violated the Constitution, Thomas Wilson and his neighbors felt they had no other choice in the matter—they had to stop Mormon land speculation. “We are to submit to a Mormon government or trample under foot the laws of our country,” Wilson summarized the moral conundrum. “To go away was to just give up all for if [Mormon] emigration once begun none would buy our land but Mormons and they would have their own price.” Wilson joined with others who

eventually drove the Mormons from their Eden. In 1836 the Missouri legislature set aside land in northern Missouri’s Caldwell and Daviess counties for Mormon settlement.

Missouri was not the only place where Mormons encountered trouble. By late 1837 Kirtland was also in shambles. That year Joseph Smith and others loyal to him fled Ohio, joining the remaining body of Mormons in Missouri. In the case of Kirtland, persecution came mostly from disenchanted Mormons, not from those outside the church (although there were plenty who worried Mormon block voting would upset area politics). Once again, land lay at the root of the problem. By 1836 Joseph had acquired significant real estate holdings in and around Kirtland. In 1836 his holdings comprised nearly 800 acres of land valued at more than $55,000. As more and more people moved into the area, land prices rose exponentially. Smith’s speculations were made with the best of intentions: to make sure new Mormons coming to Kirtland had a place to live and land to farm. To establish greater cash flow, he and others within the developing church hierarchy created the Kirtland Safety Society Bank in late 1836. When they failed to procure a needed bank charter from the Ohio state legislature, they renamed the organization the “Kirtland Safety Society Anti-banking Company,” and began issuing notes in January 1837. A month later Joseph Smith found himself in the middle of a civil action over the bank’s legality. He and Rigdon were later found guilty and each had to pay a $1,000 fine.

By May all banks in Ohio were struggling in response to a nationwide financial panic. But for Kirtland Mormons the panic was especially disastrous. As economic historians Marvin Hill, Kieth Rooker and Larry Wimmer explain, “The stock subscriptions were…only part of the losses resulting from the failure of the Safety Society. The largest losses were likely due to the loss in value of the Kirtland bank notes. Buildings, land, etc., could all be reclaimed but stock and bank notes became literally worthless.”

This caused many in Kirtland to question Joseph Smith’s role as a prophet—after all, if he was truly a prophet couldn’t he have foreseen the 1837 panic and its disastrous consequences for the Safety Society? At the same time, as Brigham Young related, Joseph’s business transactions often created a conflict of interest for him: “Joseph goes to New York and buys 20,000 dollars worth of goods, comes into Kirtland and commences to trade. In comes one of the brethren, ‘Brother Joseph, let me have a frock pattern for my wife.’ What if Joseph says, ‘No, I cannot without the money.’ The consequence would be, ‘He is no Prophet.’…After a while in comes Bill and sister Susan. Says Bill, ‘Brother Joseph, I want a shawl, I have not got any money, but I wish you to trust me a week or a fortnight.’ Well, brother Joseph thinks the others have gone and apostatized, and he don’t know but these goods will make the whole Church do the same, so he lets Bill have a shawl. Bill walks off with it and meets a brother. ‘Well,’ says he, ‘what do you think of brother Joseph?’ ‘O he is a first-rate man, and I fully believe he is a prophet. See here, he has trusted me this shawl’…Joseph was a first-rate fellow with them all the time, provided he never would ask them to pay him.”

In January 1838,

---

Joseph Smith was in debt up to $100,000 with no way of paying his creditors. With threats on his life and increasing hostility within the church, Joseph left Kirtland under the cover of night and headed for Missouri. For the rest of his life Joseph worked through an agent to repay his creditors, but died with many of his debts still unpaid.\(^90\)

Once in Missouri Joseph Smith set about locating yet another gathering place for his people. Expelled from Zion, Smith wisely set his sights on unsettled areas. In early 1838, he and others came across Spring Hill, a gentle prairie rise near the Grand River, an important feeder stream into the Missouri River. Joseph called the site, Adam-ondi-Ahman, the valley where Adam dwelt following his expulsion from the Garden of Eden. Here, Joseph taught, Adam would return prior to Christ’s Second Coming.\(^91\) At first glance, Diahman, as the town came to be known, looked similar to the City of Zion plat—gridded streets and generous lot sizes—but important distinctions remain. The plat map only revealed the location for the town’s public square.\(^92\) Joseph later situated a temple site on an elevated spot overlooking the river, a rise where he said Adam came to offer sacrifices. Despite this cosmological connection, Adam-ondi-Ahman functioned like any other river town then being planned and platted. And just as well. Like Adam cast out from the Garden of Eden, the Saints would have to toil with their hands to eat the

good of the land.\textsuperscript{93} Mormon poet and Apostle Orson F. Whitney later penned, “Was it not destiny, too, that they should thus retrace the steps of their great ancestor, who, driven forth from Eden, dwelt in Adam-ondi-Ahman?”\textsuperscript{94}

Like so many other would-be city builders and speculators, Joseph situated Adam-ondi-Ahman so that the town could take advantage of river traffic and trade.\textsuperscript{95} To encourage gathering, a brief article about the town ran in the August 1838 circular, \textit{Elders’ Journal}. “Adam-ondi-Ahman…is situated on a beautiful elevated spot of ground, overlooking the river and country round about, which renders the place as healthy as any part of the United States.” The article commented on the town’s proximity to the river, noting its navigability, fertile agricultural land suitable for growing corn, and nearby timber stands, all of which made it “equal to any other place in the upper counties in the

\textsuperscript{93} Steven L. Olsen, \textit{The Mormon Ideology of Place: Cosmic Symbolism of the City of Zion, 1830-1846}, (Provo: Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History and BYU Studies, 2002), 60-61.


\textsuperscript{95} Timothy R. Mahoney, \textit{River Towns in the Great West: The Structure of Provincial Urbanization in the American Midwest, 1820-1870} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). In selecting potential town sites, founders looked at places that would most easily connect settlers with a market for their agricultural produce. They also paid attention to land quality and timber reserves. “The premium location lay somewhere between these two extremes: directly in the path of migration, and within reach of markets, allowing a farmer to combine both profits of production and appreciation of land values to augment his capital. The attempts by farmers to find this zone just out in front of the line of settlement help explain the highly controlled movement of settlement across a region” (Mahoney, 17, 30, 32, 36).
State of Missouri.” The town’s location was a certain sign of God’s favor. Its promotional description read like any other western frontier town sales pitch, but given its spiritual connections and ideal location, Mormons needed little encouragement to settle the newly platted town. Missourian Joseph McGee recalled in his memoirs that within a few months Adam-ondi-Ahman’s population quickly outstripped that of Gallatin’s, the seat for Daviess County. William Swartzell, later famous for his anti-Mormon tract, *Mormonism Exposed*, recorded in July 1838, “All things are going on as briskly as ever. The brethren are getting lots and raising houses on them—two or three every day.”

Again, city planning and land speculation lay at the heart of the Mormon–Missouri conflict. While Mormon settlers purchased their property in Caldwell County, Daviess County had not yet been officially surveyed. In effect, Mormon settlers were squatters, invoking recently enacted preemptive land rights. Once the county was surveyed, provided Mormons had properly filed their preemptive claims, they had first dibs on the land they settled when it went for sale. But it was not to be. In fact the

---

98 In his article, “Mormon Land Rights in Caldwell and Daviess Counties and the Mormon Conflict of 1838,” Jeffrey Walker suggests that Mormons may have been attracted to Daviess County because it had not yet been surveyed. In their destitute circumstances, Mormon settlers, particularly those arriving from Kirtland, would have been able to acquire land for a reasonable rate. *BYU Studies* 47, no. 1 (2008): 27-29.
troubles that began in late summer of 1838 and culminated in Missouri Governor Lilburn W. Bogg’s extermination order that October, may well have been linked to the question of Mormon preemptive land rights. In September 1838, the General Land Office completed surveys of Daviess County; notices printed in local newspapers on October 21 indicated that land sales would commence November 12. Thus Mormon settlers had only a few short weeks to make good on their preemption claims, otherwise their property was open for sale on the public market. As one historian explains, “A closer look at events leading to the infamous Extermination Order evidences that some Missourians carefully orchestrated the persecution in October and November 1838 specifically to gain control of Mormons’ preemption rights.”

Sashel Woods, a local minister and mob leader, immediately whipped his followers into action. “[He] called the mob together and made a speech to them, saying that they must hasten to assist their friends in Daviess County.” Joseph’s friend and early convert Sydney Rigdon, later recalled, “The land sales [Woods said] were coming on, and if they could get the Mormons driven out, they could get all the lands entitled to pre-emption (sic), and that they must hasten to Daviess in order to accomplish their object.” Mob-imposed travel restrictions, and the arrest of church leaders, including Joseph Smith, effectively accomplished this task. In the end Missourian speculators purchased a combined eighteen thousand acres of previously Mormon held lands. Adam-ondi-Ahman and surrounding properties went to none other


100 Walker, “Mormon Land Rights,” 32-33. Walker notes that in later petitions for redress, Mormons often pointed out their loss of preemption claims.

than Sashel Woods, his sons-in-laws, and fellow minister George Houx. They renamed the town Cravensville.\footnote{Walker, “Mormon Land Rights,” 41.}

Driven from Missouri in late fall 1838, the Mormons sought refuge in Quincy, Illinois, and other sites up and down the Mississippi while Joseph spent the winter in Liberty Jail. In the spring of 1839 after Joseph’s escape (jail guards provided him with a horse and looked the other way), he and other church leaders began purchasing property in and around Commerce, Illinois, a swampy Mississippi river town fifty miles north of Quincy. “Behind the warmth of the humanitarian welcome in Illinois lay other motivations as well,” Glen M. Leonard relates. “At the time, the state was suffering under a severe national economic depression, the Panic of 1837. Hundreds of destitute Latter-day Saints would be a welcome stimulus to the sluggish economy of Adams County as they purchased necessities or rented houses and farms.”\footnote{Glen M. Leonard, \textit{Nauvoo: A Place of Peace, A People of Promise} (Salt Lake City and Provo: Deseret Book Company and Brigham Young University Press, 2002), 39, 44.} They renamed the city Nauvoo, which, the First Presidency assured the beleaguered Saints, was a Hebrew word meaning “a beautiful situation, or place, carrying with it, also, the idea of rest; and is truly descriptive of this most delightful situation.”\footnote{\textit{Times and Seasons} (January 15, 1841), Quoted in Leonard, \textit{Nauvoo}, 59.} The Hebrew reference was yet another way early Mormons utilized biblical allusions to both legitimize their land claims and make sacred a new urban space.

Even more than the City of Zion plat, Nauvoo articulated the foundations of Mormon urbanism. As a center for religion, refinement, and industry, city life offered
Mormons the best possible world for temporal and spiritual salvation.105 Within a few short years, Mormon historian B. H. Roberts noted, Nauvoo became “the most promising and thrifty city in Illinois, and the fame thereof extended throughout the nation, due, in part, of course, to the peculiar religion of its inhabitants.” “Here,” he added, “the Prophet Joseph preached some of his most powerful discourses, and taught his people in the doctrine of the heavenly kingdom; and not unfrequently (sic.) it happened that ‘Fools who came to mock, remained to pray.’”106 In their descriptions of Nauvoo, residents and visitors alike commented on the city’s businesses, cultural institutions, agrarian landscape, the construction of the temple, and the teachings of their beloved prophet Joseph.107

In redeeming Commerce from the swamplands and creating a proper habitat for spiritual and social improvement, Joseph Smith paid tribute to evolving nineteenth century definitions of elegance and gentility. By clearing the swampland, Mormons actively redeemed and sanctified the land, consecrating the city as a gathering site for the faithful.108 In a sense, Nauvoo’s blend of the secular and sacred was not unique, but a

105 Millet, Robert L. “The Development of the Concept of Zion in Mormon Theology,” 2-3, 35-36
108 For instance in The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), Carol Sheriff notes that in improving the land or nature man entered a into a partnership with God. Referring to the Erie Canal, Sheriff explains, “By combining natural simplicity with human genius, the canal would fulfill the Republic’s destiny to finish God’s work, which in turn would hasten the onset of the
heightened fulfillment of what early middle-class Americans desired in their cities. In an attempt to combat rash frontier speculation, penury, and other ills associated with country life, boosters orchestrated spaces of refinement—public squares, parks, tree lined streets, and gardens.\textsuperscript{109} Geographer Richard H. Jackson observes that Mormons especially saw themselves as “master gardeners who could develop pristine lands in the optimal manner.”\textsuperscript{110} Not unlike Joseph’s 1833 City of Zion plat, Nauvoo’s spacious lots were carefully cultivated, planted, and tended. Irene Hascall Pomeroy’s description of Nauvoo is typical: “I presume everyone would not think it so pretty but it is the prettiest place I ever saw for a large place; as far as we can see either way are buildings not in blocks like other cities but all a short distance from each other. The ground between them is all cultivated, it looks like a perfect garden.”\textsuperscript{111} A notice in\textit{Times and Seasons}, one of several Nauvoo newspapers, provided gardening and landscaping tips and alerted readers to the talents of Mr. Sayer. “He is a gentleman who has been extensively engaged in the business of Horticulture…and our citizens would do well to avail themselves of his instructions...in the cultivation of nurseries, the planning of Gardens, &c.” The article emphasized, “Let the division fences be lined with peach and mulberry trees, the garden walks bordered with current, raspberry, and gooseberry bushes, and the houses surrounded with roses and prairie flowers, and their porches crowned with the grape vine, millennium” (34). In like manner, dredging the Commerce swamp may have sanctified Nauvoo all the more.


\textsuperscript{111} Irene Hascall Pomeroy to Asbel G. Hascall, June 2, 1845, quoted in Richard H. Jackson, “Myth and Reality,” 46.
and we should have formed some idea how Eden looked; and how industry, accompanied with the blessing of God, will bring back to men the beauty and the riches which characterized his first abode.” This council followed a lengthy editorial detailing the earth’s fallen state and the Saints’ redemptive mission. “The restoration of the earth is a thing that the prophets have mentioned with much firmness: for indeed, they well knew the advantage of such a work. Isaiah speaking of this work says: ‘The wilderness and solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as a rose!’ The Mormon city, then, blended agrarian ideology with urban collectivity, preparing a people and an earth fit for Christ’s millennial reign.

Part of Nauvoo’s charm was the way it appeared from the Mississippi. Indeed the river may have been the city’s most priceless aesthetic, not to mention commercial, asset. As boats sailing up river rounded the bend, Nauvoo spread graciously before the traveler. As one historian put it, “Through the symbolism of the river, Nauvoo was associated with industry, civility, and ethical morality.” The contrast between the water and built environment especially created lasting impressions. “The city seemed to rise gradually from the sea, with the houses much scattered, but over a great extent of ground; it has without any mistake, more so than any place we had seen before, a grand appearance. It

looked very pretty from the river,” one Mormon convert wrote.\textsuperscript{115} Joseph enhanced the river’s symbolic significance in 1842 when he introduced his doctrine of baptism for the dead. The doctrine suggested that members might offer the saving ordinance of baptism to loved ones who had passed on by being baptized in their place. Following Joseph’s sermon on the subject, no less than eighty persons requested proxy baptism in the river.\textsuperscript{116}

Other descriptions of Nauvoo published in \textit{Times and Seasons} or its British counterpart \textit{The Millennial Star}, commented on the city as a hive of industry. The papers especially welcomed complimentary non-Mormon accounts, which bolstered the city’s credibility and provide insight into what Mormons wanted people to see in their city. These idealized descriptions generally followed a typical template in which the visitor arrives in Nauvoo under the pretense of exposing the city’s vices and roguish prophet. Instead, much to the Mormon reader’s delight, the visitor expresses disappointment and surprise and confesses Nauvoo to be a beautiful, well-run city, its citizens thrifty, and its prophet endearing. As Samuel A. Prior, a Methodist minister who visited Nauvoo sometime before 1843 remarked, “At length the city burst upon my sight and how sadly was I disappointed. Instead of seeing a few miserable log cabins and mud hovels which I expected to find, I was surprised to see one of the most romantic places that I had visited in the west.” Prior found buildings neat and well maintained; the few brick houses spoke “loudly of the genius and untiring labour of the inhabitants, who have snatched the place from the clutches of obscurity, and wrested it from the bonds of disease.” As he walked


\textsuperscript{116} Perry, “ ‘Go Down into Jordan: No, Mississippi,’” 104.
Nauvoo’s streets, Prior “found all the people engaged in some useful and healthy employment. The place was alive with business.” When he met the Prophet Joseph, he was once again surprised to meet not a “sorrowful...mystic” but “a common man, of tolerable large proportions” in whose intelligent sermon Prior found much he could agree. “I was truly edified with his remarks, and felt less prejudice against the Mormons than ever.” Other visitors were less complimentary. One noted the thick muddy streets and rough-hewn houses. But these accounts could be easily dismissed. As young John Needham reported to his parents in England, “Some have expected to find people perfect here...they must have very weak minds who look for such things.” Incidentally, published letters from Mormons like Needham’s were significantly more measured in their descriptions. In “Advice to Emigrants” which appeared in the February 1842 issue of *Millennial Star*, Francis Moon cautioned British members against paying too much attention to either utopian descriptions of Nauvoo or ones that cast the city as a rough river town. “My opinion is that a medium is the track we ought to pursue, for in all things with which we have to do there are two extremes, and in them is considerable danger.” People who emigrated to Nauvoo should be prepared to work hard and bring with them “a good supply of patience.” Part of the spiritual test, Needham articulated, would be

---

to live with the wheat as well as with the tares. “A day of sifting will come, and our trials are only to see what we will bear for the truth.”

Nauvoo was indeed a busy place, and its bustle speaks to the complex relationship that developed between Mormon cities and America’s industrializing economy. River traffic kept the city active during warm weather. As new converts, many from the British Isles, gathered to Nauvoo, the need for housing became a significant problem, but also provided employment. “The one industry which employed more labor and capital probably than all others in Nauvoo combined was the building industry,” Flanders noted in his classic work, *Nauvoo: Kingdom on the Mississippi*, especially when construction started on the Nauvoo Temple. In late 1842 the Mormons established a lumber camp on the Black River in Wisconsin. As early as August 1841 leaders began planning outlying settlements, declaring that they would select “such individuals as have been with the church and have had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the principles thereof to some extent: and to designate certain towns and cities where they will locate themselves and build up churches.” They continued, “We suggest to those coming up the Mississippi particularly, and all others who are disposed, to look at Warsaw, a beautifully located village about 20 miles below Nauvoo, consisting of about 500 inhabitants, a

---

121 Needham, “Letter from Nauvoo.”
steam flour and lumber mill.”\textsuperscript{124} Besides, as Needham noted in his letter to his parents, land could be had for less outside Nauvoo city limits.\textsuperscript{125}

While leaders wanted to attract industry, they were less interested in capital and more interested in fostering self-reliance and providing work for new immigrants. Yet in these seemingly secular pursuits, harnessed as they may have been for spiritual ends, Mormons were not that much different from other Christian millennialists, who, as historian Daniel Walker Howe notes, “planted one foot firmly in the world of steam engines and telegraph while keeping the other in the cosmos of biblical prophecy.”\textsuperscript{126} An 1841 editorial in \textit{Times and Seasons}, noting the need for steam mills in the city, is illustrative of Howe’s comment. Nauvoo’s population at the time numbered nearly ten thousand. “The most of the small towns on the Upper Mississippi, have from one to two and three steam mills,” the editorial reasoned, “If those places can support from one to two and three mills, certainly our city can amply support one.” It was not a matter of keeping up with the neighbors. “To supply the wants of this community, requires a vast quantity of flour, meal, &c. the most of which, is brought from a distance; consequently a large amount of money goes from our midst into the hands of manufactors and dealers, abroad, a thing we should avoid as much as possible, as it is bad policy to depend upon our neighbors for our home consumptions.”\textsuperscript{127} Industry itself was sacred. Glen Leonard explains, “Whenever successful businessmen departed from these religious objectives,

\textsuperscript{124} “An Epistle of the twelve to the saints scattered abroad among the nations, Greeting!” \textit{Times and Seasons} 11, no. 21, September 1, 1841. \url{http://lib.byu.edu/digital/mpntc/}. Accessed December 12, 2013.
\textsuperscript{125} Needham, “Letter from Nauvoo.”
\textsuperscript{126} Daniel Walker Howe, \textit{What Hath God Wrought}, 289, 316.
Joseph Smith and others reminded them that Nauvoo was a gathering place, a religious community created to save souls, not a commercial center where entrepreneurs could amass personal fortunes.\textsuperscript{128}

The Nauvoo Zion was more than just a gathering of people and industry; it was also a gathering of ideas. At a time, though, when studying nature was seen as a window into the character of God, it would have been surprising if Mormons had not created some form of institution for higher learning. Other Christian religious sects believed schools and public education helped create a morally informed citizenry that in some cases was seen as an integral part in bringing about the Millennium.\textsuperscript{129} In 1840, then, under the Nauvoo charter, the Mormons started a university. Orson Pratt served as chair of Mathematics and English Literature, Sidney Rigdon taught history, and Orson Spencer, languages. “The opportunity which thus presents itself to the citizens of this city, and the surrounding country, for acquiring a thorough and useful education, should not be neglected.” The notice in Times and Seasons expressed a common sentiment. “Knowledge is power—a finished education always gives an influence in cultivated society, which neither wealth nor station can impart or control.”\textsuperscript{130} The Kingdom needed scholar saints who could boldly defend and preach the gospel. Moreover, there was a sense that Mormons, with the aid of the Holy Ghost, possessed a unique ability to advance in matters of the mind. In a letter to the editor of Times and Seasons, H. Tate explained, “The saints being of choice intellects, selected from the great mass of

\textsuperscript{128} Glen Leonard, Nauvoo, 143.
\textsuperscript{129} Daniel Walker Howe, What Hath God Wrought, 450, 459, 464.
mankind, with free and independent minds, determined to think and know for themselves, are well situated by attentive observation of the phenomena and laws of nature, (the laws of motion, mechanics, &c.) to discover and demonstrate new truths. And in this way may excel in science and the arts, by turning every thing to profit in agriculture and machinery, as well as in religion, and morality.” Tate concluded, “We, by making capital of genius and intellect, may dwell in civil peace and harmony.”

Even in the confusion and persecution that followed Joseph’s murder, a Seventies Library was established in early 1845. According to an early revelation dating to March 1835, a Seventy was a specific priesthood quorum that functioned under the direction of the Apostles. Generally they served as “traveling ministers” to the Gentiles. “The Seventies,” a newspaper article observed, “while travelling over the face of the globe, as the Lord’s ‘Regular Soldiers,’ can gather all the curious things, both natural and artificial, with all the knowledge, inventions, and wonderful specimens of genius that have been gracing the world for almost six thousand years.”

Nauvoo was many things, but most importantly, it was the City of Joseph. Overlooking the Mississippi, the Nauvoo Temple defined the city. Unlike the Kirtland Temple dedicated in 1836, the new temple promised the saints even greater spiritual endowments, particularly the opportunity to offer salvation to their departed loved ones. Reminiscent of passages in Exodus that describe the construction of the Tabernacle in the

wilderness, a revelation dated January 19, 1841, commanded the people to “Come…with all your gold and your silver, and your precious stones…and build a house to my name, for the Most High to dwell therein. For there is not a place found on earth that he may come to and restore again that which was lost unto you, or which he hath taken away, even the fullness of the priesthood.”\textsuperscript{134} The temple dominated Joseph’s teachings, and the people loved to hear him preach. John Needham related that at one such meeting, “scores of carriages were round the congregation listening to the discourse. It has been said from good authority that from twenty to thirty thousand were present.” Admittedly any good preaching attracted a crowd in those days, but for Needham and others like him, gathering to Zion afforded the opportunity of hearing the word directly from God’s chosen mouthpiece.\textsuperscript{135} “To be taught in the ways of God, and sit under the voice of a prophet…is of more value than gold.” Needham added, “How thankful I am that I am here to be taught in the ways of God, and to enjoy such blessings.”\textsuperscript{136} W. Rowley called it an “unspeakable privilege and blessing of listening, like those of old, to the voice of the Lord’s servants.” Any sacrifice he had made in leaving England “have been hushed and subdued in the contemplation of thus becoming a citizen in one of Zion’s stakes, and my desire and prayer to God is, that she may still prosper and go on in glorious majesty and triumph.”\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{135} Daniel Walker Howe, \textit{What Hath God Wrought}, 613. 
Although Joseph Smith situated his cities along the Mississippi, facilitating movement and market traffic, even he envisioned the Saints’ final resting place far beyond the Rocky Mountains. In August 1842 Joseph recorded, “I prophesied that the Saints would continue to suffer much affliction and would be driven to the Rocky Mountains, many would apostatize, others would be put to death by our persecutors or lose their lives in consequence of exposure or disease, and some of you will live to go and assist in making settlements and build cities and see the Saints become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains.”

Like many of his contemporaries, the distant mountain west captured Joseph’s imagination. So too did the idea of establishing a territorial stronghold. In June 1832 the Mormon newspaper *Evening and Morning Star* reported on the movement of fur trading companies then passing through Independence, as well as Captain Bonneville’s expedition to the Rockies. Years later Wilford Woodruff, fourth president of the church, recalled the first time he heard Joseph speak. In the small, one-roomed Kirtland schoolhouse, Joseph told the assembled priesthood brothers they would yet “go into the Rocky Mountains” and “there build Temples to the Most High.” There in the mountain valleys, the people would “raise up a posterity” fit to greet Christ at his coming, for as Joseph stated, “The Son of Man will come to them while in the Rocky Mountains.”

---

When Joseph Smith gazed across the Missouri prairie in the summer of 1831, its grasses gently waving, he was well on his way to offering an alternative to the religious and secular chaos that had engulfed him and his family since early childhood. “It has always been my province to dig up hidden mysteries—new things for my hearers,” Joseph noted, boldly proclaiming, “I calculate to be one of the instruments of setting up the kingdom of Daniel by the word of the Lord, and I intend to lay a foundation that will revolutionize the whole world. I once offered my life to the Missouri mob as a sacrifice for my people, and here I am. It will not be by sword or gun that this kingdom will roll on: the power of truth is such that all nations will be under the necessity of obeying the Gospel.” A month later he was dead, murdered at Carthage.\(^\text{140}\)

In a sense, Nauvoo the river town, like Adam-ondi-Ahman, Jackson County, and Kirtland before it, was a victim of its own successes. Many scholars believe it was Joseph’s radical doctrine of plural marriage that led to his death. But in reality, any booster knew that a town’s success or failure hinged on attracting people. In a never-ending stream, eager British converts escaped Babylon and journeyed up the Mississippi to Joseph’s city. When they were no longer able to find a place in Nauvoo, they spread to the outlying towns and villages, creating an ever-widening sphere for Mormon dominance. Mormon industrial aspirations and political power, both real and perceived, were too great a threat. In a January 1846 public statement the Nauvoo City Council proclaimed, “Men who wish to buy property very cheap, to benefit themselves and are

willing to benefit us, are invited to call and look.” Infused with a certain amount of bitterness, the announcement launched the Mormon exodus from Illinois.\(^{141}\)

Almost immediately this flight acquired biblical significance. In the months leading up to the Mormon exodus, Brigham Young and other remaining apostles likened their martyred prophet to Joseph in Egypt. The comparison seems to have encouraged and comforted them as they faced troubling days ahead.\(^{142}\) Brigham Young, now recognized by most as Joseph’s legitimate successor, stated, “My faith is that God will rule the elements and the Prince and Power of the air will be stayed, and the Lord will fight our battles as in the days of Moses; and we will see the deliverance brought to pass.” They were modern Israel bound for the Promised Land. “I hope we will find a place where no self-righteous neighbors can say that we are obnoxious to them,” Young added. The first wagons began rolling out that February. At the end of the month a providential cold spell froze the Mississippi, and, like the story of the children of Israel and the Red Sea, the Mormons passed over dry-shod.\(^{143}\)

---


\(^{142}\) History of the Church Vol. 6, 15-18.

\(^{143}\) There was some worry about the Mormons joining the British in the Northwest; a subsequent circular issued January 20, 1846 made the Mormon position clear. “For the satisfaction of some who have concluded that our grievances have alienated us from our country; that our patriotism has not been overcome by fire, by sword, by daylight nor by midnight assassinations….Should hostilities arise between the Government of the United States and any other power, in relation to the fight of possessing the territory of Oregon,
When the advance party of Mormon emigrants arrived in Salt Lake Valley in late July 1847, they described their new mountain homeland in glowing terms. The Wasatch Front was the veritable land of Canaan. Wilford Woodruff “gazed with wonder and admiration upon the most fertile valley spread out before us…clothed with a heavy garment of vegetation, and in the midst of which glistened the waters of the Great Salt Lake, with mountains all around towering to the skies, and streams, rivulets and creeks of pure water running through the beautiful valley.” Orson Pratt recalled, “After issuing from the mountains among which we had been shut up for many days, and beholding in a moment such an extensive scenery open before us, we could not refrain from a shout of joy.”

Woodruff and Pratt not only saw the valley in terms of its natural beauty, a welcome site after the windswept plains of Nebraska and Wyoming, but also assessed the land in terms of its value for future settlement. The valley’s breadth could easily cradle the new Mormon capital; abundant water resources and grasslands indicated healthy land for farming and grazing. Certainly the nearby mountains possessed enough timber with which literally to build up Zion.

The Wasatch Front’s physical and cultural landscape molded Mormon settlement patterns as much as Missouri’s rolling prairies and Nauvoo’s river town splendor had earlier done. In Nauvoo, Mormons sought to create a city that mirrored early nineteenth-century ideas of gentility and refinement. Tree lined streets and generous gardens went hand in hand

---

with intense spiritual consecration and covenant making. In the valleys of the Wasatch Front, Mormon urban visions of redemption extended beyond these goals to embrace at last the complex array of Native American tribes who called the region home.

Unfortunately, these efforts often met with tragic consequences for both peoples. First experienced along the Wasatch Front, this cultural clash brought an entirely new racial dimension to Mormon city building that affected settlement patterns and layout across the Mormon corridor. In the end, the Front’s extensive village network would all but erase the earlier indigenous presence, the very peoples Mormons sought to redeem and with whom they had hoped to unite.
CHAPTER 3

THE COMPASS AND THE SQUARE

To possess an inheritance in Zion or in Jerusalem only in theory—only in imagination—would be the same as having no inheritance at all. It is necessary to get a deed of it, to make an inheritance, practical, substantial and profitable. Then let us not rest contented with a mere theoretical religion, but let it be practical,…to lead us to truth, to God, and to life eternal.

--Brigham Young, 1862

Jesse W. Fox was tall and lanky. He was a kind and peaceful man. Family remembered that Jesse always had untied shoelaces and seemed to appreciate “comfort and convenience above fashion and appearance.” He was born in Jefferson County, New York, on March 31, 1819. At eighteen, his father sent him away for additional schooling. At some point he was introduced to Mormonism and in the spring of 1844 traveled west to Nauvoo. He arrived the day before Hyrum and Joseph Smith were murdered at Carthage. “On the following day (June 28) I saw their dead bodies,” Jesse tersely wrote in his brief autobiography. Despite the confusion the tragedy invoked, Jesse was baptized a few weeks later, most likely in the Mississippi, and took up school teaching in Nauvoo. He eventually married one of his students, Eliza Gibbs, in June 1849, in Garden Grove, one of several Mormon refugee settlements strung across Iowa’s muddy plains. Jesse and Eliza arrived in the Salt Lake Valley later that fall where he worked for a time with Mormon surveyor William Lemmon before being called to help

settle the central Utah town of Manti. In 1851, following Lemmon’s death, Jesse returned to Salt Lake City and assumed the position of territorial surveyor for Brigham Young and later for Salt Lake County.  

Drive along the base of the Wasatch Front and Jesse’s handiwork is still visible. He platted and surveyed nearly all of the Front’s major towns and canals, even working for a time as chief engineer for Utah’s major railroads, the Utah Central, Utah Southern, and Utah Southern Extension. In his unassuming way, Jesse Fox quietly helped create the tightly integrated urban system he and other Mormons called Zion. In a time when most surveyors were nothing more than itinerant speculators, Jesse eschewed payment for his services, which he viewed as a special mission. Apparently the thought of picking out a few farm lots for himself and selling them never occurred to him. According to his stepson Matthias F. Cowley, Jesse believed that “only those who owned the land should be the builders on it and that no one by his assistance should ever speculate at the expense of the poor Saints coming to the Valley to serve God and keep His commandments.”

---


consecrated his time and talents literally to build up the Kingdom of God on the earth, all in preparation for Christ’s Second Coming. His mission etched the Mormon Zion onto the land itself. For as Jesse and others of his generation were taught, there was no real separation between the living and the dead, the spiritual and secular, the heavens and the earth. Faithful observance to covenants qualified the individual for exaltation, receiving an eternal inheritance and posterity. What was bound on earth would be bound in heaven. For in the end the earth regained its pre-fallen or paradisiacal glory and, thus purified and sanctified, became the Celestial Kingdom, a dwelling place fit for the righteous of God. Heaven and earth directly mirrored one another.

The ability to determine borders and boundaries upon the land was crucial to Mormon identity and landscape construction. When Mormons first arrived, the Salt Lake

---

151 Doctrine and Covenants 84: 38. See also Brigham Young, “Life and Death, or Organization and Disorganization.” in Journal of Discourses Volume 1, 349-353. http://jod.mrm.org/1/349. Accessed November 16, 2013. Young states, “The inquiry should not be, if the principles of the Gospel will put us in possession of the earth, of this farm, that piece of property…but, if they will put us in possession of principles that are endless, and calculated in their nature for an eternal increase; that is, to add life to life, being to being, kingdom to kingdom” (353). At the funeral of his sister Fanny, Young proclaimed, “Sister Fanny has been faithful: her spirit is now in the spirit world…The spirit world I now refer to pertains to this earth, so far as spirits who have tabernacle or may hereafter tabernacle here are concerned.” Journal of Discourses, Vol. 7, 173. http://jod.mrm.org/7/172. Accessed November 16, 2013. Both quotes reveal the extent to which nineteenth-century Mormons intermingled the spiritual and temporal. Even departed spirits occupied the same space as the living. Material goods and property were but representations of the kind of priestly power and kingdoms the righteous would eventually inherit.

Valley was still technically part of Mexico, though this quickly changed with the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in February 1848. For seven short months Mormons had free rein to survey and claim lands at will, a privilege they had never before fully enjoyed. Their surveys, despite later federal oversight and control, established a basis for quasi-legal land rights. Any later efforts on the part of non-Mormons or Gentiles to remove or lessen Mormon political and social influence were practically impossible. Never again would Mormon property be lost to frontier claim jumpers and angry urban mobs.

Moreover, the land itself became a symbol and played an essential role in Mormon conscience and narrative constructions. It only helped matters that the new American Holy Land physically resembled the Biblical one. When Mormon Apostle George A. Smith first traveled to Palestine in 1873, he was struck by overt similarities between his mountain homeland and the landscape he encountered there. He observed, “Our Salt Lake answers very well to the Dead Sea; our Utah Lake answers very well to the Sea of Galilee, and some of the streams that run into Utah Lake answer very well to the upper streams of the Jordan.”\(^{153}\) In claiming such a land for their own, Mormon pioneers believed they were actively fulfilling biblical prophecies. “The Prophet Isaiah has portrayed the whole history of the Latter-day Saints who occupy these mountains of Israel. He described our travels here, and our labors since we came here,” Wilford Woodruff declared in 1884 to a congregation assembled in the Salt Lake Tabernacle.\(^{154}\) As Wallace Stegner noted, “For every early Saint, crossing the plains to Zion in the


Valley of the Mountains was not merely a journey but a rite of passage, the final, devoted, enduring act that brought one into the Kingdom.”

Yet the Promised Land was not an empty place devoid of people or earlier urban aspirations. Successive Native American tribes made their home in the region for thousands of years, living in particularly dense settlements along the shores of the Wasatch Front’s two principle lakes. In 1776 Fathers Escalante and Dominguez traveled north into Utah, hoping to convert the tribes living around Utah Lake and establish a network of pueblos, thereby enhancing Spanish authority and control in the area. Their visit instead fostered complex trade networks, often marked by violence, between Spanish and Native Americans, which later overshadowed Mormon settlement efforts.

As initially conceived by the Mormons, converted Native Americans would join with them in establishing a united front against the enemies of Israel. When conflicts over land and resources seriously compromised this developing relationship, the Book of Mormon offered a useful prototype, explaining how on the one hand Native Americans might have a chosen destiny, while on the other hand required management and “chastisement.” Mormon Apostle Erastus R. Snow explained, “With regard to the aborigines of this continent, there are several prophecies in the Book of Mormon to the effect that they will one day become a pure people; but that will not take place until the fullness of the Gentiles has come.” He continued, “Then, according to the promise, the Spirit of the Lord will be poured out upon them and they will inherit the blessings promised. Until that time we expect they will be a scourge upon the people of Zion, as

---

the Lamanites were a scourge to the Nephites of old. That which the Lord is pleased to use as a scourge today, He may use in days to come as a means of support and of strength.” Mormons, Snow exhorted, should “not thirst for their blood, nor be very revengeful for every wrong that they in their blindness, may commit; but to exercise generous forbearance.” God could easily “destroy, by various diseases, those who are shedding the blood of the Saints. And this will be far more acceptable to him than if it were done by us.” Armed with these scriptural antecedents and sense of providentialism Mormons might legitimately lay claim to the land and its resources. In the end, though, while Mormon surveys ultimately erased indigenous claims to the Wasatch Front, Native Americans directly influenced Mormon settlement patterns and town layout, thus playing an influential, albeit silenced, role in Mormon urban traditions.

This chapter, then, is about layers—layers of sediment and rocks and layers of human activity and interaction with the land. It examines early Mormon encounters with the Wasatch Front and the indigenous peoples Mormon settlers subsequently displaced. It documents the ways in which Mormons established a homeland—surveying and allocating land, appropriating natural resources, and founding communities. It considers how Mormons both created and marked this landscape in ways that reflected a unique set of religious and ideological suppositions that allowed them to survive and flourish.

When Brigham Young and the others first encountered the Salt Lake Valley in July 1847, they did not see a desolate land like later Mormon readings suggested, but one

---

whose bounteous resources could be used to build the Kingdom of God. Orson Pratt recorded in his journal, “[Lorenzo] Snow and myself ascended this hill, from the top of which a broad open valley…lay stretched out before us, at the north end of which the broad waters of the Great Salt Lake glistened in the sunbeams, containing high mountainous islands.” He continued, “After issuing from the mountains among which we had been shut up for many days, and beholding in a moment such an extensive scenery open before us, we could not refrain from a shout of joy which almost involuntarily escaped from our lips the moment this grand and lovely scenery was within our view.” Likewise Wilford Woodruff “gazed with wonder and admiration upon the most fertile valley spread out before us…clothed with a heavy garment of vegetation, and in the midst of which glistened the waters of the Great Salt Lake, with mountains all around towering to the skies, and streams, rivulets and creeks of pure water running through the beautiful valley.” Woodruff and Pratt not only saw the valley in terms of its natural beauty, a welcome site after the windswept plains of Nebraska and Wyoming, but also assessed the land in terms of its value for future settlement. The valley’s breadth could easily cradle the new Mormon capital; abundant water resources and grasslands indicated healthy land for farming and grazing. Certainly the nearby mountains possessed enough lumber with which to build homes. By utilizing these resources, Mormons hoped to

---

redeem and exalt the mountains and valleys that comprised their new homeland. As Daniel H. Wells told Mormons living in Logan, Utah, “Go to with your might and build up the kingdom of God, by quarrying the rock, by bringing the timber from the canyons and making it into lumber, by making adobies, mixing the mortar, burning the lime, and drawing from the elements around us the material necessary to beautify and build up, and to exalt in every way those principles that essay to establish righteousness over the whole earth.”

This resource-rich environment was the product of complex geological processes that continue to shape life along the Wasatch Front. Geologically speaking, the Front’s current landforms and features are relatively young. Between 500 and 200 million years ago, the Front was a table-like, equatorial swamp, whose fluctuating elevations lingered at sea level. Plate tectonic activity eventually pushed the landmass northward where it eventually arrived near its present location some 40 million years ago. The moving plates and subsequent earthquake activity helped to fashion the Wasatch Mountains and propel the Salt Lake Valley upward; elevations today average close to 4,000 feet. But it was Pleistocene glaciers, 1 to 2 million years ago, that really gave the Front its distinctive

---

160 In his paper, “The Natural World and the Establishment of Zion, 1831-1833,” presented at the 2013 Mormon History Association conference, Matthew C. Godfrey explains that early Mormons believed that God required them to redeem the land through ordered and planned agricultural communities, industry, and infrastructure (5). In his chapter, “Agriculture, Mountain Ecology, and the Land Ethic: Phases of the Environmental History of Utah,” for Working the Range: Essays on the History of Western Land Management and Environment edited by John Wunder (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985), Dan Flores noted a similar trend. “The earth could not be ‘owned,’ but it could be occupied temporarily provided the occupant ‘improved’ it, or used it ‘beneficially.’ To Mormon thinking this meant changing the natural order to make it more productive of the things most useful to themselves” (164).

quality and appearance. The glaciers carved out canyons, and when they melted, they filled low-lying basins with water.

Lake Bonneville was just one such fresh water ice age lake that molded and shaped the landforms of the western United States. At its height 26,000 years ago, the lake extended across northern and central Utah. Levels topped off at nearly 6,000 feet when Bonneville breached natural barriers in southeastern Idaho and tumbled into the Snake River flood plane near Red Rock Pass 15,000 years ago. Following the Bonneville Flood, lake levels dropped 350 feet. Over the next four thousand years, Bonneville levels continued to fall, each succeeding shoreline etching itself into the mountainsides, creating the Wasatch Front’s distinctive sand and gravel bench lands and bars that overlook valley floors and lakes. Eventually all that was left of the Pleistocene lake was Great Salt Lake and Utah Lake. The land, however, is still rebounding from Lake Bonneville’s immense weight.162

Together the two lakes establish the Wasatch Front’s western matrix. With no natural outlet, the Great Salt Lake salinized. Today lake levels hover just below 4200 feet, but fluctuate with springtime snowmelt flowing from the Bear, Ogden, Weber, and Jordan rivers. Unlike the other tributaries from nearby canyons, the Jordan exits Utah Lake and meanders northward, a bluish gray thread that eventually melts into the Great Salt Lake wetlands. The Wasatch Front’s temperate climatic conditions owe much to its lake systems, especially the Great Salt Lake. In general, the Intermountain West’s aridity is related to its distance from coastal regions and the area’s north-south mountain chains.

---
Eastward facing mountain slopes trap Pacific storm systems and create significant rain shadows for regions further inland.\textsuperscript{163} The Great Salt Lake, however, moderates these general climatic patterns. When the lake is warmer than the surrounding air temperatures, rain and snow falls. This lake effect is particularly pronounced during the early spring and fall and contributes to high precipitation levels in Salt Lake, Davis, and portions of Box Elder counties. When it is cold enough, icebergs have been known to form on encrusted lake brines.\textsuperscript{164}

Because of these environmental conditions, the Wasatch Front has always attracted intense human occupation, especially near lakeside marshes and wetlands, whose complex ecologies fulfilled a variety of human subsistence needs. The first evidence for human habitation near the Great Salt Lake dates to 8,500 years ago, when lake levels fluctuated between 4,217 and 4,250 feet. Human population numbers in turn mirrored these fluctuations. Population figures continued to grow until around 5,500 years ago, when lake levels fell drastically. After this point in time, archaeologists note a marked decrease in population numbers and the quality and duration of human settlement patterns, encouraging seasonal resource exploitation. Later prehistoric peoples lived in encampments along alluvial fans and canyon streams and rivers, subsisting on bison, birds and other wetland resources like bulrushes, goosefoot, and cattails.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{163} Gwendolyn L. Waring, \textit{A Natural History of the Intermountain West: Its Ecological and Evolutionary Story} (Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2011), 8.
\textsuperscript{165} Lehi F. Hintze and Bart J. Kowallis, \textit{Geologic History of Utah: A Field Guide to Utah’s Rocks} (Provo: Brigham Young University Geology Studies, Special Publication 9, 67
Beginning in 200 B.C.E., a new people seem to have migrated into the Wasatch Front. For the next two thousand years, the Fremont peoples, known for their distinctive pottery, basket making, and farming practices, dominated settlement in the region. Their village networks reached a high point around 900 C.E. Fremont peoples concentrated in areas where water emptied out of canyon mouths across rich alluvial fans. In sites like these archaeologists have recorded as many as twenty-four pit houses. In many respects, later Mormon villages paralleled and occupied old Fremont sites. “Virtually every town traversed today by Interstate 15 from Cedar City to Brigham City has Fremont village sites,” archaeologist Steven Sims writes. “It may well be that the most populous part of this corridor during Fremont times was the Wasatch Front, just as it is the most populous part of the region today.” So intense was occupation around the Great Salt Lake, particularly on the mudflats west of today’s town of Willard, that archaeologists have trouble identifying distinct sites. Utah Lake and the Great Salt Lake were especially popular settlement sites because of the moderating influence both lakes have on the region’s climate, lengthening the growing season—something later Mormon settlers capitalized on, growing fruit on the eastern bench lands facing the lakes.166 Around 1100 C.E. climatic conditions shifted throughout the Great Basin and Intermountain West. In response Fremont peoples along the Wasatch Front began relying less on farming and more on foraging. Others left altogether, heading east into Colorado. “Utah pollen


records show more winter rainfall by the late [C.E.] 1200s and less falling when farmers needed it. Winter rains caused the streams that once meandered across broad silt-filled floodplains to cut downward and entrench themselves into the earth. This lowered the water table, and the once fertile fields dried out. The cooling trend meant more late frosts to kill young maize, bean, and squash plants,” Simms explains.167

Around 1300 C.E. Southern Numic speaking peoples who are known to history as the Western Shoshonis, Utes, Southern Paiutes, and Goshutes migrated into northern and central Utah. Material culture in the Salt Lake Valley and areas northward specifically reflects distinctive Shoshonian pottery and basketry styles.168 Numic speakers who lived around Utah Lake came to be known as Uinta or Western Utes, but were simultaneously referred to as the Timpanogots, Paganunc, and Pag-wa-nu-chi or “Water-edge People.”169 When Spanish missionary-explorers, Dominguez and Escalante made it as far as Utah Valley in 1776, they noted that the Ute peoples in the area subsisted “on the lake’s abundant fish,” so much so that neighboring tribes called them fish-eaters, supplementing their diet with wild seeds, fowl, and other small game.170 In general, then, long-established subsistence patterns throughout the region continued to hold sway—

“relatively sedentary collecting and fishing around areas such as the Bear River marshes and Utah Lake and nomadic collecting in areas away from these well-watered valleys.”

In November 1519 events occurring hundreds of miles to the south forever changed northern Utah’s Numic culture, introducing intense tribal rivalries and sweeping them into regional cycles of violence and human trafficking. That fall, Hernán Cortés brought the first horses with him as part of his conquest of central Mexico. By the end of the century, Native American traders and Spanish colonizers had expanded into northern Mexico, New Mexico, and Texas, taking their horses with them. Yet it was the Pueblo Revolt in 1680 that dramatically increased horse trade. Within twenty years of the revolt, horses spread rapidly throughout the west, radically altering indigenous life ways, rearranging tribal configurations and resource utilization. Once semi-sedentary indigenous groups acquired horses, hunting and herding largely replaced gathering and other proto agrarian practices. With horses, Plains Indians more easily followed and exploited traveling buffalo herds. Horses also marked individual and tribal status; they became objects to raid and trade. Because of increased tribal wars, bands, whose fluid membership often fluctuated in response to environmental conditions, coalesced for periods of time around particularly strong leaders. With horses, tribal elite could travel farther and take advantage of new opportunities for trade, which likewise contributed to shifting tribal identities and affiliations. Mounted tribes in turn preyed on peoples like the Southern Paiutes and Goshutes, whose desert environments could not support

---

extensive horse herds. Many of these ended up slaves in the Southwest borderlands; their ethnic identity as a people developed within a context of violence and enslavement. Associated with human trafficking, horse trade enriched tribal leaders who became ever more reliant upon European goods to bolster their power and regional dominance. 173

Shoshone groups in southeastern Idaho and northern Utah first obtained horses in the late 1600s and early 1700s from their Numic-speaking Comanche cousins to the east and possibly Western Colorado Utes. The Comanches acquired horses earlier in the century when they began to cross the Rocky Mountains and spread out across the Great Plains, where they subsequently dominated trade in horses and slaves. 174 Unlike the Northwestern Shoshone, Western Utes living around Utah Lake remained outside this horse trade until the late 1700s. Aside from the well-watered Utah Valley, Western Utes lacked necessary resources to keep large herds of animals. In addition, mounted Shoshones to the north further restricted Western Ute territories and access to horses. 175 This all began to change when two unsuspecting Spanish Franciscan friars, Francisco Atanasio Dominguez and Silvestre Velez de Escalante, visited Timpanogot Ute villages near Utah Lake in September 1776.

Ever since the founding of Spanish colonies in California, officials in New Mexico had wanted to connect the two centers. Escalante and Dominguez believed they could discover a successful route by heading north, following trails created by Spanish and Native American traders, thus circumventing unfriendly Hopi tribes to the west. In the process they hoped to establish a string of Indian missions between Santa Fe and the Pacific. Committing themselves to the care of the Virgin Mary and her husband, the Patriarch Joseph, the expedition left Santa Fe for Monterey on July 29, 1776. Apparently the plan was to head north and then, at some point, turn west, arriving at Monterey via California’s San Joaquin Valley. In late August, however, the party entered unfamiliar territory and found it difficult to determine which trails to follow. In his journal, Escalante relates that the party began encountering Yuta (Ute) camps near the Rio de los Dolores in present-day western Colorado. The Spaniards wisely decided to employ two Utes as guides, offering hunting knives and beads in return for their services. At some point the fathers heard about pueblo-like settlements near Utah Lake. Seeing an opportunity to establish a mission among an already seemingly sedentary Indian population and potentially also to restock supplies and acquire additional guides, Dominguez and Escalante decided upon this additional detour and arrived in Utah Valley at the end of September 1776. The initial meeting between the fathers and the Utah Lake Timpanogots went well. “Seeing such admirable docility,” Escalante wrote in his journal, “we told them that after finishing our journey we would return with more fathers and Spaniards to baptize them and live with them, but that from now forward they must be careful what they said so that later on they might not have to repent.”

176 Herbert E. Bolton, “Pageant in the Wilderness: The Story of the Escalante Expedition
The fathers never returned. Because of the lateness of the season, they abandoned their journey to Monterey and just barely survived the trip back to Santa Fe, arriving on January 2, 1777. Although Spanish officials failed to follow up on Dominguez and Escalante’s discoveries, the expedition’s maps and journal proved invaluable guides for later explorers and traders. Increased interaction with Spanish traders and American trappers allowed the Western Utes to acquire horses and guns without interacting directly with their Shoshoni enemies. Mounted and armed, Western Utes expanded their tribal territory and dominance through trade and strategic raiding. This was particularly the case following Mexico’s independence from Spain in 1821. “New Mexican and Indian traders now traded with even greater impunity as the few negotiated forms of diplomacy and redress established under Spanish rule dissolved. Raiders along the Old Spanish Trail between Santa Fe and Los Angeles increased their capture of Indian women and children, acting without reproach or punishment from colonial governors,” historian Ned Blackhawk explains. Additionally the influx of British and American trappers into the Great Basin compromised indigenous food resources while introducing an entirely new dynamic of imperial aspirations to the region.

It was within this context that the Western Ute leader Wakara was born in 1808 or 1815 near what would become the Utah Valley town of Spanish Fork. Frederick Piercy

---


and James Linforth’s illustrated *Route from Liverpool to Great Salt Lake Valley* (1855) and Mormon Indian interpreter and explorer Dimick B. Huntington’s *Vocabulary of the Utah and Shoshone or Snake Dialects with Indian Legends and Traditions* (1872) include two of the earliest accounts of Wakara’s life.¹⁸⁰ Wakara’s name either meant “yellow” or “brass.” Later in a vision, he received a new name, Pan-a-karry Quin-ker or “Iron Twister,” which, from a Mormon perspective fit Wakara well. (Huntington called Wakara “the Indian land pirate” and remembered him as “one of the shrewdest of men. He was a natural man; read from nature’s books. He was very fond of liquor; but when in liquor you could not get him to make a trade.”)¹⁸¹ Wakara’s father apparently obtained his first horse from Spanish traders when Wakara was just a young boy. Wakara took charge of the band when his father died around 1840 in a skirmish between the Timanogot Utes and neighboring Shoshones. With the fur trade in the region declining, Wakara turned his


¹⁸¹ Dimick B. Huntington, *Vocabulary of the Utah and Shoshone or Snake Dialects with Indian Legends and Traditions Including a Brief Account of the Life and Death of Wah-ker, the Indian Land Pirate*, (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Herald, 1872), 27-29. Huntington’s comment that Wakara was a “natural man” is interesting. Huntington may have been referring at least in part to the Book of Mormon scripture Mosiah 3:19 which reads: “The natural man is an enemy to God, and has been from the fall of Adam, and will be, forever and ever, unless he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit, and putteth off the natural man and becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord.” Thus because of the nature of his business dealings, Wakara was not a true convert, but remained in a “natural” or “fallen” condition.
attentions to slave trading and horse raiding, building upon well-established networks and relationships. In his account, Huntington described Wakara’s business practices:

In 1846 or ’47 he went to California with a lot of Piede [Paiute?] prisoners. He frightened the Piedes into giving him their children, which he took to Lower California to trade for horses to enrich himself, taking many of his tribe with him. The Spaniards gave him numbers of beef cattle and charged him for them, whereupon he started for home. When out two days he called a halt, held council, and sent the old men, women and children on towards home. The third day ten men returned to visit the Spaniards. Each man visited different ranches, and took a large number of horses. The Spaniards raised a large force and pursued them, and recovered many, but lost six or seven hundred head of wild horses, for which the Mexicans offered a large reward.

The Mormons arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, then, at the end of a dramatic period of intense geopolitical transformation and change, reshaping both indigenous and Anglo worlds. Wakara was clearly at the height of his power, which explains why, on the advice of Jim Bridger, Brigham Young passed by the more fertile Utah Valley for the Salt Lake. Brigham did not want “to crowd upon the Utes” until there was a chance to get to know them better. In reality, far from being a no-man’s land, as Mormons and later historians claimed, multiple tribal entities traversed and utilized the Salt Lake Valley. The two most powerful tribes, mounted Shoshoni and Ute horsemen, each claimed it as their

---

182 Frederick Piercy and James Linforth, Route from Liverpool to Great Salt Lake Valley, 105; Ned Blackhawk notes in Violence over the Land, “By 1840 beaver pelts, once so valued and abundant, had grown both unprofitable, as new markets and materials met European demand, and scarcer. They became harder to procure while also becoming less valuable” (185).
183 Dimick B. Huntington, Vocabulary of the Utah and Shoshone or Snake Dialects, 27-28.
184 Ned Blackhawk, Violence over the Land, 244.
own. Yet many Mormons failed fully to appreciate the complex tribal relationships that existed along the Wasatch Front. In 1873 John Taylor emphasized, “We did not come here because it was a beautiful place, for when we arrived it was inhabited by Digger Indians, wolves, bears and coyotes—a desolate, arid plain, a howling wilderness.” The Native Americans whom Taylor derisively termed “Digger Indians” may well have been Goshutes who lived in the deserts south west of the Salt Lake Valley or any other Indian group in the area whose lack of horses, brush houses, diet of grasshoppers, crickets, and other small game appalled Anglo settlers. To Mormons and others passing through the region, indigenous hunting and gathering practices appeared to be an itinerant and wasteful use of seemingly abundant resources.

Not unlike the Spanish fathers seventy years earlier, Mormon positioning towards Native Americans was colored by their own set of doctrinal beliefs. Joseph Smith, after all, had purposefully located the City of Zion on the far reaches of the Missouri Frontier, near Native American tribes. When Indian agent Richard W. Cummins protested

---

186 Jared Farmer, On Zion's Mount, 50.
188 John R. Alley, Jr. “Prelude to Dispossession: The Fur Trade’s Significance for the Northern Utes and Southern Paiutes,” Utah Historical Quarterly 50 (Spring 1982): 122. Alley notes, “The image of Diggers fit nicely into the Anglo-American ideology of savagism. Indians as savages acted as symbols of all that progress left behind.” In this case, Taylor’s usage of the term emphasized the Mormons as bringers of civilization and enlightenment.
Mormon missionary activity among the Shawnees and Delawares in early 1831, Oliver Cowdery, Parley P. Pratt and the others told him that if they were denied permission to preach, they would “go to the Rocky Mountains, but…they will be with the Indians.” Other early statements made by Joseph Smith likewise confirm a connection between life in the Rocky Mountains and Native American conversion and redemption. In 1832, Joseph blessed Paulina E. Phelps that she would help settle the Rocky Mountains. Paulina did not exactly know where or what the Rocky Mountains were, but “supposed it to be something connected with the Indians.” At the end of his life, Joseph preached that when the Saints were safely settled beyond the Rockies, they should “gather the Red Man…from their scattered and dispersed situation to become the strong arm of Jehovah.”

But the Native Americans Mormons first encountered in late July 1847 did not fit the noble image Joseph Smith evoked. Within a week of the Mormons’ initial arrival, a small party of Timpanogots met them to trade. A few days later when twenty Shoshones arrived, a brawl broke out. A Timpanogot man had stolen a horse from the Shoshones and traded it for a gun. Later when things had quieted down, the Shoshones informed the Mormons that the Salt Lake Valley was part of Shoshone territory—the Utes were interlopers. At the end of this meeting, the Shoshones offered to sell lands to the Mormons, who promptly declined the offer. On August 1, 1847 as part of his Sunday sermon, Heber C. Kimball advised the people “not to dispose of their guns and

---

192 Quoted in Richard W. Walker, “Seeking the ‘Remnant,’” 32.
ammunition to the Indians.” He “discouraged the idea of paying the Indians for the lands, for if the Shoshones should be thus considered, the Utes and other tribes would claim and pay also.” Kimball further reasoned that since God had granted Mormons the land as their promised inheritance, they did not need to purchase it from anyone. At the end of the meeting, the small congregation voted to “not trade with, or take any notice of the Indians, when they come into our camp.”

Regardless of what Mormon leadership declared, the Utes and Shoshones saw the new Salt Lake Valley settlement as a promising opportunity for trade—as long as the Mormons adhered to well-established business practices, there would be no problems. Since 1827, when fur trader and explorer Jedediah Smith successfully brokered a treaty between the Utes and Western Shoshones that opened the region to increased trade activity, trappers knew always to pay a certain amount of tribute to these tribes. Not only did this token payment establish important friendship ties, it gave them the right to trap and hunt in tribal areas. “Although considered honest, hospitable, and friendly, the Utes would be forthright and candid in their demands if the trappers were not willing to share food and other items while in Ute country. Such incidents occasionally led those who did not fully understand to accuse the Utes of begging,” historian John Alley explains.

Wakara seemed especially intent on cultivating a workable relationship with the Mormons. He met with church hierarchy in September 1848. Recalling the visit, Parley P. Pratt wrote to his brother Orson, then serving a mission in England, that the

---

“celebrated Utah Chief” arrived with “some hundreds of men, women and children; they had several hundred head of horses for sale. They were good looking, brave, and intelligent beyond any we had seen on this side of the mountains.” More promising, Wakara and his band expressed a desire “to become one people with us, and to live among us and we among them, and to learn to cultivate the earth and live as we do. They would like for some of us to go and commence farming with them in their valleys, which are situated about three hundred miles south.” To cement the deal, Wakara was baptized in March 1850 and ordained an Elder in the Mormon lay priesthood a year later in June 1851. His invitation for Mormons to settle on Ute tribal land precipitated Parley P. Pratt’s November 1849 exploration party to central and southern Utah.

Regardless of the Native American presence, Mormons lost no time in surveying Salt Lake City and parceling out inheritances. As Heber C. Kimball articulated, the land now belonged to the Saints and not to the nearby Native American tribes. This overt sense of entitlement to both land and resources later, regardless of Wakara’s overtures of peace, unraveled Mormon – Indian relationships and ultimately forced Native peoples from their land. The degree to which settlements experienced conflict affected their placement and town layout.

196 Ronald W. Walker, “Wakara Meets the Mormons, 1848-52: A Case Study in Native American Accommodation, Utah Historical Quarterly 70 (Summer 2002), 222, 225-226; Journal History June 9, 1851. Wakara’s decision to be baptized should be viewed with in the history of the long Spanish – Ute alliance system, which was often secured through baptisms. See Ned Blackhawk, Violence over the Land, 73.
According to Wilford Woodruff’s account, Brigham Young first articulated Mormon land policy on July 25, 1847. “No man should buy land who [comes] here…but every man should have his land measured out to him for city and farming purposes. He might till it as he pleased, but he must be industrious, and take care of it.” A few days later, the city survey commenced. Again Woodruff recalled, “President Young called a council of the Quorum of the Twelve…We walked from the north camp to about the center between the two creeks, when President Young waved his hand and said: ‘Here is the forty acres for the Temple. The city can be laid out perfectly square, north and south, east and west.’”

Although they later reduced the Temple lot to ten acres, the plan for Salt Lake City closely followed Joseph’s City of Zion plat: one city block contained eight, one and a quarter acre lots. Houses were set back twenty feet from the city’s wide streets and generous sidewalks, lending an air of “uniformity throughout the city.” In addition, Young set aside four, ten-acre squares for use as public grounds.198 “One side of the city borders upon the most beautiful bluffs, suitable for summer houses, cottages, etc; while the remainder is encircled by the richest meadows of choice grass and rush, just suitable for pasturage for the city,” Young envisioned. On August 7, the Quorum of the Twelve met at the Temple block with the express purpose of “[selecting] their inheritances.”199 Lots continued to be distributed through the fall of 1848.200

---

To prevent speculation and encourage self-reliance, inheritances purposefully remained small. In October 1848, church leaders surveyed a common field just beyond city limits. As Young indicated in a letter to Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra T. Benson, the Big Field was designed to avert any conflicts that might arise over land allotments. “It is our intention to have the five acre lots next the city to accommodate the mechanics and artisans; the ten acres next, then the twenty acres, followed by the forty and eighty acre lots, where farmers can build and reside. All these lots will be enclosed in one common fence…and to the end that every man may be satisfied with his lot and prevent any hardness that might occur by any other method of dividing the land, we have proposed that it shall all be done by ballot, or casting lots, as Israel did in days of old.”

What is interesting about this statement is not so much the field’s concentric organizational design but that everyone, even core urban dwellers like mechanics and artisans, were to have small land holdings with which to manage and farm. Yet although agrarianism undoubtedly played a significant role in Young’s urban design, so too did expansion and growth. Because of the influx of new emigrants, Young noted the need to extend city boundaries. Additional plats were subsequently laid out, “commencing at the Eastern line of the city and running east as far as the nature of the land will allow for building purposes.” Young added, “Not only is this addition necessary, but we are going to lay off a site for a city about ten miles north, and another site about ten miles to the
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south of our city.”202 As historian Gustive Larson observed, “Land surveys surrounding
the town and cities were deliberately extensive in anticipation of rapid population growth
as ‘the Gathering’ would pour its thousands into ‘Zion’,”203

Settlement surveys also established municipal and ecclesiastical boundaries and
thus served as the guiding impetus behind Wasatch Front urbanization and growth. In
1849 Salt Lake City divided into nineteen wards, or local congregations. Based on
members’ geographical proximities to each other, Mormon colonies throughout the
cultural core quickly adopted this pattern. Collections of wards, often single settlements,
made up stakes, whose boundaries established important regional contexts and
associations for colonization and expansion. The local bishop and his two councilors
acted as mini governing bodies whose secular authority often subsumed the spiritual. For
instance, bishops generally settled land disputes and often requisitioned labor for public
works projects, like roads and irrigation networks.204 Bishops only assumed greater
ecclesiastical responsibilities when, beginning in the 1890s, the church as a whole,
largely in response to outside political and social pressure, began to slowly divest itself of
its former temporal pursuits and concerns.205

On March 15, 1849, settlers founded the State of Deseret, with Brigham Young as governor. The new provisional government formalized the already existing theocracy and further established Mormon land claims. Legislation created a Surveyor General’s Office and appointed county recorders, who were to keep meticulous track of all county surveys and land transactions. Settlers could now obtain legal certification of their land rights and transfer titles. Later legislation granted the State of Deseret the power to issue city charters. Towns that incorporated this way received at least twenty square miles, which included the already platted town and nearby fields; additional acreage anticipated future growth. A year later, when Congress dissolved the State of Deseret and replaced it with a territorial government, nothing seemed to change. For a time Young remained governor and the land surveys continued as before. Unfortunately, the arrival of federal surveyor David H. Burr in 1855 corresponded with increased hostility between Mormon settlers and the federal government, culminating in the 1856 Utah War. Burr abandoned the survey in 1857 and hightailed it back to Washington D.C., accusing Mormons of monopolizing land and resources and inciting Native Americans to cause problems for the federal surveyors. After investigating these charges, Burr’s replacement, S. C. Stambaugh, suggested federal surveying efforts cease until a general land office opened, “and until a different policy may be devised by Congress to induce other than Mormon emigration to the Territory.” Federal surveyors heeded Stambaugh’s advice and did not

---

return to Utah territory until the mid 1860s when increased mining activity made territorial lands particularly attractive to Gentile speculators.\textsuperscript{206}

Mormons took advantage of the lack of federal surveys to expand outward and settle new areas. Cattle, in particular, dominated Mormon movement along the Wasatch Front, depleting resources normally available for Utes and Shoshones. For instance, when Matthew and Barzilla Caldwell entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1850 with a large herd of cattle, Brigham Young sent them to Utah Valley. They spent the winter in American Fork before moving further south, eventually settling in Spanish Fork.\textsuperscript{207} In fact those who decided to settle American Fork specifically dreamed of making that section of Utah Valley “a great pasture for stock raising.” Early settler Washburn Chipman recalled that the land was “varied in character.” He continued, “What was supposed to be the choicest was the meadow land in the lower part toward the lake. The central part was quite rocky, due largely to the debris which had been carried by the streams from the mountains. The channels for the water changed course from time to time scattering the gravel on the land. This central portion was covered with luxuriant growth of bunch grass, some of it two feet high.”\textsuperscript{208}

Located approximately thirty miles north of Salt Lake City, Layton-Kaysville lands were similarly described. Edward Phillips observed, “The country north of us…was covered with a luxuriant growth of grass which we called bunch grass. In the

\textsuperscript{208} Washburn Chipman, “Incidents in the Early History of American Fork,” Brigham Young University Special Collections Film 921 Number 51.
fall of the year it would wave in the breeze like a grain field. It was rich for wintering stock.”209 Another early history recalls that the mountainside benches and alluvial fans were “dry and baked, covered with sagebrush and deer brush, and cut by deep irregular streams and channels.” In contrast, Mormons “found good pasture lands, with abundance of grass, fertile, moist soil and many good springs” along the shores of the Great Salt Lake.210

As settlers moved their cows onto valuable meadowlands and lined the streams with cabins, Native Americans responded in ways that shaped settlement placement and layout as well as the degree of centralized control colonizers experienced from the Salt Lake church hierarchy. With Wakara initially on the Mormons’ side, coveted Utah Valley lands quickly filled. In the spring of 1849, Brigham Young sent a party of men into the valley where they established Fort Utah along the Provo River. Because of periodic flooding, the fort was later moved to the present site of Provo.211 A year later when Stephen Chipman, Arza Adams, and their sons traded at Fort Utah, the local surroundings caught their attention. En route they camped under some cottonwoods lining American Fork creek. The area’s tall meadow grasses favorably impressed the men as ideal pasture for sheep and cows. Upon the party’s return to Salt Lake City, Chipman, Adams and
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several others sought permission from Brigham Young to build a settlement there. “Go and take up what land you want,” he reportedly told them.212

Settlement in Utah Valley was hardly a peaceful affair, however. As early as March 1849 a Mormon detachment came to blows with a Western Ute band over stolen horses and cattle. Mormon diarist Hosea Stout recorded, “The company went out under the command of Col John Scott, whose orders were simply to take such measures as would put a final end to their depredations in the future.” It was later discovered that the horses had not been stolen after all, but the contingent nevertheless continued their search for the missing cattle. On March 5 the Mormons surrounded the offending encampment after a tipoff from Little Chief, a Ute Indian living in Utah Valley. Indian women and children hid in willows lining the nearby creek and watched as several Ute men lost their lives in the ensuing skirmish. “We found 13 beef hides in their camp some of them were recognized,” Stout duly noted.213

In light of continued cattle stealing and violence between Mormons and Utes, Brigham Young concluded that his only alternative was to act with force or abandon entirely Utah Valley’s verdant settlements. In early 1850 Young drew a line in the sand. “They must quit the ground or we must.”214 The territorial legislature again commissioned John Scott to “raise forthwith a Company of fifty efficient men…and proceed with said Company to Fort Utah, in the Utah Valley.” With

the help of settlers in the area, Scott was to “act as the circumstances may require exterminating such, as do not separate themselves from their hostile clans and sue for peace.”

Given this context, Wakara must have seemed the perfect Indian convert, an ideal Mormon ambassador to the other troublesome Utes in the area. He was tall, dignified, and intelligent. Isaac Morely described Wakara as being “a man of noble mind…He has an Eagle eye, nothing escapes his notice.” While Wakara recognized the need to adapt to the Mormon presence, Brigham Young required complete acculturation and assimilation. Furthermore as territorial superintendent of Indian Affairs, Young sought to curtail Wakara’s slave trade and regulate any future transactions between Native Americans and Anglo settlers and traders. Mormons now had to obtain licenses to trade legally with Wakara’s or any other Native American band, which severely checked Wakara’s economic power and independence. In addition, Mormon agrarian practices dramatically altered Native American subsistence patterns. Mormons introduced entirely new plant and animal species to the Wasatch Front. They hunted and fished, grazed grasslands, and diverted canyon streams and rivers for irrigation, drastically reducing resources upon which Wakara and other Native Americans relied. Escalating tensions ultimately resulted in the Walker War of 1853-54, which briefly halted Mormon settlement in central and southern Utah and cost dozens of Native American and Mormon

---


lives. Wakara survived, but died a year later in January 1855, when “a cold settled on his lungs.” On his deathbed he reportedly told his people “not to kill the Mormon’s cattle, nor steal from them.”

American Fork, nestled along the shores of Utah Lake, was settled within the context of violent military action against the Timpanogots and other Ute bands. The town’s settlement was part of an official colonization effort bent on wresting Utah Valley from Native American control. Settlements north of Salt Lake City, like the Davis County towns of Layton and Kaysville, however, were never prescribed Mormon colonies and, incidentally, lacked a serious Indian threat. The area attracted settlement because it seemed to be a good spot to graze cattle. In mid August 1847 an exploration headed north as far as the Bear River, stopping at the trapper Miles Goodyear’s log cabin on the Weber River. The Mormons duly noted the trapper’s garden and cows.

Settlement north of Salt Lake City began when Perrigrine Sessions and Hector C. Haight wintered church cattle there in 1847-48. Sessions stopped at the present day site of Bountiful; Haight continued a few miles further north, building his cabin close to the favored summer campgrounds of the Cummumbah or Weber Utes. According to anthropologist Julian Steward, Cummumbahs were most likely Western Shoshones. Others have suggested the Cummumbahs were an interethnic group comprised of both
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Shoshone and Ute peoples. Small family groups hunted and gathered in the region on a seasonal basis.\footnote{David Hurst Thomas, Lorann S. A. Pendleton, and Stephen C. Cappannari, “Western Shoshone,” in \textit{Handbook of North American Indians}, Volume 11, \textit{Great Basin}, ed. Warren L. D’Azevedo (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1986), 266, 282-283; Glen M. Leonard, \textit{History of Davis County} (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society and Davis County Commission, 1999), 12.} Emily Stewart Barnes, who settled in the Layton – Kaysville area with her family in 1851, recalled numerous interactions with Cummumbahs. “In the summertime the Indians would come and camp above Hector C. Haight’s home along the creek and down to the lake,” she recalled. “The sunflowers were so thick when ripe that the Indians would come. The squaws would have a basket tied around their waists, and a paddle made of willows. They would pull the sunflower blossom and whip its seeds into the basket. Then they would dry and clean the seeds; and then come and want us to buy them in exchange for [flour].” Emily’s family often took the sunflower seeds to a soap factory north of Salt Lake City.\footnote{Claude T. Barnes, \textit{The Grim Years}, 37, 73.}

While Native Americans often begged for food and at times made off with Mormon livestock, Davis County settlers experienced few violent encounters of the kind that occurred in Utah Valley. Mormon settlers continued to trickle into the area, lining the canyon creeks with their cabins and small farms. On January 27, 1851, William Kay was called as the first bishop. Kay’s Ward, as the congregation came to be known, encompassed the present day towns of Kaysville and Layton. Emily Stewart Barnes’s experience was typical of those who settled there. Her parents William and Mary Ann Marriott Stewart converted to Mormonism in England in the early 1840s, where Emily was born in 1846. William was a shoemaker and after carefully saving his earnings, he
and Mary Ann and their young family joined a Mormon company sailing out of Liverpool in early October 1850. Christopher Layton, who had recently settled in Kay’s Ward (the town of Layton was eventually named for him), accompanied these Mormon emigrants across the Atlantic. The Stewarts arrived at St. Louis in December, moving to Kanesville, Nebraska, in the spring, where they were reunited with Mary Ann’s brother and sister. Together, the families made the trek west. Upon arrival in Salt Lake City, Emily’s parents continued on to Kay’s Ward, where additional family members awaited them.223 Others like young Lewis Whitesides and his new wife Susannah Perkins, left their 160-acre Iowa farm in Council Bluffs to join his sister and brother-in-law, Mary and Edward Hunter, in Kaysville, settling along Holmes or Fiddler’s Creek in the fall of 1852. Cows played an important part of Lewis’s income. His son Ed later recalled, “Father carried on a barter with the emigrants going to California. He traded them fat cattle for their poor ones to his advantage until he had a good-sized herd of cattle. In fact, everything he had was in cattle.”224

Given the conflicts in Utah Valley, Brigham Young strongly encouraged settlers to congregate into forted villages. As was the case in American Fork, once surveyed and gridded, the fort became the focal point for the new settlement. Because there was no imminent threat from Native Americans in the area, Kay’s Ward started constructing their fort only after serious prodding from church hierarchy.225 Even then, settlers never bothered to complete the fort, though in 1854 Jesse Fox arrived to survey Kay’s Ward into
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the traditional Mormon grid. Those who lived on the outskirts of town disregarded
council to move into the fort, choosing instead to remain on their farms. Unlike American
Fork, Layton, because it was considered to be part of Kay’s Ward, was never platted into
a grid. Its roadways spidered and crisscrossed at will as cabins hugged the canyon creeks.
As one local historian explained, “There was no division of lands. A settler came in, saw
a tract of land that suited him, and if not already occupied, took it up by fencing and
living on it.” This independent spirit exasperated church leaders long after Indian
troubles subsided. In 1863, after settlers voted to change their town’s name to Freedom,
Brigham Young remarked, “Freedom is a good name. It may mean a good deal, but just
now I am wondering—just when [Kay’s] Ward got its freedom.” Citizens eventually
acquiesced and in 1868 the settlement incorporated as Kaysville.

In the mid 1860s, when federal surveyors returned to Utah, Mormon farmers like
Lewis Whitesides felt threatened. They were, after all, technically squatters. Mormon
legal claims to the land appeared increasingly precarious, especially to church leaders,
prompting a particularly vitriolic remark from Brigham Young in August 1866. “We
have not been broken up, as has been anticipated, by military force, and now it is
expected that a course of lawsuits will accomplish what the military failed to do. I will
say one thing to my friends, or to my enemies as they may consider themselves…if you
undertake to drive a stake in my garden with an intention to jump my claim, there will be
a fight before you get it; if you come within an enclosure of mine with any such intent, I
will send you home, God being my helper. You can occupy and build where you please,
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but let our claims alone. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in taking out the waters of our mountain streams, fencing in farms and improving the country, and we cannot tamely suffer strangers, who have not spent one day’s labor to make these improvements, to wrest our homesteads out of our hands.”

When the Land Office at last opened in 1868, Mormons began filing on their holdings through the Homestead Act. But even this route proved problematic. Under the Homestead Act, claimants had to live on their land for five consecutive years, making their claim productive through cultivation and other means. Under these stipulations, Mormons clearly improved their land, but they generally lived in town, traveling to and from their fields each day. For Mormons living in places like American Fork, the residency requirement made it difficult for them to prove up on their land claims. As Lawrence B. Lee explains, “If the federal officials were not understanding in their attitudes, the faithful ran the risk of perjury prosecutions.” William Clayton, the church-appointed liaison to the Land Office who helped fellow Mormons prove up on their claims, suggested members take a wagon or two out to their farms and camp for a few days. This way they could technically say they had occupied their land claim. Ironically, because Layton farmers already lived on their land, they may have been able to acquire legal title much more quickly. On the flip side, because settlement there had occurred on a more ad hoc basis, the original land surveys did not match the later federal one, causing serious boundary incongruities. So as to preserve brotherly unity (and most likely not attract federal attention), Apostles Franklin D. Richards and Brigham Young Jr.

persuaded the community to iron out their difficulties peacefully, outside the courtroom. “The Apostles…talked to the people on the principles of forbearance, mutual accommodation, brotherhood and charity, and the whole body agreed to abide by the government lines without regard to personal consequences.” The *Deseret News* editorial continued, “Some fences, no doubt, and perhaps other improvements will have to be shifted, causing some inconvenience and expense; but good feeling and amity will be preserved, which are of far more value than property.” 229 Eventually the 1878 Desert Land Act, in which irrigation works could be used in place of the residency requirement, proved a more effective vehicle for Mormons to acquire legal land titles.230

Federal surveying activities also directly impacted Native Americans. In a tragic irony, as Mormons sought legally to establish their own land rights, they and government agents systematically removed Native Americans from the Wasatch Front, placing them onto reservations. In 1864, Commissioner of Indian Affairs for Utah Territory, James F. Doty requested Congress make good on earlier promises in 1861 to establish a “permanent reservation of Uintah Valley as a home for the Indians of Utah.” The only obstacle in the path to creating such a reserve was “accurately surveyed lines, so that, by the exclusion of whites from the Indians may be left in undisturbed possession.” The proposed reservation was to be located in the eastern part of the territory, “the whole


region traversed and drained by the Uintah River.” 231 Within the next twenty years, most of Utah Valley’s Ute bands had been relocated to the Uintah Valley reservation, a place Brigham Young described as being “one vast contiguity of waste and measurably valueless, except for nomadic purposes, hunting grounds for Indians and to hold the world together.” 232

The fate of Kaysville-Layton’s Weber Utes or Cumumbahs is less certain. Claude T. Barnes, who was born in 1884 and grew up in Kaysville, recalled several encounters with Native Americans. His mother, Emily Stewart Barnes, frequently provided them with food and clothing, forming long lasting relationships with “the daughters and grandchildren” of Cumumbah women she knew as a young woman. “She knew all their names,” Claude recalled.233 Born in 1895, Miriam Renstrom Whitesides grew up in the nearby Weber Canyon hamlet of Huntsville. She eagerly anticipated the arrival of the Cumumbahs each summer when they came to town to trade--“moccasins, gloves and bright-colored beads.” Miriam recalled, “We watched them pile out of their wagons, pots,
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pans and children. Tents with poles tightened down fast.” Then one summer, she writes, they never came back. “They were driven from us far away to reservations.”

According to Julian Steward’s 1938 ethnography, the Cumumbahs may have been placed on the Goshute Skull Valley Indian Reservation in the desert southwest of the Great Salt Lake. Steward explains, “Several Gosiute [sic] informants explained that Weber Ute lived also in the vicinity of Salt Lake City and ranged west to Gosiute territory in Skull Valley and that their language was identical with that of the Gosiute, that is, with Shoshoni.” The two Goshute reservations were not established until 1912 and 1914, which may explain Miriam’s childhood memories.

When Joseph Smith imagined Mormon urbanism, he did so in the context of antebellum industrialization, rampant speculation, and town building. He planned his cities so that they overlooked major rivers and waterways. These natural surroundings played an essential role in his developing sense of prophetic mission. The Mississippi River brought new converts from the British Isles even as it teemed with Mormon industry and ingenuity. Joseph made sure his temple was the first structure people saw as they rounded the river’s bend. When he introduced his doctrine of baptism for the dead, people eagerly flocked to the banks of the Mississippi to perform the ordinance. And
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when the Mormons abandoned Nauvoo in early 1845, the river miraculously froze, which allowed them to drive their teams across a thick road of ice instead of braving unsteady river barges. The natural phenomenon recalled the story of Exodus when the Red Sea opened and the Israelites escaped Egypt on dry ground.

Once safely in the Salt Lake Valley, Mormons continued to situate their cities and settlements with an eye toward their natural settings. The mountains, whose own history stretched back millions of years, overshadowed the Salt Lake Valley and served as protective ramparts against Gentile aggression. The Great Salt Lake and Utah Lake, threaded together by the aptly named Jordan River established the parameters for America’s new Holy Land, which, as a modern Israel, the Mormons claimed for their own. Yet in establishing settlements, the Mormons encountered local Native American tribes—the Ute Timpanogots and Shoshone Cumumbahs, whose presence drastically affected Mormon settlement location and city layout. Joseph Smith’s dreams of creating a holy alliance between Mormons and Native Americans far away in the Rocky Mountains never materialized. Searching for additional pasturage for their cows, Mormons competed with Native Americans for grassland and water resources. Native American removal from the Wasatch Front kept pace with Mormon surveys and settlement expansion. In response to Timpanogot aggression in Utah Valley, Brigham Young encouraged new settlements to “fort up.” Later as the Indian threat diminished, settlers continued to live in the center of town and walk to their fields each day. In contrast, because of the lack of a serious Indian threat, settlers in Layton never moved into town. Kaysville’s fort was only partially complete when Jesse Fox came out to survey and grid the new settlement. In the end, it was through these surveys that Mormons formally claimed their promised
inheritances, removed indigenous peoples, and established the Wasatch Front as a tight urban-agrarian corridor.

By the end of his life, the Wasatch Front was a very different place than when Jesse Fox first took up surveying in the early 1850s. It was still overwhelmingly agrarian, but not exactly rural. In 1882, Railroad travel writer George Ferris wrote, “The country between Ogden and the Mormon metropolis is quite thickly settled, and the train stops at four Mormon villages.” Even Jesse commented on the new landscape in a letter to his stepson, Matthias Cowley, “Utah is being cut up into rail roads in all directions.” Adding, “But I do not take much interest in railroads. My interest is more in canals, to make homes for the Saints.” Besides, it wasn’t railroads Brigham Young saw when he first arrived in the valley, Fox reminded Cowley, but a carefully integrated network of canals feeding the vibrant strip of settlements whose balanced urban agrarianism fostered spiritual and temporal well-being.

Jesse Fox died April 1, 1894, the day after his seventy-fifth birthday. He spent most of the day celebrating with family and friends in Salt Lake City before catching the Bamberger, an interurban railroad, for Bountiful where his second wife lived. But Jesse spent too much time saying his good-byes and in the end had to run to catch the train. His heart still racing when he got off at Bountiful, Jesse’s family called for the doctor. Nothing could be done and he died the next day. At his funeral, held in the Assembly Hall on Temple Square later that week, Mormon Apostle Franklin D. Richards stated, “I
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can not help but feel that if Brother Fox should still be a surveyor when he takes up this
tabernacle again, and should have to do with running off some of the stakes and
boundaries and metes of the inheritances of the righteous, I would as leif he would run
the chain and set the stakes for my inheritance as any man I know of.”
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CHAPTER 4

THE NEW MORMON VILLAGE

Out of the desert…and out of the communities reared under irrigation will come men who, confident that it is best, can unflinchingly consider their neighbors’ interests with their own; and who, therefore, can assume leadership in the advancing of a civilization based upon order and equal rights.

--John A. Widtsoe, 1920

In the summer of 1856 drought and grasshoppers threatened Wasatch Front villages with famine. Fish from Utah Lake and the Jordan River saved settlers from starvation, so much so that some began paying their tithes in fish. Speaking to a congregation at the Salt Lake Bowery in early June, Brigham Young reprimanded settlers for wasting water and then proceeded to share his comprehensive vision for storing and distributing the region’s waters. “We expect to make a canal on the west side of Jordan, and take this water along the east base of the west mountains, as there is more farming land on the west side of that river than on the east. When that work is accomplished we shall continue our exertions, until the Provo River runs to this city. We intend to bring it around the point of the mountain to Little Cottonwood, from that to Big Cottonwood, and lead its waters upon all the land from Provo Canyon to this city.” The dream extended north of the Salt Lake Valley to encompass the Weber and Bear River watersheds. “There is plenty of water flowing down these canyons in crystal streams as pure as the breezes of Zion, and it is our business to use them,” Young emphasized. Why should the saints pray for rain when there was more than enough of water to be had in diverting mountain

---

streams and rivers? “I do not feel disposed to ask the Lord to do for me what I can do for myself.”

Brigham Young’s overarching message could not have been more clear: redemption rested on harnessing the region’s rivers and streams to build cities and cultivate farms able to support a growing population of saints. While farming served as the foundation for thrifty self-reliance, canal construction enhanced communal cooperation. “Our preaching to you from Sabbath to Sabbath, sending the Gospel to the nations, gathering the people, opening farms, making needed improvements and building cities, all pertain to salvation. The Gospel is designed to gather a people that will be of one heart and of one mind,” Brigham reminded the congregation. Yet the economic system Young encouraged was not entirely devoid of capitalist individualism, provided resources were shared and utilized for the benefit of building the Kingdom. “Let every man and woman be industrious, prudent, and economical in their acts and feelings, and while gathering to themselves, let each one strive to identify his or her interests with the interest of this community, with those of their neighbor and neighborhood, let them seek the happiness and welfare in that of all, and we will be blessed and prospered.”

Brigham Young’s vision reached its full fruition only in the early twentieth century, when, following an onslaught of anti polygamy legislation many church-held industries were parceled out to trusted, well-connected Mormon men. As historian
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Thomas Alexander writes, this blend of “cooperative tradition coupled with the waxing of an individualism modeled on the norms of Victorian America” enhanced Mormon creativity, allowing “church members to support both public and private social action and hold the somewhat contradictory ideals of cooperation and corporate capitalism at the same time.” Such an approach had significant consequences for Mormon urbanism. Drawing on earlier nineteenth century models of Mormon community building and business ethics, men like Jesse Knight from Provo and E. P. Ellison from Layton formed a partnership, investing in irrigation structures, canneries, and railroads. Through their efforts available farming acreage expanded along the Wasatch Front, making possible a transition from subsistence to commercial agriculture that breathed new life into otherwise struggling Mormon villages, and laid the foundation for future suburbanization in the region.

The last few chapters have been about Mormon city building and pioneer settlement patterns. This chapter focuses on the development of Mormon agribusiness along the Wasatch Front and especially the irrigation structures that supported it, arguing that the quintessential Mormon village of the early twentieth century, a product of both Mormon and non-Mormon capital, was a deeply conflicted place. Church hierarchy was
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worried about members who left the core, abandoning the village to live on isolated ranches and homesteads. Later they were concerned about maintaining the village’s agrarian ethics in the face of increasing urban interconnectivity that they themselves had encouraged. In the end, despite the increase in water, farm acreages remained small, requiring farmers to lease or purchase multiple properties. During the Depression conditions of the 1930s, it became apparent that farming along the Wasatch Front offered no sustainable future. State planners and even church leaders used water and transportation resources to help attract military-related industries to the region, ironically using the wholesome Mormon village image to bring additional development to the area.

Jesse Knight and Ephraim P. Ellison, two men who helped transform the Wasatch Front into a bustling corridor of small commercial farms, were products of the nineteenth century Mormon farming and cooperative ethic. In 1856 when Brigham Young articulated his vision for an irrigated Mormon empire, eleven-year-old Jesse Knight probably spent the summer hunting pigweeds and sego lily roots to help keep his family alive. Later that winter he hauled wood. The next year when he moved with his widowed mother and siblings to Provo, he took up cattle herding and potato harvesting. The Ellison family in Davis County likewise felt the pinch of hard times in 1856. John helped save the community’s oat crop from ravenous locusts by “building bonfires of sage brush around three sides of the field.” His six-year-old son, Ephraim Peter, or E. P. as he would later be known, remembered feeling hungry. Like the Knights, the Ellisons subsisted on
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“sego lily roots, parsnips and onions.”

Both Knight and Ellison grew up understanding the connection between irrigation and Mormonism’s gospel of thrift and mutual interdependence. They also witnessed the precarious nature of agriculture along the Wasatch Front and hoped to ameliorate it by introducing necessary water infrastructures and industries to make it economically sustainable.

Throughout the 1850s and 1860s Mormon farms remained small, averaging between forty and eighty acres, and generally operated on a subsistence basis. Local irrigation associations relied on seasonal stream flow and used existing landforms for the placement of canals, brush dams, and small earthen reservoirs. At least as early as 1849 settlers in the Salt Lake Valley began using Utah Lake as a natural reservoir, catching and storing water, which they then siphoned from the Jordan River for use on their farms. Landform features also impacted the organization of irrigation companies. For instance because portions of Utah Valley’s east bench rises abruptly over the valley floor, communities responded by creating separate associations to oversee detached lateral systems—one set brought water to the lowlands, the other set irrigated the benches. Early irrigators constructed canals along streams as they emptied out of the nearby canyons. These river bottoms were often steep and narrow and made ideal
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locations for canals and brush dams.\textsuperscript{249} Canals and laterals turned and twisted, following the natural contours of the land. One publication noted, “A simple scheme was to fill a pan full of water and then sight over the edges along the proposed route. Some distance ahead a so-called poleman would carry a pole on which was marked the height of the top of the pan. Bottles filled with water attached to a piece of square-edged timber and spirit levels were all used in the manner mentioned. By these instruments it was comparatively easy to tell whether the water would flow in the proposed canals.”\textsuperscript{250}

Slope and soil properties likewise affected how individual farmers irrigated. The 1891 publication \textit{Irrigation Statistics of the Territory of Utah} provides insights into typical water delivery methods. “Each field has little furrows, a foot or more apart, and parallel with each other, running either lengthwise or crosswise or diagonally across as the slope of the land requires. Into these furrows the water is turned, one or more at a time, as the quantity of water permits, until it has flowed nearly to the other end, when it is turned into the next furrow, and so on until all are watered.” Clay soil required special accommodation. Here farmers “[threw] up little embankments six inches high around separate plats of land that are of uniform level, and turn the water in until the plat is full to the top, when the water is drawn off to the next lower plat and so on to the end. This

enables the water to soak in more and so does the crop more good.”

Clay soil was found, more often than not, closer to shore lands and generally indicated a higher water table, making it somewhat easy to irrigate from artesian or flow wells. Water seeped through the gravel soil along the bench lands, puddling in lowland areas. Snowmelt “which fails to find its way into some of the streams must sink and collect somewhere,” the 1891 publication reasoned. “Beneath these valleys are subterranean lakes that would feed with a never-failing supply of water innumerable artesian wells.” Indeed, pump wells did provide water for lowland fields and farms, but most farmers continued to rely on surface flow rather than exploit tricky groundwater systems. Extensive irrigation along the benches often caused drainage problems for lowlanders. “Wherever the higher ditches crossed porous soil formations, seepage losses from the ditch itself were considerable. This water augmented that from excessive application, and water-logging of lower lands became proportionately rapid and serious,” George Stewart observed in 1923. “The town of Draper in Salt Lake County was moved some distance because the original low-lying farm land’s becoming water-logged.”

The completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 and the Utah Central Railroad a year later, dramatically altered these earlier agricultural practices. An 1871


Union Pacific travel guide contributed to the romanticism irrigated Mormon villages elicited. “Dreamy-looking valleys, buried in a rosy mist, and crowned by towering ranges of mountains—whose peaks, snow-capped even in the midsummer, soar above the clouds—are visible around us; while, on the left, lie well-cultivated arable lands, with orchards and gardens encircling the settlements of Kaysville, Farmington, Centerville, and Bountiful, and running along the base of the Wasatch range.”

By 1880, these villages were shipping their cereal and produce to mining towns in Nevada, Idaho, and Montana.

In reality, existing irrigation methods could not keep pace with growing market demands. Furthermore, the Mormon gathering severely taxed early irrigation networks. Under these structures only so much land could be brought under cultivation, which in turn limited the number of people who could successfully seek their inheritance in Zion. By the end of the summer, stream flow tapered off considerably, drastically reducing the growing season. Water concerns became especially pronounced when settlement moved away from the valley floor up onto the bench lands, which, because of their slope and significant soil permeability, required frequent irrigation. As Kaysville resident Henry Blood recalled, “The canyon streams were small, and except on the lower lands, near the outlets, were confined in deep-out gullies and channels, from which it
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seemed not convenient to bring out the water to the land. For this reason homes were first made on the moist, alluvial, and sometimes marshy lowlands…Later, when settlers began to come in more rapidly and the higher lands began to be settled, there were objections on the part of those first on the creeks to the using of the waters above.”

As early as the mid 1850s, Kaysville-Layton farmers attempted to solve this problem by constructing a canal to divert water from the Weber River south along the bench, but a sand ridge, a few miles north of town, proved too great an obstacle, leaving the Weber River to “continue to flow into the Salt Lake without being made subservient to the agricultural interests of the country, that would be materially enhanced by their application to its parched soil.” In May 1869 farmers attempted construction again, establishing the Kaysville and South Weber Irrigation Company. This time they had the backing of wealthy cattleman and farmer Christopher Layton. As Kaysville’s bishop, Layton contributed the most capital to the canal’s construction—he also had the most to gain. He recalled, “About this time a survey was made for a canal, which was called ‘Weber and Davis Co.’s Canal.’ I was one of the stockholders and put a number of men and teams to work on it. I sold some of the teams and let the men work it out in contracts on the canal, taking stock, thus their paying terms were easy and I became a large stock
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holder.” By 1881 workers had completed eighteen miles on the canal, effectively opening up an additional thirty thousand acres in Weber and Davis counties.

The Utah Valley towns of American Fork and Lehi further illustrate the complexities of Mormon irrigation practices along the Wasatch Front. In May 1864 American Fork’s bishop, Leonard E. Harrington, worked with Lehi and Pleasant Grove to construct a canal diverting water from the Provo River. “The canal this season will probably be so far advanced as to afford the first named settlement water enough for the advantage of the present crops, which will also, by another arrangement, increase at least one third the amount of water to the other two settlements drawn from the American Fork River,” the Deseret News predicted. “As the labor on the canal is extended from Pleasant Grove to American Fork City, the whole of the American Fork River will ultimately be directed to Lehi.” Jesse Fox oversaw the canal’s survey. Apparently work stalled and settlers living along the Provo Bench ended out purchasing the partially complete canal. During these years American Fork’s Union Irrigation Company oversaw much of the town’s water needs. At least through the 1880s stockholders (who included...

---


founders like Arza Adams, James Chipman, and William Greenwood) continued to meet in the American Fork meetinghouse.  

Numerous irrigation associations created redundant networks, further compromising effective water delivery in the area. Without reliable water supplies, many Wasatch Front farmers left. An 1889 irrigation report noted, “The canal system at Provo is typical of that at every large settlement whose old and small ditches have been enlarged and new ones built at higher and higher grades, finally resulting in long lines of parallel canals each covering a narrow strip of country and perhaps crossing each other and conducting the water with little economy and great expense to the others.” The report added, “In the north end of the Utah Lake Valley is the American Fork River and a few other streams whose waters are entirely taken out to supply the settlements of Battle Creek, Pleasant Grove, American Fork, and Lehi.” In 1905 the *Salt Lake Tribune* observed that Utah Valley’s shrinking water supply had “caused a feeling of unrest among the farmers and led many to move to a newer country, where the water supply is not only larger, but of a more permanent character.” Population movement worried church hierarchy because it threatened nineteenth century village traditions of close communalism and self-reliance.  

As early as 1882 the First Presidency expressed
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concern over “a spirit to spread far and wide out of sight and reach of the authorities of the Church.” A circular issued in December of that year impressed upon Mormons the need “to gather in villages, as has been our custom from the time of our earliest settlement in these mountain valleys.” This way church organizational structures would not be compromised and people could “cooperate for the good of all in financial and secular matters in making ditches, fencing fields, building bridges, and other necessary improvements.”

In many respects the only ones who fully benefited from the Mormon land tenure system along the Wasatch Front often happened to be polygamous men whose numerous land holdings, families, and astute business practices, and ecclesiastical positions contributed to their success. In her autobiography Annie Clark Tanner, who grew up in the Davis County town of Farmington, recalled that her father, polygamist Ezra Clark, created his own family cooperative. “There were many advantages in this family cooperative. Father was a man of many financial interests, which his large family of boys helped create. He was called by President Young to build a flourmill in Morgan, Weber County before the railroad was constructed in Utah…. In time, some of the family lived in Morgan. Some of my other brothers settled in Georgetown on the ranch in Bear Lake.” She added, “Bear Lake was a great cattle and dairy country. In the fall a load of cheese and a herd of beef cattle were brought down to the Salt Lake Valley ready for market. A
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wagonload of flour often came from Morgan.”

271 For his part Christopher Layton, whose capital helped construct the Weber and Davis County Canal, purchased a farm in the Kaysville area in the 1850s. “There was considerable emigration through Utah, and as I always kept a band of horses, I used to trade my fat horses for their poor ones (many of which after resting and being on pasture awhile, proved to be very good animals).”

Through the 1860s, he acquired additional land for his growing family (by 1870 he had eight wives) and tried his hand at dry farming the sand ridge in northern Davis County, which had proven so troublesome to canal builders a decade earlier. “To be sure, the wind at times was terrible and the sand cut off and destroyed much of the grain, but I never believed in giving up easily, and I persevered until I made a success of it,” Layton recorded. “Today it blossoms as the rose, and is covered with many comfortable homes, surrounded by lovely orchards.” His many enterprises and farms allowed him to comfortably provide for his families, and, in keeping with Mormonism’s communal traditions, offer work to the less fortunate. “Whenever I found a man trying to help himself I employed him at something, but I always despised an idler.” Deeply pragmatic, Layton looked for concrete returns—“the Lord always blesses those who help the poor, for I have proved it many a time.”

272 People began to refer to the area north of Kaysville as Layton, perhaps in honor of the man, but more likely because Christopher Layton and his sons owned most of the land.

Even with the backing of wealthy ecclesiastical leaders like Ezra Clark and Christopher Layton, Mormon farmers, like those living across the West, found they could
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not individually or collectively bring additional acreage under cultivation without substantial capital and investment. At the same time, with the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker Act in 1882, the federal government began cracking down on businesses and cooperatives owned by the LDS Church as part of its larger anti-polygamy crusade, severely limiting capital the church could invest in irrigation projects.273 In response, the church privatized most of its business holdings. As Thomas Alexander observes, “In essence, the Latter-day Saints transferred a religious attitude which had developed in response to nineteenth-century community enterprises to privately owned twentieth-century businesses in which majority ownership often vested outside the Latter-day Saint community.” 274

At the same time the LDS church hierarchy lost much of its financial ability to direct and fund irrigation projects, in 1888, two senators from Nevada and Colorado, William M. Stewart and Henry M. Teller, passed a resolution requesting the Secretary of Interior carry out a survey demarcating irrigable lands throughout the West. John Wesley Powell, then serving as director of the Geological Survey and whose exploration trip down the Colorado River a few years earlier had established his reputation, put forward a plan to not only identify irrigable lands, but also determine potential reservoir sites. The survey built on Powell’s previous 1879 Report on the Lands of the Arid Region of the United States, in which he suggested that only through “extensive and comprehensive

plans,” could additional lands be made productive. Later the 1902 Reclamation Act allowed for federal monies to be used in the construction of irrigation projects with the idea that water users would eventually repay all construction costs.

Utah water law also evolved during this period in ways that encouraged greater privatization. In 1865 the Utah Irrigation District Act provided a way by which county courts could, at the request of area residents, delineate irrigation districts able to tax all water users, not just landowners. “The irrigation districts of Utah were in reality cooperative organizations for canal construction,” George Thomas clarified in 1920. “Much of the canal construction had been done in Utah by voluntary cooperation but as is true in all social undertakings there had been a certain percentage of ‘slackers’ and the irrigation district plan proved an effective means of compelling such men to do their part in the construction of canals and dams.”

Although the 1865 law was repealed in 1897, many irrigation districts continued to function through 1909. At that point, a new law established a way to create additional districts, most likely so as to better work with the Bureau of Reclamation in funding irrigation construction projects. Furthermore an 1880 law no longer tied water rights directly to a piece of land, allowing rights to be bought and sold at will. “Soon after the law became effective many canals were
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organized as companies and collected the operation and maintenance expenses by an annual assessment upon the shares of the canal,” Thomas explained.279

The privatization of church holdings at the turn of the century and federal reclamation laws directly influenced Mormon urbanism and farming practices along the Wasatch Front, opening the region to commercial agriculture.280 As Mormon farmers and businessmen actively sought to bring water to their fields by creating irrigation companies and associations, they also constructed food-processing plants up and down the Wasatch Front. While individual businessmen often financed canning operations, the Mormon hierarchy hovered in the background, as outside capital constructed the interurban railroad lines that moved produce quickly and efficiently to markets in Salt Lake City.281 In 1898 when Charles Brough observed the dynamics of Utah’s developing commercial agricultural in his book *Irrigation in Utah*, he praised the region’s farmers and irrigators for encouraging self-reliance, thrift, and “the economic independence of the family unit.” In contrast to areas outside the state that paid “tribute to water monopolies in the form of rentals,” Utah farmers were “constructing and maintaining their own canals.” Furthermore, in an effort to make their small farms productive, Utah farmers
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diversified “the products of their farms to meet the demands for home consumption” and thus avoided “impoverishing the soil and glutting the market by raising a single crop.”

The relationship between church hierarchy and individual Mormon capitalists is illustrated in the partnership of Provo mining magnate Jesse Knight and Layton rancher and businessman E. P. Ellison. Born in Nauvoo in 1845 to early Mormon converts from New York, Newel and Lydia Knight, Jesse left his parent’s faith as a young man. Quick to notice and condemn hypocrisy of any kind, he observed, “Through my ignorance I looked at the actions of men rather than at the principles of Mormonism, believing that if people knew the Gospel was true they ought to be better.” It was only later, upon witnessing the miraculous healing of his two-year-old daughter that Jesse Knight returned to church. Like Christopher Layton, Jesse ran cattle near Payson at the southern end of Utah Valley, but he loved prospecting the nearby canyons more, and eventually struck it rich with his Humbug mine on the east side of Godiva mountain. Over time he increased his holdings by acquiring other claims in the Tintic district. Jesse believed that his devout faith was responsible for his exorbitant wealth. He felt an undeniable sense of responsibility and stewardship to help his church and provide employment for others. Commenting on the Humbug mine to his son, Knight observed, “We are going to have all the money that we want as soon as we are in a position to handle it properly. We will some day save the credit of the Church.” Jesse’s prophecy proved largely correct.
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During the 1890s federal persecution over polygamy placed the church in a precarious financial condition. In late 1896 Knight loaned the church $10,000.²⁸⁴ Between 1898 and his death in 1921, he donated at least $500,000 alone to Brigham Young University, paid for additions to the campus, and left the university with a $200,000 endowment.²⁸⁵

Through such actions Knight quickly became a trusted agent for the Mormon hierarchy and was known throughout the church as “Uncle Jesse.” Knight vertically integrated all of his many business and mining interests into the Knight Investment Company. Their holdings included the Knight Consolidated Power Company, a woolen mill, a coal company, and interests in the Utah Irrigation Company and Provo Reservoir Company, which sold shares of water and land to prospective Utah Valley farmers.²⁸⁶ On January 1, 1900 LDS church president, Lorenzo Snow gave an address that particularly impressed Knight. Snow saw the new century as one of promise and millennial peace, provided capitalists and laborers could set aside their differences and join together, ushering an era of unprecedented wealth and progress. In seeking “for the union of capital and labor,” Snow called on businessmen everywhere to “take the idle from the crowded centers of population and place them on the untilled areas that await the hand of industry. Unlock your vaults, unloose your purses, and embark in enterprises that will

²⁸⁴ Jesse William Knight, The Jesse Knight Family, 85.
²⁸⁶ William Knight, The Jesse Knight Family, 65-81; Francis W. Kirkham, “Some Facts About the Utah Lake Irrigation Co. and Provo Reservoir Co.” BYU Special Collections. Americana AC 901; Francis W. Kirkham, sales agent, “Irrigated Farm Lands in the Salt Lake Valley under the new canal of the Utah Lake Irrigation Co. near the line of the new Salt Lake and Utah Railroad, a modern electric interurban line.” BYU Special Collections AC 901. A1a no 29828.
give work to the unemployed.”287 Later that year, as if in compliance with Snow’s directives and at the suggestion of Apostle John W. Taylor, Knight bought 30,000 acres near Spring Coulee, not far from Cardston, Canada. After visiting his newly acquired properties in July 1901, Knight entered into a contract with the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company and the Alberta Railway & Irrigation Company, purchasing 226,000 more acres and constructing a sugar beet factory. By 1903, the town of Raymond, Canada, named after Jesse’s oldest son, boasted a population of 1,500—mostly young Mormon families from Utah “anxious to get a good location for a home.”288 Later church president Joseph F. Smith helped Knight select a suitable business partner and agent for handling his Canadian sugar interests, Ephraim P. Ellison from Layton.289

E. P. Ellison’s parents, John and Alice Ellison, were Mormon converts from England who arrived in Utah in 1852, eventually settling in Kaysville a year later when E. P. was only three years old. When he was eighteen, he worked hauling railroad ties to Union Pacific workers laying track in Weber Canyon. Around this time, as a way to accrue capital, E. P. and his brother Elijah purchased a threshing machine and hired their labor and machine out to other farmers in the area. Shortly after his marriage to Elizabeth Whitesides in January 1873, Ellison’s father helped him get started with a large herd of sheep and cows. Although the 1902 Biographical Record of Salt Lake City mentioned the Ellison brothers as being “among the large cattle owners of Davis County,” it was E. P.’s other commercial interests that most affected Layton residents. In 1882 a handful of
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prominent local farmers and businessmen grew tired of traveling to Kaysville for their mercantile goods and established a Farmers Union store. Stockholders, who included Christopher Layton and other early settlers, selected E. P. as treasurer and superintendent. In 1891 Ellison convinced other stockholders to construct a larger store. To insure support, Ellison purchased additional stock in the company, so that when the board met to cast their final vote, E. P. essentially owned Farmer’s Union.290

E. P.’s leadership in business spilled over into water. Previous efforts to build a canal diverting water from the Weber River had continued to run afoul. The Central Canal Company, organized in 1881, once again attempted the scheme, but lacked enough capital to continue. The company reorganized in 1884 as the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company (DWCCC), with Ellison, at least initially, only a minor stockholder. Nevertheless the reorganization proved successful; construction on the canal was completed in 1889 and additional branch canals followed in quick succession. The DWCCC, however, controlled only the river’s surplus water. When E. P. took over as vice-president in 1892, the company worked to remodel existing structures in the hopes of making them more efficient (Ellison’s Farmers Union supplied over half the lumber for new canal fluming). A few years later the company was looking to construct an earthen dam along East Canyon Creek, a major feeder into the Weber River.291 The September 1898 stockholders’ meeting in Ogden voted to borrow $50,000 from the Illinois Trust and Savings Bank. In return for mortgaging “the entire system of canals,

water works, water appropriations” to the Chicago firm, the DWCCC constructed one of
the most effective water storage systems along the Wasatch Front.\textsuperscript{292} It worked so well
that in 1900 the company raised the dam an extra 40 feet. In January of 1903 the \textit{Salt
Lake Tribune} reported that East Canyon reservoir “very materially increased the amount
of water available for use and brought new land under irrigation.” Through such projects,
the article contended, “hundreds of thousands of acres of the very richest land can be
brought under cultivation, the products of the soil doubled and quadrupled and the
business transacted increased correspondingly.”\textsuperscript{293} The reliable water supply most likely
prompted the creation of the Layton Water System, organized in January 1911 with the
express purpose of “furnishing water for irrigation, culinary and other purposes.”\textsuperscript{294}

Ellison’s power increased when he partnered with Jesse Knight. Knight’s sugar
beet factory in Raymond eventually closed in early 1914—most settlers in the area were
more interested in growing wheat than sugar beets.\textsuperscript{295} By this time Ellison had resigned
as manager for the Knight Sugar Company, but was still influential enough with Knight
to persuade him to move the defunct Raymond mill to Layton where “local farmers knew
about sugar beets; labor unions would not be a problem; and the factory would benefit
Utah people.”\textsuperscript{296} Davis County celebrated the relocation with a banquet at the town’s
Union hall where Ogden Judge H. H. Rolapp was on hand to deliver an address
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appropriately titled, “What the Sugar Beet has done for Utah.” The plant opened in time for that year’s beet harvest, processing “500 tons of beets every 24 hours.”

Canneries and sugar factories needed just as much water as cropland. In late December 1916 the Layton sugar factory had to close because snow drifts blocked portions of the Davis and Weber canal, creating an ice dam that took days to break through and cost the factory $2500. “The syrup on hand is being worked up, but the slicing of beets has stopped,” the Ogden Standard reported. A year later, Layton Sugar began construction on a pipeline bringing water from nearby Holmes Creek reservoir directly to the factory. In a letter to her son Emil, Mary Whitesides commented, “The trenching machine is working east up the new road now.” Additional projects followed. In 1925 the DWCC, again headed by Ellison, created an entirely new entity, the Weber River Water Users, which partnered with the Bureau of Reclamation to construct an additional dam along the Weber River. Finished in 1930, Echo Dam not only promised more water to Layton farmers but also to those in American Fork—a diversion canal looped around behind the Wasatch Mountains feeding water from the Weber River into the Provo.

Ever since their introduction to the Wasatch Front in the late 1880s, cannery moderated and to some extent controlled the growing commercial agriculture that
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dominated the lives of people living in towns like Layton and American Fork, including what they grew and when and how much pay they received. Canneries came to be an important source of supplemental employment for farm families, especially for young women who did much of the work at the canneries. In fact the 1884 *Utah Gazetteer* specifically noted, “The care of fruit, as a rule, falls to the lot of women and children, the work not being heavy, nor the orchards very large, though they are great in number.”

At the Pleasant Grove Cannery, bean pods were “carefully handled by a girl, who breaks off the stem and if they have any strings these are removed.” The *American Fork Citizen* continued, “They are then put in a cutter where they are cut automatically into one inch lengths and any foreign substance is taken out. One girl can easily handle this machine.” In a 1973 oral history interview, Charles Walker from American Fork recalled that during the winter “men from all over this valley were employed [at the Lehi Sugar Factory] and they paid a little better wage than they could get doing something else. They worked twelve hours a day, but they got paid pretty well for that time. The factory continued to run from the time the beets were harvested until early spring. It might furnish a farmer who had no other source of income for the winter a job for three or four months. This would really help the family out.”

Generally in early spring, companies contracted farmers for their produce and established pricing. “This is done on the acreage basis, exactly as sugar beets are
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contracted for, and the same applies to other vegetables. Fruit is bought in the orchards. The price paid for gathering fruit varies in different localities,” Albert Philips indicated in his 1903 special for the *Salt Lake Tribune*. In 1916, though, farmers confronted the three principle sugar factories doing business in the area—the Utah-Idaho Sugar company, the Amalgamated Sugar company, and the Layton sugar company—demanding at least $7 per ton for their sugar beets. The farmers requested, among other things, “better unloading facilities,” the ability to begin their harvest as early as October 1, and that “local field men and weighmasters” be employed. “All present were agreed that in the past there had been too much ill feeling and misunderstanding between the growers and the sugar companies and that in future their aim should be in a spirit of fairness to both sides, to co-operate and build, rather than misunderstand and tear down,” the printed report concluded.\(^{304}\)

Other farmers like Robert Brown’s father from American Fork took his produce directly to Salt Lake City. “My dad used to load his covered wagon up and start up at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning and go to Salt Lake with seventy-five bushels of potatoes, onions, and stuff. He would pedal all over Salt Lake City.” When Robert’s father died suddenly in 1913, Robert had to help provide for the family. For a time he and his brother worked for other farmers. “Later I went up to the Utah Pickle Company and talked to Mr. Leelander who was the founder and manager of the place,” Robert related, “I talked him into letting me raise cauliflower for his pickles and cabbage for his sauerkraut. I got a contract with him and my brother and I used to raise as high as 700 tons of cabbage

\(^{304}\) “Farmers request a minimum scale of $7 for beets,” *Ogden Standard*, December 6, 1916.
which I mainly hauled on my truck.” The plant was north of American Fork in Murray and Robert and his brother had to make multiple trips. “We made four trips a day and three the next…I got the first load up there in the morning before their crew got there and I would have to unload that by myself. I would unload one cabbage at a time and there were close to four ton.” Robert later claimed to have been one of the first farmers in American Fork to raise pole beans and lima beans. “My brother raised twenty-seven hundred pounds of lima beans on an acre,” Brown recalled. “The resident of Hunt’s Canning Company came down and went through these lima beans. He said that was unheard of.” Robert attributed his farm’s success to the land’s close proximity to American Fork Creek. “In those days the creek used to flood all that ground and bring down that mountain soil. The other soil is three to five feet deep and we had one foot deep of mountain soil mixed in with it. By the time we fertilized it the way we did every year, it was rich soil. It would out produce by two any ordinary ground…I used to haul 100 to 150 loads of chicken litter from Draper and other places.”

Reliable railroad networks formed a crucial component to the success of the Wasatch Front’s developing commercial agriculture. The Bamberger and the Orem (officially incorporated as the Salt Lake and Utah Electric Interurban Railroad), two interurban electric railways constructed in the nineteen teens, were especially important. While the lines established an urban interface that made for easy travel up and down the Front, they also provided reasonably priced freight service for farmers. Non-Mormons

established both railroads. Simon Bamberger, who was Jewish, later served a successful term as Utah’s fourth governor; Walter C. Orem was a Baptist from Missouri whose interests in railroads complimented his already successful career in mining. (Orem reportedly quipped, “I’m the best Mormon that never joined the church!”) The Orem line in particular marketed itself as a freight line. “Within a short time…it will be possible for the farmer to get his products to the Salt Lake market earlier, more quickly, more cheaply and better than it has ever been before. As the road passes the Lehi sugar factory it will enable the beet raiser to ship his beets at a lower cost and is expected to add materially to the advancement of that industry,” a 1914 newspaper article pointed out. Later that year when Lehi initiated plans to construct a new canning factory, the Orem line donated the property, offering to install “all necessary spur tracks, switches, etc. free of any charge.” Brigham City citizens, on the northern end of the Wasatch Front, carefully observed these developments, astutely noting, “Three canning factories, one evaporator and a cider mill will be in operation when the season is open next year.” The Orem railway, the Brigham City newspaper declared, was “an important factor in bringing about the establishment of these industries.”

With the presence of the interurban lines, Salt Lake City became the central redistributing hub for Wasatch Front produce coming from towns like American Fork and

---

306 Salt Lake & Utah Rail Road (Orem Line) time table, July 1, 1937. Brigham Young University Special Collections. AC 901 .A1 no. 2426.
307 Provo Herald June 13, 1982, Walter C. Orem Papers MSS 6 Box 1 Folder 1, Brigham Young University Special Collections.
308 “Orem Road Taps Rich Farming Area,” The Herald Republican, April 2, 1914; unknown paper dated November 11, 1914. Walter C. Orem Papers, Brigham young University Special Collections, Mss 6 Box 1 Folders 1, 2.
309 Brigham City, December 10, 1914. W. C. Orem Papers, Brigham Young University Special Collections, MSS 6 Box 1 Folder 2.
Layton, a point Chauncy Harris observed in his 1940 dissertation, “Salt Lake City, a Regional Capital.” Harris especially noted the role railroads played in connecting Wasatch Front farmers with markets outside the state. “More than a hundred spurs within the zone act as the capillaries in the freight circulation system,” Harris explained. “The wholesale and manufacturing concerns attached to these spurs tap strong commodity flows, segregate and process them, and direct numerous smaller streams into city and region by railway and highway.” Furthermore Salt Lake’s Growers’ Market, located “southwest of West Temple and Fourth South” was a hive of activity. In 1935 the city’s 407 wholesale outlets brought in a combined 100 million dollars. “The market and adjacent streets contain about 30 produce dealers engaged in assembly or distribution. Auxiliary agencies such as telegraph services, box and crate companies, and refrigerator transport representatives are connected with the market,” Harris described.

Thus, by the 1920s, the new Mormon village E. P. Ellison and Jesse Knight had helped to create blended nineteenth-century Mormon urban models of communalism and self-reliance with twentieth century commercial capitalism. Through irrigation and rail networks, largely financed by non-Mormon investment capital, Mormon villages became part of an integrated Wasatch Front urban corridor. Strategically placed canneries functioned as visible reminders of the new village structure. Moreover, as the WPA’s Utah: A Guide to the State reported, “There are some 30,000 farms in Utah, about half of which are in the six counties adjacent to Salt Lake City. Because of this concentration, in
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reach of electrical lines, Utah is fifth in the nation in percentage of farm homes wired for electricity. This hardly presents a picture of a traditional rural, agricultural hinterland. Some might even call it the beginnings of agrarian sprawl.

By the 1930s, however, the village system was deeply in trouble. Agriculture struggled following World War I as post war markets dried up. As historian Thomas Alexander observes, “The depression of the early 1920s was a part of the price Utahans paid for shifting resources to marginal mining, manufacturing, and agricultural enterprises during the war.” Alexander continues, “Even more serious for the future of Utah agriculture was the fact that capital invested in farms began to decline in absolute and relative amounts.” Land values purchased at inflated prices during the nineteen teens fell significantly and did not return to pre World War I levels until the 1940s and 1950s. In many respects Utah’s depressed agricultural conditions followed national trends, but the Wasatch Front’s unique land tenure system of small farms and fields made recovery particularly difficult. Rural sociologist Lowry Nelson traced the Wasatch Front’s small farms back to initial Mormon settlement patterns. “The fact that the Mormons came in large organized bodies and literally settled the land in communities rather than by individual settlement created almost immediately a ‘scarcity’ in both land
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and water. In the early years of settlement, in order that each family could share in the available land and water, small holdings were essential.” Nelson furthermore contended that this type of land tenure system, connected as it was to a village center, explained why a significant percentage of the state’s population was listed as “urban-farm” on the 1930 census—higher than any other state in the union. Nelson did observe that the growth of commercial agriculture encouraged “a steady increase in the size of farms in Utah,” noting, however, that this was generally done by owning or renting several plots scattered across an area rather than acquiring large, single swaths of land.316

Nelson’s observations were born out by George Stewart’s 1923 agricultural bulletin “A Farm Management Study of the Great Salt Lake Valley” and Owen Morrell Clark’s 1936 Master’s thesis, “Economic Aspects of agriculture in Davis County, Utah.” Looking at census data for 1910 and 1920, Stewart found that “the percentage of the total number of farms carrying mortgages in 1920 was just about double what it was in 1910. The farms of the surveyed areas are not only more heavily mortgaged, but more of them are so burdened.” This was an important point because Stewart found that larger farms were substantially more productive than smaller ones. “It is apparent, however, that the farm operator of less than 50 acres should thoroughly investigate every reasonable opportunity for increasing the size of his farm. Renting additional acreage as he can profitably handle is probably the cheapest method of obtaining additional land.”317 Indeed, Owen Morrell Clark found in 1936 that farm sizes had decreased substantially

between 1920 and 1930 and that tenancy continued to increase, especially among “truck-gardeners and special-crop farmers.”

Utah’s depressed farming conditions during the 1920s and 1930s prompted deep introspection on the part of the Mormon hierarchy. On the one hand, church leaders continued to preach the benefits of agriculture. Church president Joseph F. Smith and other apostles likewise viewed growing urbanization and its attendant vices with alarm. Urban professionals and wage earners threatened the old urban/agrarian balance that Joseph Smith and Brigham Young extolled. In one public address from 1903, Joseph F. Smith, nephew of Mormonism’s founding prophet, counseled members to make sure their sons did not grow up to be lawyers. “I know of scarcely any employment more remunerative than is the practice of law…But what do they do to build up the country?” Smith questioned, consenting that though “there may be a few [lawyers] who have farms…the vast majority of them are leeches upon the body politic and are worthless as to the building up of any community.”

During the Depression, farming was a way to remain self-sufficient and free from government welfare. Joseph F. Smith’s successor, Heber J. Grant declared, “I believe firmly that the very best place in all the world to rear Latter-day Saints is on the farm, and that about the poorest place to rear Latter-day Saints is in the biggest city in which you can locate them. There seems to be strength, physical,
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moral and religious, which comes to those engaged in cultivating the soil which, on the average, is superior to that of any other occupation.”

Early church magazines like the *Contributor* and *Improvement Era* reinforced this message, focusing on self-reliance and the associated spiritual and temporal blessings members could reap by staying on their farms. In 1917 the church created the Home Bureau Department, which attempted to resettle urban members on farm lots outside the city. An article that appeared in the *Improvement Era* outlined the department’s goals: “Its purpose is to stimulate and encourage the ‘Get back to the Farm’ idea, a love for mother earth and husbandry, a means for an independent vocation, the ownership of land, and the providing of inheritances for the rising generations, to benefit the widow and her growing children, and to check as much as possible the increasing tendency of aged and dependent people who leave their humble homes in outlying districts to come to our larger cities, thus becoming dependent on others.” Once farmers “[drifted] to Salt Lake City” they often frittered away their savings on high food prices, ready-made clothes, and expensive entertainment. “They see their mistake, and want to get back to the farm. It is this class of men that the Home Bureau Department stands ever ready to assist.”

As late as 1940 Mormon Apostle J. Ruben Clark (ironically a lawyer) countered that the reason for continued drought and hard times was because members placed their faith on federal incentives and promises. “Why should the Lord bless the land we do not farm? Why should He give us water for the land we are not using,” Clark rhetorically asked.
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“Why should He bless us with His blessings when our reliance is put not in Him but on government gratuities for not working, for not farming, for not doing the things that have been man’s allotted part since Adam was driven from the Garden.”

However much church leaders attempted to recreate the Mormon village as a place ideal for gospel living, government planners facing economic depression and drought believed that Wasatch Front commercial agriculture was ultimately an unsustainable use of land and began searching for ways to diversify. The construction of the Ogden Arsenal just north of Layton in the early 1920s spelled the direction of the future. This general mood was further reflected in the mid 1930s when state planners looked to dike the Great Salt Lake in an attempt to create a freshwater bay west of Layton. The bay was designed primarily to store water for industrial development. J. O. Elton articulated the problem. “We have seen that Utah has reached her agricultural limit and that while there is lots of land there is no water for it. We have seen that the farmers cannot supply the needs of the industrial population required for the fabrication of our copper, lead and zinc, to say nothing of iron, aluminum, magnesium and chemical products.” He continued, “When this dike is completed we have been told that approximately 2½ million acre feet of fresh water will be available for industrial use. The fine thing about this industrial scheme is that industry cannot consume this water. It can use this water without diminishing it or losing it. It is a case where we can eat our pie and still have it.”

324 Quoted in Dyal, “Mormon Pursuit of the Agrarian Ideal,” 33.
J. Ruben Clark’s sermonizing aside, towards the end of the 1930s Mormon politicians and planners sought out federal projects and funding, hoping to shape the Wasatch Front into an intermountain industrial corridor. The onset of World War II only accelerated these efforts. In the late 1930s Mormon senator Abe Murdock from Beaver successfully brokered deals with what became the U.S. Air Force to use the Ogden Arsenal as a new aircraft training and repair base, renaming the site Hill Field in honor of Major Ployer P. Hill, who died in 1934 test flying one of the first B-17s. Likewise in 1941 Columbia Steel Company and U.S. Steel Corporation used federal funds to construct Geneva Steel works on the edge of Utah Lake. Columbia Steel already operated a pig iron plant at Irontown, near Springville. The Wasatch Front’s distance from the West Coast and access to transportation and rail routes made the location particularly attractive for defense purposes. “The response of people to the establishment of the various garrisons and plants depended in large part on the interests of those involved,” Thomas Alexander noted. In some cases locals protested construction because of the attendant loss in farm ground, but when army installations threatened to build plants elsewhere perspectives shifted dramatically. Those lobbying in favor of defense installations included Utah senators Elbert D. Thomas and Abe Murdock, governor Herbert Maw, and Mormon Apostle David O. McKay.
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Hill Field and the Geneva Steel plant dramatically changed local dynamics for residents living in Layton and American Fork. Both communities faced an influx of population. In 1942, Ed Whitesides, still active in Layton water affairs, petitioned the federal government about providing water to a new 400-unit war housing project constructed within city limits. A letter from the National Housing Agency office in San Francisco assured Whitesides that the government was, in fact, planning on constructing the system. Layton, though, would have to come up with a metering system and establish rate schedules. “In establishing such a rate it should be kept in mind that the Government is furnishing the entire on-site distribution system and mains necessary to transport the water to the site and additional reservoirs necessary to store water.”  

In 1943, when the Department of Publicity and Industrial Development began thinking about the post war Wasatch Front, the reality of these changes began to sink in. Commercial agriculture had actually led to serious underemployment. With significant acreage of former agricultural ground now in housing or under concrete, farmers would have to intensify cultivation all the more. More significantly, the department found that despite the influx of outsiders, “approximately two-thirds of all of the new jobs created in the area as a result of the war have been filled by Utah people. The population of Utah has been like a sponge in the manner in which it has been able to absorb many tens of thousands of new jobs while maintaining near normal employment in most of the old activities.” The report continued, “The new employment needs have been met by Utah people who were either unemployed or working on emergency relief projects, by a large
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reserve of unutilized women workers, by a considerable number of farmers who had much spare time on their hands, by people who were working on sub-marginal jobs of many kinds, by old and young people who had not been normally employed before and by a considerable number serving in two jobs at the same time.” 330 Leland Priday from American Fork best articulated the post war transition: “There has been one great change in the economy since Geneva came. A lot of people who went to work at Geneva had their farms. At the same time they just picked up a side job at Geneva. Now farming is their side job.” 331

More urbanization and industrialization required additional water resources. 332 As a later pamphlet published by the department of Publicity ascertained, “The task ahead is to bring the water to the land. The answer is reservoirs—and more reservoirs!” 333 Both the Weber Basin and the Provo River projects promised to increase water supplies for agriculture and growing urbanization. The projects had their origins in the 1930s when Utah faced severe drought-like conditions, but were put on hold during the war years. For instance, Utah Lake’s ability to act as a reservoir for Salt Lake County was seriously compromised, leading planners to look for reservoir sites along the Provo River. 334
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Davis County the need was exacerbated by post war growth and the desire to continue to maintain an industrial presence. “Davis and Weber counties are ideally situated for...industrial development, with four major railroads, two major airlines, and five U.S. highways to serve them and carry their products in all directions. This development, however, requires that an adequate water supply be developed for this expansion.” The Weber Basin Project involved the construction of several dams and reservoirs along the Ogden and Weber Rivers as well diking portions of the Great Salt Lake. The project promised to irrigate “more than 50,000 acres of new land and 24,000 acres now inadequately irrigated” and would provide “40,000 acre feet of supplemental water for municipal and industrial use” for Layton and other Weber and Davis county communities. The first dam was completed on May 9, 1957, but it would be another thirteen years before the entire project was in place. The Provo River Project, on the other hand, was completed with the intention of providing Salt Lake City with a sure municipal water supply. Its features included the construction of Deer Creek and Provo River reservoirs, several water diversion tunnels, and the Salt Lake Aqueduct. The project also extended and increased the Weber-Provo diversion canal, constructed much
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earlier as part of the Echo Dam project. Even with its completion in 1958, planners realized the Provo River Project would not be able indefinitely to supply Salt Lake and Utah counties with adequate water. Only through the Central Utah Project would Wasatch Front municipal water needs be fully satisfied, it was later argued.

As much as the Wasatch Front industrialized, during the immediate post war years planners continued to capitalize on the state’s agrarian image. This was particularly the case during Utah’s 1947 Centennial. That year planners and commissioners hoped to host a party of unparalleled grandeur, one that would attract the attention of the entire nation with its many events and activities. It was an opportunity to showcase the success of the Mormon experiment: watered agricultural valleys and cities made green and productive through Mormon industry and innovative irrigation networks and structures. Press attention remained overwhelmingly positive. It was as though the nation had both forgiven and forgotten Mormonism’s controversial past. Mormons now represented elements of quintessential American democratic traditions and dreams. The media likened them to the Pilgrim Fathers, who in seeking religious freedom had carved out a new promised land of freedom and progress. Furthermore, the 1940s Wasatch Front was overwhelmingly Anglo-European, a reflection of Mormonism’s pioneer period of gathering and emigration. Small family farms and villages seemed to exemplify honesty, thrift, and sobriety—values that made the region attractive to businesses. It was an image
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that the centennial commission carefully choreographed and marketed, ironically in the hopes of securing post-World War II industrial expansion and population dynamism.\textsuperscript{341}

The 1947 Centennial Publicity and Industrial Development department created a new state motto. Founded on agrarian values of integrity and hard work, “The Friendly State” was an ideal place to do business and raise families. While Mormon congregations dominated, promotional literature assured that Mormon meetinghouses were “modern, and are regularly attended by a loyal people.”\textsuperscript{342}

Layton chamber of commerce particularly capitalized on rural imagery as a way to attract residents. The pamphlet “Layton: Gateway to Hill Air Force Base,” characterized the town as a “quiet oasis in a bustling area” where “the loudest noise you’ll hear of a summer night…is the restful chirping of crickets.” Located twenty minutes from Salt Lake and only fifteen minutes from Ogden, Layton offered “country living” but not isolation. “Of an evening, one still looks out across green fields at fiery red sunsets mirrored in the Great Salt Lake, and enjoys the breath-taking vista of snow-capped peaks jutting into the sky.”\textsuperscript{343} Likewise the 1955 pamphlet “Your Plant Location Opportunities in Greater Utah Valley” touted Mormon village ethics and included a letter from L. F. Black, General Superintendent from Geneva Steel Mill. Noting that community’s “attitude, ability, ambition, thrift, and faith can spell success or failure to any industry, plant, or business concern,” Black heartily recommended the people of
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Utah Valley. “With a bare nucleus of employees with previous steel mill experience, we have developed a highly efficient working force, in spite of the fact that many of our present employees had little or no industrial experience.” The relatively young Mormon population was educated and was strong in their commitments to faith and family, creating a stable work force. Finally Mormon village living meant urban amenities in a rural setting. “Slums are unknown,” the pamphlet promised. “Cities and towns are spacious in area. Slums are unknown. Large lots provide opportunity for garden plots and beautiful yards. Home ownership with its accompanying pride and security is the rule.”

In 1947, centennial commission director Gus P. Backman told the *Milwaukee Journal*, “We want the country to be adequately informed of our history and our growth, and to be advised to expect Utah to emerge as a new western industrial giant within the next decade.” He continued, “Utah’s confidence in her future as a new center of western industry will be emphasized as a direct outgrowth of pioneer achievement,” the story articulated. It was not an altogether unrealistic reading of the past. Yet the irrigation networks that established and supported the Wasatch Front’s then vibrant agribusiness were all of fairly recent vintage, the product of second and third-generation Mormon capitalists—the very kind of men who would have served on centennial commission planning boards. As corporate individualism overtook communal theocracy, Kingdom
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building shifted. True, while the church retained an affiliation with certain industries (like sugar beets) and banking ventures, it increasingly relied on a growing cadre of professional men to oversee and run them and other related, though privately owned undertakings. Many of these men and their families were subsequently rewarded with either high ecclesiastical positions or enhanced status within the Mormon community. Often the two went hand in hand.

When Brigham Young presented his grand vision for tapping the vast waters of the Wasatch, little did he know that two of the men who would carry it out, Jesse Knight and E. P. Ellison, were starving children, subsisting on sego lilies and pig weed—hardly candidates to take on such a mission. Yet Brigham probably would not have been too surprised. “We will acknowledge that we are very ignorant, and that the Lord has taken the weak things of the world to confound the wisdom of the wise,” he observed in 1870. Taken from “the coal pits, from the ironworks, from the streets,” Mormons learned “how to organize the elements so as to subserve their own wants and necessities.”

As Brigham would have liked it, irrigation has long been associated with and celebrated as a unique Mormon landscape feature. And indeed there is much truth encased in this myth, but not in the way most would think. Irrigation has had far more to do with the Wasatch Front’s growing urbanization than watering fields of sugar beets (though it certainly did this). Without water, the new federal industries and suburbanization that dominated the Front following World War II never could have existed. Irrigation structures replaced natural stream flows with concrete canals and
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dams. Finger-like watercourses that once carved the land, linking mountain and lake in perpetual symbiosis, are now forever locked behind the Wasatch Mountains in a concrete web of dams and aqueducts. (Ironically though, in 1983 after a particularly wet spring, bench land homes sluffed off the mountainside as runoff retraced ancient routes.) Furthermore the arrival of Geneva Steel near American Fork and Layton’s new neighbor, Hill Air Force Base, not only altered these towns’ agrarian base, but severely contaminated water sources. By the end of the century, both locations had been listed as superfund sites. Thus the Mormon businessmen and farmers who initiated these changes not only strengthened preexisting urban networks, but also laid the groundwork for post-war development. Here were men who acted on their own initiative to create and expand the Wasatch Front’s industrial presence. The irrigation structures these men invested in and the federal industries they actively attracted significantly altered previous Mormon urban forms, paving the way for a new suburban existence.
CHAPTER 5

WASATCH FRONT SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT

In the vision of our minds we could see in the future comfortable and commodious houses for the people to dwell in, buildings for religious worship and education; temples, tabernacles, and academies.

--Brigham Young, 1862

Renee Whitesides was newly married with a small child when she saw her first suburban housing development south of Bountiful in the late 1950s. What she saw did not impress her. Renee had grown up in Provo. Her family relocated to Salt Lake City when she was in her late teens, moving into an older, but elegantly maintained, neighborhood near the University of Utah where her father taught and a few short miles from downtown shopping and cultural attractions. Renee’s mother had always patronized the corner grocer, picking up fresh meats and vegetables as they became available. Her family thought nothing of walking or utilizing readily available public transportation. In contrast, the Bountiful tract contained row upon row of tiny box houses, lacked any landscaping, and was far from an urban center. The uniformity was foreign and unattractive. Yet Renee and her husband Steve were hoping to buy a house. Steve had grown up in Kaysville, not far from his grandparents, Ed and Mary Whitesides in Layton. A childhood friend and second cousin, Jimmy Brough, was in the real estate business, busily developing his father, Ben Arlo Brough’s, farmlands into tidy tract neighborhoods. Renee and Steve contacted Brough about the possibility of purchasing a lot and building a house in north Kaysville, near where Steve taught elementary school and served in the

Reserves at Hill Air Force Base. Renee specifically remembered selecting the house plan and brick color. The “little yellow house” had three bedrooms, a living room, kitchen, and one bathroom.\textsuperscript{348} As soon as the Whitesides moved into their new home, they planted trees, the first in the neighborhood.\textsuperscript{349}

Renee and Steve Whitesides’s experience was typical of many young couples in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{350} Brough Subdivision was filled with families. Children canvassed the neighborhood and noisily played in each other’s back yards. The opportunity to build a house—even choose the color for the bricks—symbolized a couple’s sense of pride in their post war economic security and prosperity.\textsuperscript{351} As was the case elsewhere in the United States, suburban housing tracts along the Wasatch Front represented a new settlement type that forever altered existing Mormon landscape forms and functions. Since Joseph Smith’s City of Zion plat, Mormon urban traditions focused on redemption. Covenanted communalism and dedicated agrarianism promised the obedient spiritual and temporal blessings in Zion and helped prepare an earth and people ready for Christ’s second coming. Early twentieth-century commercial farming coexisted comfortably with the nineteenth century Mormon urban model. In partnering with non-Mormon investors and utilizing federal programs, Mormon capitalists helped keep the village system economically sustainable through the 1920s. As post World War II suburban housing
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tracts began replacing Wasatch Front farmland, the Mormon urban ideal of redemption focused increasingly on building faithful families. In many respects, Mormons saw suburbs in much the same way other Americans did. As historian Robert Fishman observes, suburbs offered “complex and compelling visions of the modern family freed from the corruption of the city, restored to harmony with nature, endowed with wealth and independence, yet protected by a close-knit, stable community.”

While much of Wasatch Front suburban spaces can be related back to prior land use traditions, Utah’s federally financed Interstate 15 is largely responsible for current development patterns. In an odd way, the federally planned and funded I-15 fits in well as a Mormon cultural landscape feature—sort of a concrete capstone to Mormon road building traditions and the faith’s contested relationship with the federal government and outside capital in general. As was the case elsewhere in the nation, the interstate accelerated suburbanization along the Wasatch Front. Completed in the mid 1970s, the interstate runs from San Diego through Utah and Idaho and on to Sweetgrass, Montana, near the Canadian border. Nearly fifteen hundred miles long, I-15 is the United State’s fourth longest north-south interstate. The interstate visually altered the Wasatch Front in ways perhaps not seen since the transcontinental railroad first connected the Mormon Zion with the outside world a hundred years before. Given the Front’s unique
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geographical matrix, the interstate intensified development along the Front. Mormon
villages spaced a convenient ten to fifteen miles apart morphed into ideal bedroom
communities for commuters working in Salt Lake, Ogden, or Provo and real estate
development came to be seen as a lucrative way for Mormon men to earn money. Over
time the remaining agricultural land that separated these towns gradually filled with
houses, box stores, office space, and parking lots. Layton and American Fork joined the
single strip of urban space that was Kaysville, Centerville, and Bountiful; Lehi, Pleasant
Grove, and Lindon.

The interstate also subsidized the Wasatch Front’s sand and gravel industry, so
much so that by 1971 it was listed as “the most prevalent mining operation in the
state.”\textsuperscript{354} The sand and gravel used to construct Wasatch Front neighborhoods, churches,
and other urban infrastructure—including the interstate—has its origins in the generous
bench lands and alluvial fans, where it is excavated by the truckload. In 1996 the Beck
Street gravel pits north of Salt Lake City alone provided 80 percent of the sand and gravel
for construction projects at the Salt Lake International Airport.\textsuperscript{355} Many of these pits are
owned and operated by Mormon contractors and businessmen who have made their
fortunes repurposing mountainsides into meetinghouses.

More than anything else, though, the interstate heightened attention to Mormon
urbanism’s agrarian underpinnings. For a time the interstate even physically separated
residential development from agricultural land use: east of the interstate was largely in
homes; west of the interstate remained in agricultural use or unused pasture land. Interest

\textsuperscript{355} Beck Street Reclamation Framework and Foothill Area Plan (Salt Lake City and
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in preserving agricultural land increased during the 1970s when growing urbanization
and the nation-wide energy crisis created a context for conservation. Ironically, planning
councils like the Wasatch Front Regional Council and the Mountainlands Association of
Governments were formed during this period so the state would be eligible for additional
funding for infrastructure projects. While the councils emphasized the need to conserve
lands for agricultural use, by the 1970s significant shifts in land use priorities made it
difficult to make good on these plans.

Mormons have always built roads. Their inclination to gather required it. Between
1847 and 1869, the original Mormon Trail, which Interstate 80 now parallels, brought
countless converts to Zion. A whole trail culture supported it. In 1857 Brigham Young
established his short-lived Brigham Young Express and Carrying Company, which
attempted to create a network of supply stations stretching from Missouri to Salt Lake
City. The venture folded when federal troops marched on Salt Lake City, ostensibly
summoned there by Gentile territorial officials to put down a supposed Mormon
secession movement.\textsuperscript{356} Some Mormons made the trek across the plains multiple times,
either as missionaries traveling to and from “the field,” as they called it, or as trail guides,
picking up emigrant trains in Missouri and bringing them safely home to Zion.\textsuperscript{357} In
1864, eighteen-year-old Joseph Greenwood from American Fork volunteered to serve as
a night guard for an incoming emigrant train. On the way back to Utah, just forty miles
outside of Salt Lake, he caught a bad cold and died. His father, William Greenwood, who
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recorded the incident, saw in his son’s death the ultimate sacrifice. He solemnly recorded, “Thus he ended his youthful career in dutiful service in the Kingdom and gave his life in assisting to gather the Saints and build up the Kingdom.”

Road building commenced as soon as Mormons began settling their new homeland. Most of these roads were already there, game trails previously utilized by fur trappers and Native Americans. Trapper and explorer Jedediah Smith actually traversed the present route of Interstate 15 on his 1826 journey through southern Utah to California, ending near San Diego. Twenty years later the fated Donner-Reed party hewed out from dense hillside brush the very road Mormons first used to enter the Salt Lake Valley. Once the Mormons arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, they utilized these trails and routes to establish a workable road network. Ultimately the roads would link the Kingdom’s Wasatch Front urban core with its peripheral settlements, creating a corridor south to California and ultimately the Pacific. Ward bishops, in much the same way they oversaw canal building and ditch digging, assigned men to help construct and maintain the roads. The Mormon-run State of Deseret provided legislation for road construction, appointing Joseph L. Heywood as highway surveyor in March 1849. Later that summer, Parley P. Pratt described the main road connecting Ogden and Provo.
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as being “a good carriage road,” adding that “good frame bridges are already completed across many of the streams.”  

There were, of course, other roads besides Mormon ones. In 1848, California-bound emigrant Samuel Hensley created an alternative to Hastings cutoff, which wound around the north end of Great Salt Lake, crossing the Bear River and rejoining the California trail in southern Idaho near City of Rocks. Locals in Kaysville and Layton called it the Emigrant Road. A third road, now known as Highway 89, hugged the eastern bench lands. In Kaysville and Layton, residents still refer to it by its pioneer name, the Mountain Road. The federal government also played a crucial role in developing early Wasatch Front infrastructure. After General Albert Johnston arrived in 1857, he set his men surveying and constructing wagon roads crisscrossing the territory.

Between 1869 and 1909, however, when the state legislature created the Utah Roads Commission, most infrastructure development focused on railroads. During these years, territorial and state officials hardly mentioned roads at all. Ezra C. Knowlton, whose History of Highway Development in Utah remains the single authoritative source on the subject, contends that this attitude began to change when people began buying cars. Actually, as Knowlton points out, the nationwide Good Roads movement had its origins in the 1890s when people began riding bicycles, but automobile traffic certainly
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heightened a need for reliable roads. As Governor William Spry remarked in his opening remarks to the spring 1909 legislative session, “There has been considerable discussion of the improvement of our public roads, this subject will be one of the most important brought before you for consideration.” Spry advocated for a “uniform system of construction with the means of raising special road funds in the various counties.”

Yet for much of the nineteen teens, funding constraints limited road paving projects. This changed with the 1921 Federal Highway Act, which, much like the National Interstate and Defense Highways Act thirty-five years later, imagined the need for nationally integrated roadways. For Utah, with its high percentage of public lands, the Act promised to lessen the expenditure of local funds on any given paving project. “This lower rate of participation seemed to provide the incentive necessary to encourage the counties, after the new state bond funds available for matching purposes became exhausted, to furnish all the local share of financial participation,” Knowlton summarizes. As early as July 1920, the Road Commission began plans to pave the Wasatch Front’s main north-south highway. A year later, the American Fork Citizen announced, “Before the summer is over a strip of cement from Ogden to Payson [south of Provo] will probably be complete.”

The history of the National Interstate and Defense Highways Act has been told elsewhere, but for Utah’s Wasatch Front, increased federal funding for roads, like
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previous funding for water storage and dam building, could not have come at a more opportune time. The 1943 Salt Lake City Plan observed, “The war time expansion of population, labor force, and employment in the Wasatch Front probably has been greater in relation to pre-war conditions than in any other large industrial area in the Pacific Southwest, excepting the San Diego and San Francisco Bay area.” The plan continued: “Cities and towns in the area have spread so much in the past three years that the entire Wasatch Front is now more highly urbanized and far more closely knit than before.”370

The increased population pressured the region’s infrastructure. “The large number of war plants indicates a definite need for a wide road, free from local traffic, which will provide fast transportation between plants,” a second planning report declared.371 Aspects of this roadway infrastructure had been under pressure for some time, however. As early as 1945, the Road Commission began studying several routing options for a major high-speed highway. The only significant controversy over these plans came from Salt Lake City’s west side residents, who vehemently opposed the proposed highway route because it bisected and destroyed old neighborhoods.372 Other opposition came from farmers in rural parts of the state who, like Kleon Kerr from Tremonton in Box Elder County, voiced concerns over the interstate’s impact on farmland. In a 1958 letter to the editor, Kerr urged planners to wait to construct interstates in rural areas until traffic needs warranted it. “Other sections of the interstate system which have, according to reports,
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been postponed for 10 to 15 years are more important to interstate traffic flow than some of the farm sections now being considered for highway use.” Iron County citizens living in the south-central Utah town of Parowan expressed more pressing concerns. There, a strip of the proposed interstate route not only split farmlands but no less than eight irrigation streams would need rerouting to accommodate the new freeway.

The new interstate certainly spelled the end of interurban lines like the Bamberger Railroad, which had played such a crucial role in Wasatch Front commercial agriculture. During the 1950s the Bamberger was unable to compete with the increased numbers of automobiles. Bamberger stockholder reports first noticed a decline in passenger and freight traffic in 1947 and specifically attributed these declines to the “increase of new private automobiles.” As the 1952 report concluded, “The intense competition from highway trucks continues to take a large amount of freight formerly enjoyed by this company.” On September 6, 1952, the Bamberger made its last trip. Privately owned bus companies likewise cut services to a minimum so that by the early 1960s public transportation was all but dead—“an outdated system serving the low-income groups, the elderly, and children.” Vehicle registrations in Davis County for 1960 totaled 29,452.
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Ten years later these figures had nearly doubled. Initially few seemed to care that I-15 paved over some of Utah’s richest farmlands in Davis and Utah County. Instead, as a *Deseret News* editorial explained, most were concerned that the interstate would bypass smaller communities in favor of larger ones. In the end, though, it became a matter of advertising. “We must find ways to tell travelers and potential travelers what we have to offer.” The editorial concluded, “The freeway system is a blessing in many ways, and can be a blessing in even more ways if we have the imagination and energy to seize our opportunities.” By 1976, Kleon Kerr’s concerns notwithstanding, I-15 stretched past Brigham City to Tremonton, completing the Wasatch Front’s asphalt interface. “The freeway now has a durable concrete surface, laid down in one continuous application from shoulder to shoulder on each side of the highway.”

This “durable concrete surface” added a new element to the Wasatch Front’s Mormon landscape: white, sandy gravel pits. Construction contractors, many of whom were Mormons, quarried the interstate’s sand and gravel base from the Front’s generous hillsides. They made tremendous fortunes in supplying the ready-mix concrete and asphalt that interlaced Wasatch Front subdivisions, roads, and interstates. Of course aggregates had long been used as a construction material. When the Mormons first

---

378 “Citizen Goals and Policies Relating to a Comprehensive Plan for the Wasatch Front Region, Utah,” May 1973. Utah State University Merrill-Cazier Library Special Collections, Logan, Utah 109-110. These figures for Davis County are also mirrored in the “Average daily Vehicle Miles for all Vehicles.” In 1960 Davis County drivers drove an average of 680.2 miles. In 1970 they had driven an average of 1,225.8 miles.


arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, they immediately noticed the gravel at their feet.

According to Thomas Bullock the mountains offered more than enough building materials. “There is an ocean of stone…with which to build stone houses and walls for fencing.”\(^{381}\) Brigham Young believed that the “pebble stones that are so abundant here” could be used to fashion adobe houses, speculating that adobe mixed with gravel was “better than a brick house. For when you burn the clay to make brick, you destroy the life of it, it may last many years, but if the life is permitted to remain in it, it will last until it has become rock, and then begin to decay.”\(^{382}\) He envisioned the ideal city as having graveled streets and paved walks, “clean and nicely swept, and everything neat, nice and sweet.”\(^{383}\) As a result, small, communal gravel pits and limekiln operations opened and were used for limited construction needs.\(^{384}\)

With the turn of the century, more people began to use cement instead of lime for their construction projects. In the early 1900s, Portland cement plants were located up Weber Canyon near Devil’s Slide and Parley’s Canyon, southeast of Salt Lake City.\(^{385}\) In 1905, Utah plants shipped cement to Montana, Nevada, Colorado, Washington and Idaho. Cement also helped construct local projects: sugar factories, smelters, and city street and
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sidewalk paving.\textsuperscript{386} For the most part, through the early twentieth century, sand and gravel operations remained small, insignificant operations. “Loading by hand directly into a one horse cart or a two-horse wagon was not uncommon,” Robert Phillips observed in his Master’s thesis, “Utah Sand and Gravel Industry.” “It was said that one man could load from 8 to 18 yards in an eight hour day, lifting it from 8 to 10 feet.”\textsuperscript{387} Generally pits continued to be locally or individually owned and operated; the gravel was excavated only when people needed it. For example sand and gravel used in constructing the Hotel Utah was “furnished from the nearby hills by local men employing home men and home teams to haul them.”\textsuperscript{388} In 1913, Salt Lake City had plans to lease portions of P. J. Moran’s northeast bench land property to extract gravel for a citywide paving project.\textsuperscript{389} A few years later in 1916, convict labor used gravel “from Giles’ field near Riverdale,” and the sand from “the pit on White’s hill” to construct a cement roadway connecting Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber Counties.\textsuperscript{390} Not surprisingly, World War II construction projects and post war growth created unprecedented demand for sand and gravel, galvanizing aggregate extraction along the Wasatch Front. Local deposits undoubtedly lowered construction costs.\textsuperscript{391}

Utah Sand and Gravel, based in North Salt Lake, and Utah Valley’s W. W. Clyde Company met the challenge head on. Both companies had their origins in the 1920s when

road-paving projects established the sand and gravel market. Eric W. and William E. Ryberg, second generation Swedish Mormon converts, started Utah Sand and Gravel in 1920 and began excavating the hillside east of Beck Street, Salt Lake City’s northern industrial strip. The Rybergs’ community and business involvements were numerous. Eric Ryberg sat on the board of directors as chairman for the Utah Idaho Sugar Company, eventually serving as the corporation’s vice-president. He was later elected director-at-large of the National Sand and Gravel Association.392 Eric’s brother, William was no less active, serving as bishop of the Holiday ward and as a member of the LDS Church Welfare Committee.393 In 1939, the Rybergs constructed the church’s first underground parking structure at Temple Square. When William died unexpectedly in 1950, Apostle Henry Moyle noted that he was a “contractor among contractors,” lauding William’s devotion to community and church.394

Moyle’s assessment was an accurate one. In 1936, Utah Sand and Gravel contracted with the Federal Works Progress Administration to construct concrete runways at the Salt Lake Municipal Airport. The project launched them into the ready-mix concrete business. According to a corporate history, between 1940 and 1950 Utah Sand and Gravel’s North Salt Lake plant “was the basic production unit supporting the company’s needs for sand and gravel in the Salt Lake metropolitan area.” To retain its industrial prominence, Utah Sand and Gravel busily acquired other quarry sites. In the early 1940s, the company won contracts to help construct the Geneva Steel Mill.

and gravel for the plant’s concrete structures came from the hills above American Fork. The Rybergs eventually sold the American Fork gravel pit in 1946. “It was determined that the Union Pacific Railroad Company was no longer interested in gravel ballast and also that serious zoning problems would arise if the plant were completed and again put in operation.” In 1955, however, in an effort to keep up with product demand, the company acquired 33.6 acres at the mouth of American Fork Canyon. Utah Sand and Gravel Executive Vice President and General Manager, Ezra C. Knowlton, noted, “This property is so located to serve well all of Utah County from Provo northerly.” In the mid 1940s, Utah Sand and Gravel likewise acquired property along the Weber River in northern Davis County, not far from Layton.

W. W. Clyde was no less prominent. Born in 1889, Clyde was a fourth generation Mormon from Springville Utah, a few miles south of Provo. His parents named him for the then president of the church, Wilford Woodruff. Growing up, Clyde demonstrated a head for mathematics and graduated with a degree in civil and electrical engineering from the University of Utah in 1913. Ten years later he and his brother-in-law, Blake Palfreyman, started a construction company and bid on a Nevada road construction project. In 1927, Clyde decided to go it alone, establishing the W.W. Clyde & Co. Like the Rybergs, Clyde’s company experienced unprecedented expansion during World War II, winning significant military contracts that included Hill Air Force Base and the
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Dugway Proving Ground. By 1968 the company was rated as the “second largest dollar volume highway construction company” in Idaho, Utah, and Nevada. In the meantime, Clyde expanded his interests to include ready mix concrete, starting Geneva Rock Products, Inc. in 1954. With his own cement operations Clyde could take on even more projects. Geneva Rock’s first project supplied a concrete pipeline for Geneva Steel. Clyde purchased an Orem gravel pit, which served as Geneva Rock’s first batch plant and in 1976 the company began carving away the Lake Bonneville Sandbar at Jordan Narrows. In addition to providing asphalt and sand and gravel for major I-15 construction jobs, Geneva Rock was an important supplier for significant LDS construction projects. The twenty-eight-story church office building, Salt Lake City’s ZCMI shopping mall, and the Joseph Smith Memorial Building/Hotel Utah remodel all utilized Geneva sand and gravel products.

Ironically, the very successes that these businesses enjoyed opened them to controversy and criticism. Utah Sand and Gravel and Geneva Rock competed for property to expand operations with the very customers it served: subdivision developers and homeowners. With exquisite valley views, Wasatch Front bench land property became premium real estate. The benches are where most of the Front’s sand and gravel deposits are located; few homeowners welcomed a backyard gravel pit. Yet as Ezra

---

399 Arrington, W. W. Clyde, 153-154, 158
401 Craig W. Johnson and Kevin Stowers, Problems and Potential in Mining Sand and Gravel on the Wasatch Front, Phase I (Utah State Mineral Leasing Funds, Utah State University, not dated), 2.
Knowlton observed in his history of Utah Sand and Gravel, the industry’s future always rides on the ability to acquire additional gravel deposits and to “keep ahead of the outward movement of suburban growth before these lands are put to other and less important uses and also before the imposition of burdensome or prohibitive zoning regulations.” Knowlton’s last comment about zoning reflects an almost endemic problem for sand and gravel operators. As early as 1913, residents along Salt Lake City’s northeast bench banded together to oppose the construction of a city gravel pit on P. J. Moran’s property. The Reverend Elmer I. Goshen of the First Congregational Church headed the twenty-member committee. The gravel pit meant that residents “would have to submit for six years to bad roads and flying dust every hour of the day when teams hauling the sand or gravel were passing,” not to mention the “defacing of a beautiful part of the city.” In the end, the city temporarily reconsidered the lease.

The incident set the tone for future citizen protests as well as arguments favoring the pits. Residents opposed gravel pits because they were dusty, noisy, intrusive, and unsightly. Yet keeping gravel pits nearby kept construction costs down. Utah Sand and Gravel handled the situation by creating a subsidiary realty in 1951, which helped them purchase property in Cottonwood Heights, near the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Knowlton made no effort at hiding the subterfuge; in fact, he almost seems proud of the corporation’s drive and creativity. “The purchase was made in this manner to avoid the necessity of using the name of Utah Sand and Gravel Products…for fear of agitating
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403 Salt Lake Tribune, Residents of Northeast Bench Protest to City Commission; Final Action Deferred,” May 27, 1913.
further neighborhood opposition. For much the same reason, G and G Realty Company has acquired other properties needed by the company.\footnote{Knowlton, History of Utah Sand and Gravel Products Corporation, 73-74.}

Residents concerns were justified. As later reports demonstrated, steep slopes created significant rehabilitation issues. Accelerated run off made it hard for vegetation to cling to the stripped mountainsides; any water reaching the plants quickly leached through the disturbed soil. As a result, the denuded slopes were especially vulnerable to wind and flooding.\footnote{Craig W. Johnson and Kevin Stowers, “Problems and Potential in Mining Sand and Gravel on the Wasatch Front—Phase I.”}

In a 1974 editorial that discussed a coal strip-mining bill then being debated in Washington, the Mormon-owned Deseret News came down hard on gravel pits. “Coal is not the only problem in strip-mining,” the newspaper emphasized. “Gravel pits are another example of an eye-sore caused by strip-mining.”\footnote{“Why Utah should adopt controls on strip-mining,” The Deseret News, December 6, 1974.}

Two years later, in the wake of a failed state mine regulation bill Deseret News ran a two-part series on the gravel pits, calling for better regulation. At the time only Davis County took measures to ensure gravel pit operators rehabilitated their property. “Davis County may have better gravel pit control than its neighbors because many residents have been suing for tough enforcement,” the article stated.\footnote{Joe Bauman, “Few laws, inspectors for gravel pits,” The Deseret News, August 24, 1976.}

The 1960 and 1962 Davis County Natural Resource Zone and Ordinance required sand and gravel operators to apply for county excavation permits and submit detailed plans for rehabilitation.\footnote{Davis County Natural Resource Zone and Ordinance, included with Craig W. Johnson and Kevin Stowers’s “Problems and Potential in Mining Sand and Gravel on the Wasatch front—Phase I.” Utah State University.}
were a total of 175 gravel pits along the Wasatch Front. The Davis County zoning appears to have helped somewhat, though: of the 175 only twenty-nine pits were located in Davis County while Utah County boasted sixty-one.\textsuperscript{409}

If the interstate spurred the development of Mormon-owned gravel pits and attending zoning regulations it also encouraged real estate development along the Wasatch Front. Selling lots and building houses seemed like a good way for Mormon men made to make their fortunes. Initially tract housing occurred on a piecemeal basis, in which a developer like Jimmy Brough subdivided the family’s farmlands. Additionally, because of the preexisting village settlement pattern, most people did not leave the city for the suburbs. Instead housing needs in the village, exacerbated by the arrival of new industries in the area, prompted local development. This meant that families largely retained their ties to the ancestral village. For instance the first phase of Layton’s Golden Acres subdivision, near what would later become the Layton Hills Mall, was platted in the early 1950s. Golden Adams first purchased the forty-acre farm plot from his father, Marion Adams, in 1922. Thirty years later he subdivided the farm into approximately forty-four, quarter acre lots and named the streets after his children. His brother was busily doing the same thing. Phase three of Diamond Adams’s neighboring subdivision was completed in 1961 under the Diamond Hills Development Co., Inc.\textsuperscript{410}

Large-scale tract development during the 1950s and early 1960s was limited to
developers like Alan Brockbank, whose housing tracts came to define much of south Salt
Lake. Founder of the Home Builders Association of Utah, Brockbank was born in 1903,
served in the Southern States Mission, and attended the University of Utah, taking
courses in sales, real estate management, and land planning. (According to his resume he
did not graduate “for lack of three laboratory classes which were not taken because of
time required.”) Using the Alan E. Brockbank Plan, which operated on the model of a
used car dealership, new buyers purchased a small, easily affordable home. If the buyer
decided to upgrade to a larger “Brockbank Custom Home” within five years of his or her
original purchase, Brockbank offered a ten percent discount and promised to “assist
Purchasers, without charge, in final selection of the building site...in arranging financing
for the Brockbank Custom Home and in interior decorating.” Upon completion of the
Brockbank Custom Home, Brockbank took title to the buyer’s original home as a trade-in.
“Purchasers’ equity shall be determined by taking the original purchase price of the
Brockbank Home, providing it to be in good condition...and deducting...any and all
mortgage balances owed at the date of closing,” the contract spelled out. Brockbank
advertised his homes as having all of the latest suburban design features. In one
advertising pamphlet Brockbank assured potential homeowners, “During the past year, as
a member of the Board of Trustees of the National Association of Home Builder’s
Research Council, I have spent much time with some of the most forward looking

411 Alan Brockbank resume. Box 1 Folder 2, Brockbank Papers, MS 0604. Marriott
Library Special Collections, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Library Special Collections, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
building material manufacturers in the United States, and in our 1959 houses we are incorporating as many of these new ideas as we found to be researched to the point where they were ready to be used in the field.” Brockbank’s designs featured enhanced storage spaces for the growing family. “You will find that we have not left any space unused in this house,” was a typical selling point.413

No one caught Brockbank’s vision of affordable family housing better than Ellis Ivory and his brother-in-law, Roger Boyer. Ivory was born, appropriately for the future developer, at home in the small central Utah town of Fountain Green. “We moved to Salt Lake when I was ten. My dad did that because he was a builder. This was in the forties, and he had various contracts building for the government and then building houses.” Young Ivory recalled working on the first house above Wasatch Drive in Salt Lake City. “My dad and I that whole summer, we slept in the basement of that house, and we’d go down and rent a motel room for one night to shower one night a week…I was probably seven or eight years old, and would work on the job there just helping Dad and the workers on building that house.”414 Seeing the ups and downs of the construction business first hand initially steered Ivory away from homebuilding. Following his mission and marriage, Ivory settled into law school. In 1965, however, Ivory reentered the real estate business and never left. His father was involved in a real estate case

413 “Alan E. Brockbank invites you to stake a claim in a Golden Western Horizon Home in beautiful Tanglewood, 13th East 65th South. All New Western Horizon Homes ’59.” Box 26 Folder 6. Brockbank Papers, MS 0604. Marriott Library Special Collections, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

regarding a man who had recently died, leaving his family with a large estate of land holdings. Ivory’s father was tasked with the assignment of divesting the properties, which by now included holdings in Utah, Nevada, and California. At this point, Ellis Ivory entered the scene and began working with his father to find buyers. After the first year, Ivory made thirty-six thousand dollars. He brought in his old high school friend, University of Utah fraternity brother, and brother-in-law (the two had married sisters), Roger Boyer. Ivory persuaded Boyer, a Harvard MBA, to return to Utah where the two founded the Ivory & Boyer Company in 1968, subsequently creating a second land holding corporation, Terracore, which they used to develop properties along the Wasatch Front and as far away as St. George.415 A 1968 article from the Deseret News highlighting Boyer and Ivory reported the two were busy developing a Soda Springs, Idaho, subdivision (sixty of the seventy-eight lots had sold) and attracting Eastern investors. “Everyone is aware of the possibilities of making money in real estate, but we feel the real service is to find areas of growth and to be sure we are getting investors a deal,” Ivory noted at the time, adding, “There is a vacuum in the Intermountain area as compared with other areas in developing recreational subdivisions.”416 In looking back at those years, Ivory later recalled, “Between ’68 and ’70 we went from a small organization of maybe twenty people up to about three hundred. It was a very big time for land development and interstate sales of land offerings and we rode that wave for two years.” Ivory did, however, note the company had a hard time attracting outside capital, a

415 Ellis Ivory Oral History, interviewed by Cal Boardman, September 8, 2008, Salt Lake City Utah, 1, 3-4, 6-7, 8-9, 11. Utah Business History Project, David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah.
problem irrigationists from the previous generation of Mormon developers would have understood. Ivory looked to insurance companies and New York investors.\textsuperscript{417}

Boyer and Ivory eventually split from Terracore. Boyer went on to focus primarily on commercial real estate development, founding the Boyer Company, while Ivory continued in residential housing. “My whole game was lots, and through the seventies we developed a lot of subdivisions. We were doing about twenty percent of the lot development in the state…From Cedar City to Ogden we did subdivision development and then would sell to builders.”\textsuperscript{418} In 1976 Ivory won Utah’s Realtor of the Year award.\textsuperscript{419}

Ivory’s successes allowed him to devote his talents to church and community service. “I had a great desire to reach financial success by age 30. By the time I got there, I had other values,” Ivory reflected in a newspaper article. “The key word in my life is balance. I try to schedule my time and not let business interfere with family activities. I’m at a point where I’m not very goal-oriented. I try to do all I can to benefit other people in my community and church.”\textsuperscript{420} In his mid-thirties, Ivory was serving his church as president of the University of Utah student stake and on a newly formed Melchizedek Priesthood General Committee. (The committee was “designed to serve as a planning and evaluating unit,” charged with reviewing “materials used in programs like home teaching, family home evening, programs for single adults and materials involved in Melchizedek

\textsuperscript{417} Ellis Ivory Oral History, interviewed by Cal Boardman, September 8, 2008, Salt Lake City Utah, 1, 3-4, 6-7, 8-9, 11. Utah Business History Project, David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah.
\textsuperscript{418} Ellis Ivory Oral History, interviewed by Cal Boardman, September 8, 2008, 13.
\textsuperscript{419} Suzanne Dean, “Salesman has special gimmick,” Deseret News May 2, 1977.
Priesthood quorum administration and curriculum.”)421 In 1979 he was called as a mission president to Manchester, England.422

Economic downturns and a poor housing market awaited Ivory’s return, causing him to completely revamp his previous business strategy by taking on contracting and building. By the late 1980s Ivory Homes got a second wind with a contract building company homes for a mining corporation in Elko, Nevada. By 1988 Ivory Homes was building “three, four and then five hundred a year.”423 Through the 1990s and early 2000s Ivory’s elephant logo cropped up all along the Wasatch Front. For over ten years running Ivory Homes was named Utah’s top builder, particularly in the South Davis County communities of Farmington, Centerville, Bountiful, and North Salt Lake. “Davis County is a great place to raise a family. You get the sense you are part of a tranquil, small-town community, and yet you have all the conveniences; a short drive to downtown Salt Lake City, great schools, access to a dozen golf courses and so many other recreational opportunities,” Ivory observed.424 Ivory extended his corporate motto, “We care about your home today and its value tomorrow,” to the kinds of properties he sold. “We have learned to be very picky about where we build. We want our buyers to live in the best possible neighborhoods and we want them to feel like they made a smart choice.”425
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424 “9th time in 9 years, Ivory rises to become Utah’s top builder,” Deseret News January 25, 1997; “Ivory Homes is No. 1 in Utah, again, and No. 1 in South Davis County,” Deseret News, November 9, 1996.
Beginning in the 1970s, residential development caused many to reconsider the Wasatch Front’s agrarian past. Rather than packing houses onto small lots, some developers looked to preserve the feel of country living, while touting the subdivisions’ proximity to infrastructure and shopping. Advertisements in a 1970 *Improvement Era* notified readers of new developments like Hi-Country Estates. Hi-Country Estates built on the traditional image of the Mormon agrarian village. “If you’re the kind of person that would love to live in the country, but your livelihood requires you to live in Salt Lake City, Hi Country Estates is perfect for you.” To maintain the development’s rural character, developers were only selling land in five-acre sections. “If you’re longing for the good old country life, or just a darn good investment, now’s the time to cut out.”426

Incidentally the interstate itself was at the forefront of discussions regarding the future of the Wasatch Front’s agricultural land. In 1966 the Davis County Citizen Planning Council explicitly referred to and utilized the newly constructed freeway in drafting comprehensive planning guidelines. The council recommended that areas east of the interstate should remain exclusively residential and light commercial. West of the interstate might be zoned for “less expensive residential and light industrial.”427 Moreover as I-15 neared completion along the Wasatch Front, local governments recognized the need for more cooperative planning efforts. This was certainly not a Utah problem. Beginning with Section 701 of the 1954 Housing Act, the federal government began offering funding for planning initiatives. The 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act

mandated that before a state could receive highway funding, it had to have a regional transportation plan in place. Two additional laws enacted in 1965 specifically earmarked funds for regional planning councils: The Housing and Community Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act.428 The two principle planning agencies for the Wasatch Front, the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), which serves Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties, and the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), which coordinates planning for Summit, Utah, and Wasatch Counties, date to this period.429 Early reports and studies conducted by these agencies reflect how citizens approached land use questions, especially those that concerned the delicate balance between suburban growth and agricultural conservation—the ever-present tension within the Mormon urban tradition.

In “South Davis County Today and Tomorrow” (1966) planners recognized Davis County agricultural land for its aesthetic value, not necessarily its economic importance. “In spite of the urbanization of the County and the resultant changes in the economic patterns, those families who located in Davis County, because it provided them with a desirable living environment, would like to preserve the land uses in harmony with the past as well as the present characteristics.” The report at once recognized that agriculture needed special protection through zoning and lower taxes while alternatively encouraging residential ordinances that allowed for “one- and two-acre ranchette lots designed for

possible future subdivision.” In contrast, the 1968 master plan for Utah County called for explicit agricultural land conservation program and called for the implementation of a “satellite-green belt form of urban development.” This form of development, the council believed, best preserved the original pioneer village system. “The Council reasoned that the satellite-green belt type of urban form has all the advantages that can be found in smaller cities where variety in the living environment is ever present, plus the advantages that can be found in larger cities where a large selection of goods and services and cultural and educational facilities are conveniently available.” The report noted that green belts allowed for urban development “without diminishing the productivity of surrounding agricultural land.” The report continued, “The conversion of agricultural land to non-farm uses should not be encouraged nor should public water and sewer projects be constructed in unincorporated communities of the county which will tend to encourage urban development to take place unless regulations are adopted that will prevent the scattering of urban uses into surrounding agricultural areas.”

Part of the difference in approach can be traced to the overall economies of Davis and Utah Counties. During the post-war period, Davis County was the state’s fastest growing county. This was largely due to Hill Air Force Base and other defense related industries located in nearby Weber County. “Any unanticipated expansion of Hill Field or new high employment industries in Davis, Slat Lake, or Weber Counties would be reflected by an accelerated growth rate in Davis County.” Small towns like Layton had
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quickly morphed into suburban bedroom communities. A planning report from 1970 accurately predicted that by the year 1990, agricultural land would largely be in houses. The only thing left of Layton’s agricultural heritage would be an industrial park planned in the general vicinity of the old sugar factory. The report seemed to view this loss as inevitable and favored a plan to construct an additional highway west of I-15 to handle projected traffic needs.  

In contrast, the 1968 Utah County Master Plan revealed considerably different trends and priorities. Between 1950 and 1960, American Fork grew from 5,126 to just over 6,000. Population projections for 1985 placed the town at 11,000. The report attributed the lower population numbers to a significant outmigration. Those who stayed were generally educators or employed as caregivers for the elderly. Conversely, though, the report indicated the presence of vacant agricultural property scattered across the county. “Most of it is capable of producing crops, but is held for speculative purposes for urban development.” These dynamics began to change only in the mid 1980s when Utah Valley began attracting high-tech industrial growth. 

Given the energy crisis of the 1970s and increased concern over disappearing open space, movements to preserve Wasatch Front agriculture became more intense. In 1977 the Wasatch Front Regional Council applied for funding to study the effects of urban encroachment on the region’s agriculture. The report looked at such issues as the
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significance of agriculture to the Wasatch Front economy, both in terms of its net contributions and the expenses incurred when supplying new development with urban services. The study also promised to look at the affective aspects of agricultural preservation—“the effect of disappearing farm lands on the sociocultural values of the community.” The final report, published in 1979, noted the decline in agriculture as an important part of the regional economy. Between 1959 and 1974 Davis County lost over five thousand acres of agricultural land; Utah County, on the other hand, lost fewer than one thousand. The report expressed a real need to preserve at least some of the Wasatch Front’s agricultural land, if for no other reason than to retain “a certain degree of self-sufficiency.” Additionally agriculture was seen as a traditional landscape type—“green irrigated fields with the mountains as a backdrop are held by many Utahns as something worth preserving purely for aesthetic reasons.” If Wasatch Front residents were serious about agricultural conservation, they needed to quit building on large lot sizes in sporadic, unplanned subdivisions and initiate appropriate zoning, tax breaks and other incentives to keep lands in agriculture.

Other reports cautioned against extending freeway infrastructure, especially through Davis County, where additional transportation routes “would increase
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accessibility and intensify the pressure for development.” Twenty years later Deseret News features editor Marilyn Karras forcefully contended, “Unless there is some incentive for Utahans to begin to take responsibility for what has up until now been an irresponsible attitude toward preserving our rural legacy, we may not have to worry so much about where our grandchildren drive. They’ll probably prefer to live away from Utah, in states where visionary leaders took steps to manage growth instead of merely encouraging it.” Karras’s assessment was not altogether fair—there had been efforts to preserve Wasatch Front agrarian landscapes and open space—but as the 1979 Wasatch Front Regional Council noted, it proved nearly impossible to reverse post war development trends.

Interstate 15 molded Wasatch Front suburbia. Not only is the interstate the primary organizing agent for life along the Front, its presence has contributed to the shifts within the region’s Mormon landscape forms. Social theorist Henri Lefebvre suggested that space comprised “a set of relations between things (objects and products)” and must be created or produced. Lefebvre emphasized that spaces like I-15 involved “networks of exchange and flows of raw materials and energy,” continuing that the means of production “cannot be separated either from the productive forces, including technology and knowledge, or from the social division of labour which shapes it, or from the state and the superstructures of society.” As such, space is culturally constructed,
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appropriated, and consumed. Lefebvre’s idea of space being constantly produced by both the state and societal superstructure certainly applies to the Wasatch Front’s I-15. While the federal government subsidized its construction, the route had already been long determined by preexisting settlement patterns and traditional systems of land tenure—which in turn were influenced by Wasatch Front geographical constraints. The interstate encouraged new businesses and ways of making money. Mormons went into the contracting and construction business, taking advantage of precious sand and gravel resources close to home to expand infrastructure and build homes.

Beginning in the 1950s and 1960s, descendants of pioneer village farmers cashed in their landed inheritances for something far more lucrative. Some might say they sold their birthright for today’s suburban soup, but large Mormon families needed homes. When Renee and Steve Whitesides moved into Brough Subdivision, Ben Arlo Brough’s numerous progeny surrounded them. It was a community of cousins. Mormon suburbs came to be places where, as Mormon children sing, “families can be together forever.” By the 1990s, despite earlier commitments to community greenbelts, towns like Layton and American Fork had filled with businesses and residential development. To maintain his 40-acre farm Bob Carlisle from American Fork began converting his cornfield into a maze each fall. “I just started thinking, ‘Hey, here’s how I’ll be able to keep the farm.’” Wasatch Front land use policies equally descended into a labyrinth of competing interests and values. By the decade’s end even most of the church’s network

---

of welfare farms had been parceled off and sold.\footnote{442} Thus the interstate represents not only shifts in land use but in overall attitudes towards agriculture as an important way of life. The transition to Mormon suburbia did not necessarily mean a wholesale abandonment of the earlier agrarian/urban mix. What it did mean, as the next chapter demonstrates, was a repositioning and redefinition of those values: homes whose architecture and decoration schemes reinforced Mormon gender ideals and ward meetinghouses that served as the new village center and lifeblood for Mormon community life. It is quite possible that by the century’s end if anything Mormon suburbia created an even more intensely nucleated settlement pattern than had existed under the old agricultural village system.

CHAPTER 6

GENDER ROLES IN MORMON SUBURBIA

We believe in the fireside, in the laughter of little children, in the gospel that builds happy, peaceful homes, without which the finest and loftiest longings of the heart can never be satisfied.

--Bryant S. Hinckley, 1931

The cover for the March 1952 issue of the LDS magazine *The Instructor* featured the Smith family from Logan, Utah. Mother, father, and eight children stood on the front steps of their frame home, neatly pressed and dressed for church. The *Instructor* observed, “Members of this family help each other. One can call at the Smith home anytime and find it ‘spick and span.’ Return missionary associates are always welcome and if the call is around mealtime, there is always room for one more. Brother Ariel and Sister Josephine Smith are active Church members. The entire family attends Sunday School as a group, they return in the evening for their ward sacrament meeting. No problem here of not being able to get everyone ready for church. These children are trained in their youth. It is a well-managed home.” The Smith family represented all a Mormon family should be: a mother and father who took seriously their charge to love and teach their children. On the other hand, the family could have appeared on any magazine cover from the 1950s exploring America’s new suburban face. The Smiths

---


were white, middle-class, and represented what historian Elaine Tyler May has termed “domestic containment” where “potentially dangerous social forces” of the Cold War could be confronted and overcome. 445

As land use along the Wasatch Front shifted from farming to interstates and housing tracts, suburban ideals of the 1950s reinforced and shaped Mormon urban traditions. In the heightened Cold War environment church leaders emphasized the importance of the family as the basic unit of society and preached traditional gender roles for men and women. Mormon ward congregations increasingly came to function as a support system for families, helping mothers and fathers accomplish their responsibilities in rearing and teaching their children. Meetinghouse architecture largely reflected these changes. Standard plans mirrored tract housing subdivisions and blended worship with recreational spaces. In financing, constructing, and caring for their meetinghouses, wards modeled desirable family dynamics and values.

Church handbooks, magazines, and other resources played an essential role in articulating home and family-centered ideals. A BYU marketing study from 1940, which covered the Wasatch Front towns of American Fork, Kaysville, Morgan, and Springville, observed that these magazines enjoyed a significant readership—the only other publication with a wider subscription base was Readers Digest.446 Messages from church magazines portrayed the home primarily as a place where parents trained children to be active, church-attending Mormons. In particular, women were tasked with the

446 Department of Marketing, Brigham Young University, “A Study of Pertinent Marketing Data from American Fork, Heber City, Kaysville, Morgan, and Springville,” 1940, 82. Brigham Young University Special Collections, Provo, Utah.
responsibility of establishing a home environment that fostered a disciplined, yet loving, family circle. As the 1952 Instructor cover iterated, if the Smith home was “spick and span” and welcoming to unannounced dinnertime guests it was largely due to Josephine’s skills as a homemaker. Weekly Relief Society lessons and articles in church magazines gave explicit guidance to women on how they might accomplish their mission, explaining what a Mormon home should look and feel like. Instruction included home decorating ideas, suggestions for what kinds of books to buy for the family library, and appropriate artwork to hang on the walls.

Beginning in the late 1960s and continuing through the 1970s, when the women’s movement began to question traditional gender roles, Mormon homes increasingly became insulated places that guarded families from potentially corrupting outside influences. During this period, the suburbs became the zone where Mormonism’s family theology merged with the church’s strident political stances. Because successful family life hinged disproportionately on mothers, male church leaders strongly condemned women wage earners, even at a time when providing the kind of suburban life Mormons valued became more and more difficult. Choosing to work outside the home compromised a woman’s divine calling as mother and questioned traditional gender roles within the family. Women who had to work carried a double burden—that of provider and nurturer. In such a context, home decorating established not only the proper environment for gospel instruction and nurturing, but documented women’s own devotion to faith and family and obedience to counsel from the male priesthood leadership.
A key feature of post World War II suburbs across the United States was their high degree of religiosity. Suburban neighborhoods of the 1950s experienced something of a religious revival as Judeo-Christian values were held as the defining difference between the United States and the Soviet Union.\footnote{Bill J. Leonard, “Dangerous and Promising Times: American Religion in the Postwar Years” in \textit{The Cambridge History of Religions in America} Vol. III, ed. Stephen J. Stein (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 9, 16, 17.} New churches and synagogues also offered a sense of community for new families once found in urban neighborhoods and ethnic kinship groups.\footnote{Elaine Tyler May, \textit{Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War} (New York: Basic Books, 2008), 29.} Historian James Hudnut-Beumler specifically notes the connection between the construction of suburban housing tracts and new centers for religious worship. “The family proud of their new split level house would soon be attending a church equally new and worthy of pride.” Moreover, new architectural designs often emphasized functionality over religious form and “bore a striking resemblance to that found in modern suburban tract homes.”\footnote{James Hudnut-Beumler, “Suburbanization and Religion” in \textit{The Cambridge History of Religions in America} Vol. III, ed. Stephen J. Stein (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 111-112.} Building a new suburban church in and of itself was a way to create instant community. An article for \textit{The Saturday Evening Post} highlighted the efforts of North Carolina architect Howard Haines, who designed new churches and taught local congregations how to raise money to pay for construction costs. Through church bees, as Haines called them, congregations not only raised money but also built community. At one construction project Haines supervised, “the church budget doubled, the building fund tripled. When the work started, Sunday-school rolls included just two young adults; after the roof raising there were
thirty…A local couple with two children who had moved into Durham, eleven miles away, began driving back on working nights. They rejoined the church, bought some land and made plans to build. If a congregation could not afford an architect, they might select a standard plan, which, not unlike the cookie-cutter box houses in suburban tracts, could be expanded as the congregation grew. Families often “shopped” around for the right congregation and place of worship. Finally, as Etan Diamond emphasizes, “If one theme ran consistently through the new suburban church, it was ‘family.’ Across the nation, the suburban family had taken on iconic status since it was seen as the fundamental unit of American society and the bedrock of American democracy. New suburban churches drew on this imagery as they sought to build the congregational community around the family.”

In many respects, Mormon suburban wards mirrored these larger trends. Mormons, too, began to refer to their local congregational units as ward families, places where new move-ins could find instant friends and communal support. But important nuances and distinctions remain largely because of the way in which wards developed within Mormonism and the distinctive role they have played in defining local religious experience. Mormon wards have never been exactly like other suburban Christian congregations. Wallace Stegner was not far off the mark when he observed that the
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“social life of Mormondom is centered in the Ward House.”

453 As Douglas Alder quipped, “The Mormon ward seems to be somewhere between the casualness of a congregation and the totality of a monastic order.” Each ward member takes on voluntary responsibilities, often termed a “calling,” that fully integrate him or her into the ward “family.” Alder went on to explain, “The sacramental, pastoral, and instructional functions are carried entirely by the laity because there is no paid clergy. The responsibility of the whole rests on the shoulders of all.”

454

The ward structure itself is a very urban phenomenon and developed during the Nauvoo period as a way to help large numbers of poor entering the city and surrounding areas. As Leonard Arrington and Davis Bitton explain, “Since the city had been divided into municipal wards as part of the civil government, it was decided to establish a parallel ecclesiastical unit, retaining the name ward and appointing a bishop over each.” During the summer months when the weather was nice, the entire city of Nauvoo joined together at meetings. During the winter, ward bishops presided over gatherings of members in homes or other public meeting places.

455 Nineteenth-century wards functioned essentially as both the ecclesiastical and political structure for the Mormon Kingdom’s expanding network of villages and settlements.

456 Moreover, just as settlements were laid out along a predictable grid, so too could wards and their larger ecclesiastical counterpart, stakes, divide and split as populations grew. This geographical regularity left little guesswork as

453 Wallace Stegner, Mormon Country (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003), 16.
to where members would go to church. Even today, the best way to determine a Mormon area’s growth rate is to look at how often ward and stake boundaries reconfigure.

The evolution of Mormon meetinghouse architecture is a good way to gauge changes in the church’s cultural priorities. Meetinghouse functions changed significantly from the nineteenth to the early twentieth century. The nineteenth century meetinghouse reflected the merging of communal and ecclesiastical functions that characterized the settlement period. Rectangular meetinghouses contained one “large room on the ground level that could be converted from chapel to recreation hall as the occasion required. In the basement might be a small assembly hall, classrooms, food storage area, municipal offices, perhaps even a jail.” With the turn of the century, meetinghouse architecture experienced a dramatic shift. In an article for the 1914 Improvement Era Apostle Joseph F. Smith Jr. explained, “As the population increased and as these first buildings were outgrown, and as conditions changed, due to the influx of a ‘non-Mormon’ population, many of these meetinghouses passed into the hands of the city and county governments.” Meetinghouses then morphed into a kind of community center, which were used “on all days of the week, by one then by another of the organizations of the church.” To accommodate these new purposes, most meetinghouses also included an amusement hall, which either was incorporated into the main building or constructed alongside it. Although, as Lewis T. Cannon wrote in a 1914 Improvement Era article, the church had

---

yet to develop “a distinct type of architecture,” most of the meetinghouses constructed in
the nineteen-teens had a chapel, which could seat 300 to 400 people and sometimes
contained “a gallery for additional seating capacity.” While Cannon did not want to see a
“stereotyped plan for all ward houses,” he advocated central regulation over
meetinghouse construction so that the church might more effectively monitor quality and
cost. “The Church might appoint a committee to include at least one good architect, one
good builder, one good businessman whose duty it should be to pass on plans for ward
houses and other church buildings.”

In 1921, the church took Cannon’s advice and created its first Architectural
Department, which helped finance and oversee ward meetinghouse construction. The
department also furnished several distinctive plans that added a separate amusement hall
to the older single-floor meetinghouses. Amusement halls were either built separately
from the meetinghouse or located in the basement along with classrooms. These early
forays into standardized meetinghouse plans were met with resistance from local and area
architects who complained to church headquarters about their loss of business. In 1924
wards were again free to hire their own architects, though, through the 1930s and 1940s,
however, meetinghouse construction became increasingly centralized. The increased
centralization benefited that local wards, who could now rely on church headquarters to
pay for a larger percentage of construction costs. Eventually, as Richard W. Jackson

459 Lewis T. Cannon, “Architecture of Church Buildings,” Improvement Era 17, no. 8
(June 1914): 793-794, 789-799.
https://archive.org/stream/improvementera1708unse#page/792/mode/2up. Accessed May
4, 2015.
notes, “The participation rate became 50 percent Church and 50 percent for the local unit.”

This standardization and centralization became especially marked in the 1950s when, according to Jackson, meetinghouse construction doubled. Church attendance went from twenty percent in 1950 to forty percent in 1960. To meet growing demands, the church reconfigured the Architectural Department as the Church Building Committee and hired new architects, who helped expand the number of standardized meetinghouse plans. One of the more influential was Arnold Ehlers, who joined the committee in 1951. Born in 1901 in Germany, Ehlers came to Utah with his family when he was five years old. As a teenager his apparent artistic talents landed him an unofficial apprenticeship with the Salt Lake City architectural firm of Cannon and Fetzer. After a mission to Germany, Ehlers headed East for formal architectural training. In the intervening years, he married, worked in Philadelphia and in the San Francisco Bay area before returning to Utah in 1932, where he formed his own architectural firm, Young and Ehlers, architects. As a church architect, Ehlers experienced something of an epiphany: “This thought came to me, ‘We should make our buildings so inviting and so homey that we would love to go to church.’” What followed was a standard church plan that could be

---

expanded to accommodate a growing ward family. In these one-story meetinghouses the gym or “cultural hall” was usually situated behind the chapel and was closed off by an accordion partition door. For larger meetings, the partition was opened and the gym served as an overflow for the chapel; classrooms and kitchen extended off the chapel so that multiple wards could be housed in the same meetinghouse. These designs were not unlike those adopted by Protestant denominations across the United States—indeed Ehlers expressed fondness for modern Lutheran church designs then popular with their high “A” frame chapels. As James Hudnut-Beumler observed, “The easy functionality of space outside the sanctuary bore striking resemblance to that found in modern suburban tract homes. The Sunday School had moved from a dank basement…into a wing of its own with lots of light.”

Local wards assumed most of the overhead cost for meetinghouse construction and, until the mid-1960s, provided much of the labor. By 1970 wards and branches in the United States only had to pay thirty percent of the construction costs. A special Improvement Era issue for April 1959 contained several articles on meetinghouse construction that highlighted the typical process a ward went through to build a new meetinghouse. Individual wards selected building sites and filled out an Application for Real Estate Purchase and/or Building Program, which they mailed directly to the First

---

Presidency. The forms then went to the real estate department, which sent representatives out to make sure the property adequately filled the ward’s needs. Once approved, a request for purchase went to the expenditures committee, which comprised the First Presidency, three Apostles, and the Presiding Bishopric. Wards then selected and approved a meetinghouse plan, which could be adapted to meet local environmental conditions. The responsibility of furnishing the new meetinghouse likewise rested with ward leadership, who could turn to advertisements in the *Improvement Era* for ideas: Salt Lake City’s Interstate Brick Co.; Deseret Pipe Organ Co. (“Designed by LDS Craftsmen for LDS Chapels and Services—Custom built at Reasonable Prices.”); Transwall Coated Products (“How to create 14 Sunday School rooms for only $3,641.”); Bigelow rugs and carpets—available through the church-owned department store Zion’s Cooperative Mercantile Institute or ZCMI (“Your church has a homier, more comfortable atmosphere when you have cozy, soft Bigelow Carpets on the floor.”); and even folding chairs.

Unique perhaps to the Mormon experience were the moral and spiritual lessons members were supposed to derive from meetinghouse construction. These lessons, drawn from official church literature, went beyond the communal nature of the project. Often it drew on pioneer examples of sacrifice to reinforce the need for members’ monetary contributions to the cause. A filmstrip from the early 1970s forcefully emphasized this

---
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point. “To organize a building program you need faith. This is the Lord’s house you are building and he will help you build it—if you let him,” the filmstrip narrator iterated. “It is highly unlikely that you’ll be able to raise your share [of funds] without great faith and sacrifice on the part of your people, halfway measures don’t do this job.” At this point the filmstrip showed a depiction of a pioneer with a handcart. In the next slide the narrator reminded viewers, “Joseph Smith said that a church that does not have the power to require sacrifice from its members does not have the power to bring them exaltation. When you and your people accept and live this principle and law of sacrifice, you will be preparing yourselves for some of the choicest blessings.” The filmstrip concluded, “To build a house to the Lord requires a rare combination of common sense and wisdom, of faith and works—of heart and dreams and muscle as well as lumber, bricks, concrete and steel! And when it is finished you will have something that will stand as a living, working monument to your people, and their faithfulness!”

Other lessons could likewise be drawn from meetinghouse construction. A special 1959 Improvement Era issue on meetinghouse design and construction featured an article by assistant to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, Sterling W. Sill. In “The Blueprint,” Sill recalled watching a contractor at work. “I was greatly impressed with the thought that the most magnificent building that the greatest architects had ever conceived could be materialized by any good builder, merely by following the blueprint. But this same idea operates everywhere. A sculptor has a model to work from. An expert dressmaker has a pattern by means of which she is able quickly and accurately to produce whatever the greatest artists may design.” Sill then extended the analogy. By following the “blueprint”
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laid out by the greatest architect of all, Jesus Christ, Mormons would be assured a successful, happy life. “The downfall of the nations as well as of the individuals of the past has come about because they have insisted on making their own road maps,” Sill warned. “We who follow the gospel have the advantage of the objectives, ideals, and instructions of our Father in heaven who knows the way perfectly. It is therefore unnecessary for us to make the costly and damaging mistakes which blotch the lives of so many, yet there are some who cannot follow the most simple direction.”

Mormon meetinghouse construction not only enhanced ward unity and taught important spiritual lessons, but also modeled standards of self-reliance and reinforced traditional gender roles for families. For instance, wards were to operate within a building budget and not go into debt. “Local leaders must not ask, nor encourage their members to borrow money to contribute to building funds.” Wards were also to take pride in their meetinghouses and keep them well maintained and in good repair. In 1968 the church provided each ward with a “Meetinghouse Maintenance Manual,” which outlined, among other things, how to break in a chalkboard and care for the sound system—“never blow into a microphone.” Much like the home, meetinghouses should be “attractive both inside and out—sanctuaries where the spirit of God can dwell in abundance. Beauty, harmony and peace should appeal to the eye and to the heart, and radiate friendliness, warmth, comfort and inspiration. Our chapels should reflect in their cleanliness and light,
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thru harmony and decoration and furnishings the great but simple beauty of the
Gospel.”

A 1938 publication outlined ways women could help with meetinghouse
decoration and maintenance, providing a “touch of comfort and beauty.” Through the
Relief Society, women were to “make a survey of the homes of the Ward and ascertain
what each woman can do...what she might give in money or material—who can give
seeds, bulbs, plants, shrubs or trees.” Under the direction of their bishop, women could
help “establish a reading room and lending library...by soliciting books and current
magazines from homes, and thus put them within reach of all ward members.” Women
were also put in charge of “furnishing curtains and drapes” and providing “flower
holders, vases and baskets, and keep[ing] them filled with flowers in season.” Not
surprisingly, the kitchen came within the Relief Society’s purview. “[The Relief Society]
should have adequate equipment to keep it clean and sanitary.”

Magazine articles and instructional handbooks that guided meetinghouse
construction and maintenance carried over into matters relating to home life and overtly
invoked traditional roles for women. Along with important input from the Mormon male
hierarchy, it was the Relief Society, the church’s women’s organization, that initially
articulated and transmitted these values to individual wards and families. Weekly lessons
and articles from the Relief Society magazine, for instance, projected the ideal Mormon
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family life and held women responsible for creating the proper atmosphere conducive to realizing these expectations. In the process Mormonism embraced nineteenth century separate spheres ideology, now reinvigorated by the nation’s retreat to suburbia. Dolores Hayden, commenting on American post war dream homes, observes, “For the first time in history, a civilization has created a utopian ideal based on the house rather than the city or the nation. For hundreds of years, when individuals thought about putting an end to social problems they designed model towns to express their desires, not model homes.” Hayden traces suburban utopia’s intellectual roots back to Catherine Beecher and landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing. Beecher and Downing’s house plans adapted Puritan communal values to families whose economic life now revolved around the city. As Hayden observes, in post World War II suburban tracts women were to be primarily “ministers” of their homes, “in charge of a well-organized private domestic workplace in a democratic society where public life was run by men.”

Whereas nineteenth century Mormons who practiced polygamy lived in open defiance of Catherine Beecher’s ideals—her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe once equated polygamy with Southern slavery—suburban Mormons whole-heartedly embraced the twentieth-century version of separate spheres. Polygamy offered some Mormon women unprecedented independence. In 1856 Brigham Young even encouraged women wage earning, urging them to obtain training in a vocation that would enable

---

them to “sustain themselves and their offspring.” On another occasion Young observed, “We have sisters here who…would make just as good mathematicians or accountants as any man; we think they ought to have the privilege to study these branches of knowledge that they may develop the powers with which they are endowed.”

Nineteenth-century Mormon women likewise used priesthood power to administer to other women, anointing and blessing each other in times of illness and childbirth. The end of polygamy fundamentally reshaped gender relationships within the church to reflect those of early twentieth-century American society so that by 1922, women no longer enjoyed previously held priesthood privileges. Fathers, as a lesson in the *Relief Society Magazine* emphasized, came to be acknowledged as “the recognized head of the family, the bearer of the Priesthood.” The lesson further clarified, “It is the responsibility of the father to provide an adequate living for his family. This means food and clothing sufficient for health and self-respect, a respectable home, medical attention, and some provision for wholesome recreation.” A father who played with his children and took them “on hikes and excursions, usually keeps close to his children.” Through recreational play fathers taught their children “truthfulness, courtesy, fulfilling one’s word, cooperation, and many other sterling qualities.”

---

Women, on the other hand, were to serve as a support to their husbands and take an avid interest in his career and ecclesiastical responsibilities. “If marriage is to be successful,” an article in the Improvement Era reminded readers, “a wife must share in the world of her husband. Church leaders have long recognized that the wife plays a determining role in the success of her husband in his church callings.” The article went on to note, “When a wife does not share in this dedication, much of her husband’s effective power is drained off to meet the problems in his marriage. When marriage is a successful partnership, the husband can devote greater energy to his work and his church callings, and the wife can meet her needs more effectively.” A wife’s needs comprised adult conversation and creative stimulation outside housework and childrearing. Incidentally, the author of the article, who was a woman, believed these needs could best be met when women submerged their own interests and desires, becoming instead active participants in their husband’s careers.484

The gender roles articulated in these church publications reflect those adopted by the larger American society. In industrialized urban centers across the United States, long working hours took men away from their wives and children, leaving women to take on the role of sole caregiver to the couple’s children. In the process society glorified and idealized a woman’s place in the home to the extent that any wage work she might take on had to be justified in terms of family necessity.485 This dynamic can be seen in the

church’s Family Home Evening program, which typically involved a song, prayer, gospel lesson, some kind of game, and treat. The Family Home Evening program was first introduced in 1915, but received renewed emphasis in the 1960s. “The family home evening has an important function in putting morality and religion into the home,” a Relief Society circular from the 1970s stated. “The family home evening gives an opportunity for parents to know their children better. They discover talents, hopes, fears and desires of their children…. A child needs to learn from his parents and parents can learn from their children. Parents do like to have fun. They do like to play. They are not ‘square.’”

While fathers were supposed to initiate the family home evening every Monday night, during the rest of the week it fell to mothers to teach children correct gospel principles. “It is the duty of both parents to teach their children…but this responsibility devolves upon mothers far more than upon fathers, for mothers are with their children a greater part of the time,” a Relief Society lesson iterated. “At a mother’s knee children should be taught all good habits and practices.” Moreover, mothers faced the additional task of fixing “nutritious and appetizing meals, and to make her home attractive and comfortable—a place where friends and relatives may feel the warmth of hospitality.”
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When church leaders spoke of the need to invite the Spirit or Holy Ghost into the home, thereby making it a sacred place, they expected women to open the door. As Bryant S. Hinckley, an early editor for the church magazine *The Instructor* explained in 1931, “Home and Mother are the magic words that stir the heart of the world.” He continued, “A home must have a soul, an atmosphere, a climate.” Women, Hinckley emphasized, remained primarily responsible for articulating or encouraging this unique atmosphere or climate. “Our external environment has much to do with our physical, mental, and spiritual makeup,” editors for the *Relief Society Magazine* pointed out to women. “Our homes are actually, outside as well as inside, a reflection of ourselves.” A well-maintained exterior meant clean windows, uncluttered porches and entryways, and painted or varnished wood surfaces, all of which, the editors emphasized “are not outside the financial limits of the least affluent of us.” (A Utah Power and Light advertisement strategically appeared alongside the article reminding women that “Happiness is total electric living.”)

---


Women were particularly encouraged to give their homes “a personality” as reflected in furnishings, decorations, artwork, and books.\textsuperscript{492} Displayed family heirlooms, for instance, communicated generational connectedness and demonstrated “the skills and crafts of pioneer ancestors.”\textsuperscript{493} To this end Relief Society meetings helped women to learn traditional pioneer crafts and display their handiwork in the home. “It would be tragic to lose this part of our inheritance because the developing of these skills to produce handwork can enrich life in many ways. The arts and crafts can beautify the home and bring pleasure to guests as well as to members of the family. This developing of skillful hands has a very hygienic effect on the mind and it also helps to produce a confident spirit.”\textsuperscript{494} To encourage women in preserving folk crafts, the Relief Society opened Mormon Handicraft, a consignment store in 1937. Located adjacent to Temple Square, Mormon Handicraft was initially one of the church’s larger depression-era welfare projects. The store served as an outlet for women to sell their homemade craft goods and earn a little extra money without leaving the home. “Mormon Handicraft specializes in things for the hope chest,” a 1939 \textit{Relief Society Magazine} article noted.\textsuperscript{495} Mormon Handicraft’s Rules and Regulations for 1940 required women to pay a dollar membership
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fee before submitting their work. Consignment items had first to be approved by a woman’s stake committee, which then obtained official permission from Mormon Handicraft to submit the item. This was to assure quality control and to avoid “overstocking some lines of merchandise.”

A catalogue from the 1950s listed some of the items then for sale at Mormon Handicraft: eight-inch high Mormon Pioneer dolls, aprons, infant dresses, quilts “made to order, either single or in pairs,” and cotton braided rugs. Beginning in 1960 the store added a Homemaking Supplies Department that included “beautiful yardage for quilts, stamped articles for embroidery, toweling, tablecloths, quilt batts, and sewing supplies.” Women could buy these articles “in person or by mail” for their local Relief Societies.

Belle Spafford, who served as general Relief Society president during the 1960s, noted that Mormon Handicraft’s mission went beyond providing women with an extra income. More specifically the store helped women to “preserve artistic designs and craftsmanship of pioneer days” and craft “new articles and patterns for beautifying the home.” Spafford saw the store as a place where women could learn new decorating ideas. “Women could come and see what was there, and see what they might make that was superior.” Spafford continued, “We had articles prepared for publication in the [Relief Society Magazine] telling the purpose of the shop, or what some sister had done,
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or we would show a picture of an older sister working at her crocheting or her knitting and making a beautiful afghan. We would invite women to come to the shop and see these articles. In 1986, the church-owned Deseret Book store assumed control over the store and at least through the 1990s, women continued to sell crafts on consignment. In 2000 Deseret Book retail vice president Roger Toone unveiled plans for a new 3,500-square-foot store. Constructed and decorated like a pioneer home, the store would include exhibits featuring the history of LDS women and the building of the Salt Lake Temple. At the ribbon cutting ceremony, Relief Society general president Mary Ellen Smoot succinctly summed up the Mormon home decorating ethic, “I love homemade. I love items that someone has touched with love.”

In addition to decorative crafts, church magazine articles and lessons emphasized that books and artwork all affected a home’s “personality.” Such material contributed to children’s cultural refinement and spiritual training. In much the same vein as their home decorating hints, the *Relief Society Magazine* proceeded to provide women with a guide on the proper selection of books and artwork for their homes. “Far more than just books and magazines make a good home library. It takes intelligent planning to create this intellectual and spiritual center of family uplift and recreation,” Howard R. Driggs observed in a 1945 *Relief Society Magazine* article, adding, “A story hour, the reading of poetry, of the Bible, and other choice literature, brings spiritual uplift, cultivates
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appreciation for the best books, and leaves golden memories to guide and inspire throughout life.” Driggs then instructed Relief Society women in how to select books for their home libraries. Although the contents of the family library might reflect individual interests and tastes, certain books should be prominently displayed. “No library, for example, would be complete without a Bible. For Latter-day Saints, the other standard works of the Church are essential. Besides these, a good dictionary and a good encyclopedia are constantly helpful. A good history of our country is another essential volume. Likewise, each member of our Church should possess a good history of the Church as a reference.”

Mormon women got book ideas for their home libraries from advertisements placed in church magazines; they could also join the LDS Books Club. Advertised in the April 1959 Improvement Era, the club promised members an “increase your knowledge of the gospel, assist you in building a strong testimony,” and a 20 percent discount on all books. Offerings included such titles as Testimonies of Our Leaders, Science and Your Faith in God, and a children’s anthology, A Story to Tell.

Artwork particularly needed to be chosen with care. As early as 1934 the Relief Society Magazine observed that more than any other “accessory,” appropriate artwork and pictures on the wall best revealed the “tastes, ideals, and culture” of those living in the home. “Pictures should be chosen for their intrinsic worth or decorative qualities and because of their suitability to the spirit of the room in which they are to be hung.”


article encouraged women to choose prints and copies of the “great masters” “so that children by constant contact grow to enjoy truly fine things.”

Beginning in the 1960s, however, women were increasingly encouraged to display religious-themed artwork in their homes. For instance, the cover of the *Improvement Era* in January 1967 featured a family of seven holding Family Home Evening. Prominently displayed above the fireplace was a print of Werner Sallman’s *The Head of Christ.*

The move towards displaying religious artwork in the home sponsored a cottage industry of Mormon artists and illustrators, who began painting scenes from Mormon history, the Book of Mormon, and the life of Christ. To locate suitable artwork, Mormons in the Provo area could visit “House of Fine Arts,” a gallery which promised high quality artwork commissioned by “contemporary LDS artists as well as many old American masters.”

The *Ensign* likewise announced a plan to “make available from time to time beautifully reproduced artwork or photography suitable for framing and display at home and church.” The first such painting featured Harry Anderson’s *Gethsemane* and was included in the December 1973 issue.

While the church initially relied on Protestant artists like Harry Anderson and Werner Sallman, it increasingly sought out its own illustrators and artists for church
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magazines. Mormon artist and illustrator Del Parson, for example, received his MFA from Brigham Young University. After teaching art in public schools, he took illustration jobs for the church’s magazines.509

The shift towards religious artwork says much about the changing cultural climate in which Mormons lived. During the 1950s and early 1960s, Mormon families, and women especially, strove to live up to the white American, middle-class suburban dream. During the next decades Mormonism attempted to perpetuate this earlier ideal even when much of American society seemed to be adopting the new liberal stances of the 1960s.510 To assert more effectively the authority of the Mormon, male-led hierarchy, the church’s administrative structure went through a period of profound realignment, known as correlation, bringing in quasi-independent organizations like the Relief Society under male priesthood leadership and control.511 In December 1970, for example, women edited the last edition of the Relief Society Magazine; thereafter their budget was submerged within the larger church financial structure. In January of the following year, the church launched The Ensign, an all-new magazine for adult members. “Changing times bring changing conditions. That is basic to Latter-day Saints who believe in continuous revelation,” a final editorial in the Relief Society Magazine read. “Changing times have

brought the end of the journey to the Relief Society Magazine.” “As we detail and recall nostalgic memories, we still, obedient to the priesthood and receiving direction from them, face forward in step with the new era of the 1970’s with anticipation and a sense of dedication and support for the all-adult magazine.” The demise of the Relief Society Magazine in favor for a gender-neutral magazine was symbolic of larger changes within the organization in which women lost autonomy and visibility. Some women vocally opposed these structural modifications. Relief Society President Belle Spafford later observed that women “were unhappy about losing the magazine and they were unhappy about losing their self-financing program, and they were unhappy about losing the bazaars. They said right straight, ‘Well, the first thing you know there will be a ward bazaar and we’ll have to do the work, but it will be in somebody else’s hands.’ Now, our Relief Society women will do the planning and the work under the direction of the bishop.” Spafford explained resignedly, “But they’ll live to see the wisdom of it all; they’ll adjust to these changes. Relief Society women know how to accept priesthood-directed change.”

Part of the reason church leaders emphasized families to the extent that they did was because they perceived traditional gender roles for men and women as being

---


undervalued, even attacked, by larger segments of American society. As historian Neil Young points out, the concept of family has long played a central role within Mormon theology. Much of this has to do with Mormonism’s conceptions of redemption and the afterlife. “Unlike mainstream Christianity, which splits eternity into just heaven and hell, Mormon theology minimizes hell and expands heaven into tiers. Mormons believe, then, that all humans will live in glory. The question for Mormons is which realm of glory they will deserve based on their life on earth.” Young continues, “In effect, Mormons do not so much seek salvation, that is, pardon from damnation, for they essentially have assurance of that. Rather, Mormons strive for exaltation in the celestial kingdom, the highest of the heavenly realms, with the greatest glories and closest proximity to God.” Exaltation requires temple marriage, where a sacred ceremony binds or “seals” husbands and wives together forever, allowing the perpetuation of the family unit beyond the grave. “Just as the Relief Society lost its organizational autonomy to the church’s male authorities in 1970,” Young observes, “Mormon women reach exaltation only by submitting themselves in marriage to a priesthood-holding Mormon man.” It should be noted, however, that the reverse is also true for men. Only by marrying a worthy Mormon woman can a priesthood-holder advance to the Celestial Kingdom.

In at least one sense church leaders had a right to be concerned. Between 1960 and 1975, Utah’s divorce numbers, which, since 1890, have always been slightly higher

---

than the national average, nearly tripled from 2,167 in 1960 to 5,892 in 1975. Rates were
slightly lower in Davis and Utah Counties where Mormon population numbers remained
high. Even still, divorce rates in 1975 for Mormon couples averaged twenty-eight
percent.\footnote{Klaus D. Gurgel, “Marriage and Divorce,” in \textit{Atlas of Utah} eds., Deon C. Greer, Klaus
D. Gurgel, Wayne L. Wahlquist, and Howard Christy (Ogden and Provo: Weber State
College and Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 123.} Given the faith’s emphasis on marriage as a saving sacrament or ordinance,
any increase in failed marriages would be cause for alarm. Furthermore, by the end of the
1970s, 37 percent of all Utah women worked as wage earners, slightly lower than the
national average of 40 percent.\footnote{Research and Analysis Section, Utah Job Service, “Unemployment,” in \textit{Atlas of Utah}
eds., Deon C. Greer, Klaus D. Gurgel, Wayne L. Wahlquist, and Howard Christy (Ogden and Provo: Weber State College and Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 251; Alice
Kessler-Harris, \textit{Out to Work}, 301.} In at least one sense, church leaders saw the two
statistics as being interrelated. As Apostle Ezra Taft Benson voiced in 1981, “The seeds
of divorce are often sown and the problems of children begin when mother works outside

The Mormon suburban home thus became a site of retrenchment from worldly
goals and desires. An article by Apostle Mark E. Petersen for the January 1970 issue of
the \textit{Relief Society Magazine} is illustrative. “The home in a sense is like a miniature

---

\footnote{Klaus D. Gurgel, “Marriage and Divorce,” in \textit{Atlas of Utah} eds., Deon C. Greer, Klaus
D. Gurgel, Wayne L. Wahlquist, and Howard Christy (Ogden and Provo: Weber State
College and Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 123.}
\footnote{Research and Analysis Section, Utah Job Service, “Unemployment,” in \textit{Atlas of Utah}
eds., Deon C. Greer, Klaus D. Gurgel, Wayne L. Wahlquist, and Howard Christy (Ogden and Provo: Weber State College and Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 251; Alice
Kessler-Harris, \textit{Out to Work}, 301.}
branch of the Church,” Petersen wrote. “The program of the Church should prevail and the priesthood should preside there in love and righteousness, and love and harmony should exist among all present. The gospel should be taught there even more effectively than anywhere else.” Thus, if Mormon families were in peril, the entire church would suffer. In another article Apostle Thomas S. Monson specifically counseled women to “sustain your husband; second, strengthen your home; third, serve your God.” In doing so, he specifically told them to avoid seeking fulfillment in work and careers outside the home. Presiding bishop for the church, H. Burke Peterson emphasized this point further, “Satan would have us believe that money or the things money can buy are more important in the home than mother.”

Mormonism openly embraced 1950s-era suburban separate spheres ideology without fully accounting for the economic cost post-war consumer culture levied on individual families. A 1967 study on a sample of 123 Mormon men from Orem found that many of them had two jobs; one-fourth spent over sixty hours a week working. Moreover consumerism acquired spiritual dimensions. As Francine Bennion observed in

---

a 1977 article, “For some LDS mothers, the need for money is based rather specifically on need for status, importance, or respect. For some, it is based on the need to appear righteous in the eyes of neighbors who define material success as a sign of God’s blessing the deserving.” On another level, church hierarchy’s emphasis on mothers in the home can also be seen as an attempt to return to agrarian values, as urbanism has long been associated with women wage earning. Yet earlier, women’s wage work in canneries helped keep the Mormon village way of life economically solvent. As historian Lavina Fielding Anderson observed, the stances against women wage earners “seemed to envision the ‘marketplace’ for men as a farm where harder work would invariably produce more food. This situation is no longer the case in our monetized society,” placing significant stress on Mormon men to provide the suburban dream for their families.

Mormon women responded to this rhetoric in a variety of ways. One woman voiced, “I realized for the first time that my home held all the possibilities of achievement I could hope to find outside in any field. And with that thought I actually became transfused with new life and began making the change from housewife to professional homemaker.” Some, particularly during the heated debates over the Equal Rights Amendment, pushed back and supported feminist organizations like Sonia Johnson’s

---

Mormons for ERA. Johnson paid for her political positioning with her church membership. Her excommunication proved a ready example for other women, effectively quashing any pro-ERA sentiment within the church.\textsuperscript{529} Others sought comfort in Mormonism’s nineteenth-century radicalism. They overlooked the hardships of polygamy to embrace the faith’s more liberal aspects, publishing their ideas in *Exponent II*, named and modeled after an earlier magazine published by Mormon women.\textsuperscript{530} Along the Wasatch Front some joined the Equal Rights Coalition of Utah, which initially sought to make sure Utah legislators passed the ERA.\textsuperscript{531} Even though most women fell in line with pulpit politics and opposed the ERA, they continued to enter the workforce. A 1991 study of three thousand Mormon women living along the Wasatch Front revealed that 36 percent worked full time. The male authors who conducted the research reported their surprise that these women were able to keep “their religiosity in spite of the time demands of full-time employment.”\textsuperscript{532} By 2012 the percentage of overall Utah women who worked outside the home had climbed to 61.6 percent.\textsuperscript{533}

Neil Young maintains that by actively opposing the Equal Rights Amendment, Mormon women “outwardly revealed to each other their internal acceptance of the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[529] Neil J. Young, “‘The ERA is a Moral Issue,’” 637-639, 632, 635.
\item[531] For an exhaustive treatment of this organization see Sarah Weber, “Casualty of the Culture War: The Equal Rights Coalition of Utah,” particularly chapters four and five.
\end{footnotes}
church’s teachings about proper gender roles, male-female relations, and the submission of women.” In so doing, they sought “to prove to their church, their co-religionists, and themselves that they embodied Mormonism’s most fundamental beliefs.”

Home decorating according to real or implied church guidelines may have served the same purposes, particularly if a woman worked outside the home. Displaying primarily religious artwork helped children remain true to their Mormon upbringing in a world awash with conflicting values and changing attitudes. It also documented women’s devotional ties to home and family. In a 1973 article for the *Ensign*, the dean of University of Utah’s College of Fine Arts, Ed Maryon, drove the point home with a story, warning parents, specifically mothers, of the dire consequences if they neglected, or took a lackadaisical approach to home decorating. “A mother sadly reported to her bishop that her three sons had left home and joined the navy. Why they had done this, in view of other opportunities for employment, further schooling, missions, or even another branch of the service, was very perplexing to this loving mother.” The bishop then decided to visit the woman’s home where he saw that the only artwork on the living room wall was a painting of a ship at sea, sails spread wide to catch the wind. “‘There is your reason,’ he told the mother. ‘As your sons have grown up, you have told them every day through this painting of the romance and adventure of the sea. You have taught them well. No wonder they all joined the navy.’” Maryon then suggested Mormon homes hang more religiously themed artwork. “Latter-day Saint homes in the past have seemed to infrequently utilize ‘religious’ paintings or prints. Perhaps this was due to our members recoiling from the adoration of some religious paintings by members of other faiths. But it stands to reason

---

534 Neil J. Young, “‘The ERA is a Moral Issue,’” 625.
that if, for example, a beautiful print of Christ were in a home, thoughts would be turned to him more often.” Finally, in contrast to earlier decorating advice, Maryon encouraged members to prominently display family photographs as a way to “develop attitudes of family unity.” “Hallways, stairways, and both formal and informal wall areas can be used for collections of family memorabilia.”

One general authority Franklin D. Richards recalled staying in the home of a local stake president. As he prepared to sleep in the room of the stake president’s son, he noticed the walls were covered with pictures “of all the Church temples.” The choice of artwork, Richards approvingly noted, reflected the boy’s desires for “a temple marriage as well as a mission.” In this instance, home decorating schemes emphasizing key doctrinal concepts like eternal marriage, seemed to be working. This attitude received the official endorsement of the president of the church, Spencer W. Kimball, who stated, “It seems to me it would be a fine thing if every set of parents would have in every bedroom in their house a picture of the temple so the [child] from the time he is an infant could look at the picture every day and it becomes a part of his life.”

Mormon urban traditions have always been about redeeming a people and a land, effectively preparing both for Christ’s second coming. As Mormon real estate developers carved up the Wasatch Front’s small farms into subdivisions, attention rested on

individual families, with profound implications for gender roles. While critics lament the cookie cutter architectural style, they concede Mormon meetinghouses contribute to what landscape architect Kevin Lynch termed a city’s “legibility,” or “the ease with which [a city’s] parts can be recognized and can be organized into a coherent pattern” of districts, landmarks, and pathways.\footnote{Paul F. Starrs, “Meetinghouses in the Mormon Mind: Ideology, Architecture, and Turbulent Streams of an Expanding Church,” \textit{The Geographical Review} 99, no. 3 (July 2009): 345, 347-348; Kevin Lynch, \textit{The Image of the City} (Cambridge: The M. I. T. Press, 1960), 2-3.} As Martha Sontag Bradley has noted, the church’s uniform architectural standards “reflected the intent to unify different cultures and people. For Saints in the international Church, the ward house was a symbol, a trademark; the steeple was a symbol that the Church had arrived.”\footnote{Martha Sontag Bradley, “The Mormon Steeple: A Symbol of What?” \textit{Sunstone} 16, no. 89 (September 1992): 46.} It is this legibility on the landscape that makes Mormon meetinghouses such a powerful religious statement—or as Starrs observes—“an engineered statement of imperial reach.”\footnote{Paul F. Starrs, “Meetinghouses in the Mormon Mind: Ideology, Architecture, and Turbulent Streams of an Expanding Church,” \textit{The Geographical Review} 99 (3) July 2009, 345, 347-348.}

Suburban ward organizational structure effectively modeled ideal Mormon family life. Homes served as satellite meetinghouses or “mini branches.” Men and women subscribed to traditional gender roles in their efforts to carry out their sacred, even eternal, duties of child rearing. Church leaders, publications and classes made women like Josephine Smith responsible for establishing a nurturing atmosphere within the home. Decorating, books, and artwork communicated and reinforced important family values and church doctrines. When changing societal demands, rising divorce rates, and women wage earners seemed to threaten divinely ordained gender roles, church hierarchy pushed back. The once
independent Relief Society became subsumed within the church’s larger organizational structure; magazine articles emphasized the need to incorporate family oriented and other religious-themed artwork into a home’s decorating scheme. By obeying this council, women demonstrated their devotion to home and family—and by implication, a willingness to obey prophetic council and sacrifice personal ambitions to stay at home. The price tag attached to heeding the prophet was great, however, and for many, it was too high.
CHAPTER 7

THE VALLEYS OF EPHRAIM ARE FULL

It seems a standing command to the Saints, wherever they may be located, to build a house unto the Lord, wherever there is a stronghold pointed out for the gathering of the Saints…They are always commanded to build a house unto the Lord.

--Orson Pratt, 1873

Mormons loved Gordon B. Hinckley. Ordained in 1995 at the age of eighty-four as the fifteenth president of the church, Hinckley’s boundless energy was contagious. Gentle jokes punctuated his addresses. As he exited the church’s semi-annual General Conferences, television cameras caught him as he waved his cane and flashed a humble, almost boyish smile, at the gathered crowd. He made lifelong friends with experienced news reporters and politicians with his frank answers and optimistic assertions of faith.

Hinckley was a modern-day Brigham Young whose leadership defined the early twenty-first century much like his predecessor had the nineteenth. In 2005, just shy of his ninety-fourth birthday, Hinckley quipped, “I didn’t know I’d make it this long because I run on batteries. I have a pacemaker. I wear glasses. I carry a cane and I have batteries in my ears.”

He loved setting records and surpassing expectations: a conference center capable of seating over twenty thousand; the reconstruction and dedication of the Nauvoo Temple; extensive redevelopment of Salt Lake City’s downtown.

At the groundbreaking for the Bountiful Temple on May 2, 1992, Gordon B. Hinckley observed, “Temples were built anciently, but I’m satisfied that they were never built in such numbers as we have been building them in the last few years. We now have temples on every continent of the world…We’ve dedicated as many temples in the last dozen years as have been dedicated in all the previous history of the Church.” He continued, “And there will be others. This, I repeat, is the greatest era in the history of the world in the construction of these houses.” Each temple, Hinckley emphasized, served “as a monument to the conviction of this people that life is eternal, that the human soul is immortal, that when we pass through the veil of death we continue activity…For that reason, [temples] are absolutely essential…to the complete work of the Church as it has been revealed in this the dispensation of the fullness of times.”543 This heightened sense for the need of redemption reflected the faith’s surging population growth, especially along the Wasatch Front corridor, where new temples effectively met the growing needs of the ever-growing faithful—the majority of which Hinckley oversaw and dedicated.

As Orson Pratt had suggested over a century before, Mormon city building and temple building went hand in hand. Joseph Smith’s City of Zion Plat replaced the central business district with a temple complex. The Kirtland and Nauvoo temples were the crowning architectural features of their respective cities. Indeed, Salt Lake City conforms to the outlined pattern—the city’s street system emanates from the Salt Lake Temple. However between 1893 and 1972 there were only four temples built in Utah: the St. George, Logan, Manti, and the Salt Lake temples—all constructed during the nineteenth

century. In the interim, nine other temples served isolated Mormon population centers outside Utah. The building boom to which Hinckley referred accelerated in the 1990s and early 2000s and reflected a general population growth in northern Utah. (During the 2000s, Utah County alone grew by forty percent.)\(^{544}\) As of 2015 there were eleven temples along the Wasatch Front corridor. From a darkened airplane window, their spires sparkle prominently in the night sky. A 2008 article in the *National Geographic* on light pollution featured a full-page photograph of the Bountiful Temple to illustrate its point.\(^{545}\)

Thus, while temple building has always been fundamental to Mormon urban conceptions, the new spate in construction promised a resurgence of the old planning ideal. During the 1990s and early 2000s the church launched high profile construction projects, all of which emphasized temples and downtown revitalization efforts—suburban temples in former Mormon agrarian villages, and more recently Salt Lake City’s City Creek complex, which merges apartment-style living with upscale shopping and dining. This new face to Mormon urbanism is likewise reflected in the state’s non-profit agency, Envision Utah, which joins Mormon and non-Mormon community leaders, developers, and planners in seeking a more integrated approach to local and regional land use and resource allocation. The most significant way, then, in which Mormon urbanism is returning to its roots of city planning is through these three, not entirely unrelated, efforts:


accelerated temple building, downtown revitalization efforts, and concerted regional planning.

Many of the new temples are located in old Mormon villages where they promise to complete Joseph Smith’s original City of Zion plat, in which each city would have its own a temple. At the same time, though, these temples significantly impact community planning and development patterns, perhaps more so than previous meetinghouse construction. For example, as advertised in the 1970 Improvement Era, Marriott Development Company’s Burning Tree Acres, with its overt biblical reference, promised Provo residents “an exclusive, planned community especially developed for families seeking the best in wholesome living.” The ad continued, “Members not only own their own home or lot, but they also share equal ownership in the wonderful recreational facilities which have been completely developed.” Burning Tree was strategically located five minutes from BYU and the soon-to-be completed Provo Temple. The development boasted quick access to “new shopping centers, schools, churches, Utah Lake and Provo Canyon.”

Dedicated in 1982, ten years after the Provo Temple, the Jordan River Temple was the first of the truly suburban temples and served as an important precedent for the later building boom in the 1990s. Announced in 1978, the Jordan River was located on fifteen acres of donated property in South Jordan, a town in southwestern Salt Lake County. The temple initially served some fifty stakes in the area, thus relieving a significant burden on other Wasatch Front temples located in Ogden, Salt Lake City, and

Provo. “All temple work in the area served by the three temples has increased 293 percent since 1971, and approximately one half of all endowments done in the Church take place in these three temples,” the announcement stated.\(^{547}\) The new temple president, Donovan H. Van Dam, had been an accountant and property manager in the Salt Lake area.\(^{548}\)

Suburban temples not only affect the religious lives of faithful Mormons, but also shape community planning and property values. In selecting the South Jordan location, the church chose wisely. In the mid 1980s, interest rates for home mortgages fell, creating a building boom along the Wasatch Front. South Jordan was the fourth most popular area for homebuyers. By 1988 the city was one of the fastest growing in Utah.\(^{549}\)

In 1977, the year before the church announced plans to construct a temple in South Jordan, the neighboring community of Sandy issued its own master plan for the city that provided, among other provisions, “a site for a possible temple of The Church of Jesus


Christ of Latter-day Saints.” Once it became known that the church would build in South Jordan, property values rose; one resident suggested renaming 1300 West to “Temple Way.” As communities in southwestern Salt Lake County positioned themselves for growth during the mid 1980s boom, no one could match the Jordan River Temple. “The Jordan River Temple...has given South Jordan its greatest attraction, bringing in 40,000 people a month into the city.” South Jordan City Administrator Richard Warne saw the temple traffic as “a drawing card for business”—if only he could get the freeway exit sign changed from “Jordan area” to “South Jordan,” thus “letting merchants know the temple visitors are there.” Warne got his wish with the construction of the $3 million Jordan Gateway roadway in the mid 1990s, which also served as an access way for the 880-unit Sterling Village Apartment Complex then being planned.

---


Completed within a year of each other, suburban temples in Bountiful and American Fork likewise highlight the ways in which city planning initiatives revolved around new temple construction. In 1988 the church purchased property in Bountiful as a future temple site. The nine-acre east bench site provided “a panoramic view of the valley and the Great Salt Lake to the west. A road now under construction will provide easy access to the site.”\textsuperscript{554} The church officially announced plans to build the Bountiful temple, Davis County’s first temple, in early 1990; ground was broken two years later.\textsuperscript{555} The roadway mentioned in the 1988 press release cost the city upwards of $700,000, not to mention ongoing winter snow removal costs. (Temple workers would later joke that during the winter they needed four-wheel drive trucks to make it up the hill every day.) The city used its powers of eminent domain to acquire needed property for the half-mile, sixty-six foot wide stretch of roadway, which wound through some of the city’s most upscale bench land neighborhoods. Bountiful councilwoman Renee Coon was the only dissenting vote on the project. “I am adamantly opposed to this,” she stated at the time. “I don’t believe government has a right morally to take private property…it’s an abuse of our power.” Other than one angry property owner who filed a lawsuit against the city, the road went in without a hitch. The Bountiful mayor emphasized the road was necessary to keep residential neighborhoods free from temple traffic. “If all that traffic from north Davis County began winding up through those neighborhoods, the residents, regardless


of their ecclesiastical affiliation, would not be happy. It’s simply an issue of good planning and safety. Not surprisingly the temple prompted additional development along Bountiful’s east bench—Ivory Homes’s Orchard Crest subdivision was located “just below the LDS Bountiful Temple.” The location promised “spectacular views and is convenient to shopping, golf, churches and is just minutes from I-15 and Highway 89.”

As construction commenced on the Bountiful Temple, the church made additional plans to build a temple in American Fork, encouraging a rise in property values and speculation within that city as well. “Not only are people wondering where the temple will be built, but developers are looking to buy land near a possible site. Several called city offices…wanting to know if it knew the location,” an article for the Deseret News reported. American Fork mayor B. Kay Hutchings commented, “It’s common knowledge, I suppose, that property around a temple site has a tendency to increase in value.” As was the case in South Jordan ten years earlier, American Fork looked to benefit from the new temple. “We look forward to it…It will put our name on the map,” Hutchings stated, adding his hope that the temple would attract “merchants, restaurateurs, homeowners, and real estate developers.” With good accommodations, weekend temple attenders might stick around in the area to explore Timpanogos Cave and American Fork Canyon, and other nearby areas offering excellent camping and fishing. As it happened, American Fork’s Mount Timpanogos Temple did attract at least one hotel—in nearby Lindon.

---

Somewhere Inn Time promised to be the perfect setting for wedding dinners and receptions, offering spectacular views of the nearby temple and stately mountain for which it was named.\textsuperscript{559}

American Fork’s Mount Timpanogos temple also required city planners to reassess access roadways. In February 1996, much to the consternation of church officials, Utah County was one month behind schedule of completing the proposed extension, which looped “1100 East behind the temple in a graceful S-curve.” The church needed the roadway completed in time to accommodate the hoards of visitors to the temple open house—projections for the open house lay in the millions. The temple site already experienced heavy traffic during the groundbreaking ceremony and from people living in American Fork and nearby communities who came to monitor the temple’s progress. When construction crews installed the Angel Moroni at least 20,000 onlookers (approximately the entire town of American Fork) crowded the streets. “If the roadway is not completed in time for the open house, it could prove to be an embarrassment to the county and a disruption to what could otherwise be an enjoyable experience for the thousands of temple visitors,” church projects administrator F.R. Michael Enfield wrote to Utah County engineer, Clyde Naylor. Police Chief John Durrant agreed with the church. At issue was how the proposed roadway would affect two property owners’ yards and driveways. “It will be difficult to open the temple without that road. We’ll still have

some logistical concerns whether that road is done or not.” By August, though, the road was miraculously completed in time for the temple’s open house. “First-time visitors to American Fork shouldn’t have much trouble finding the temple if they stay on the roads covered with a new layer of asphalt,” one newspaper article quipped.

Although the church continues to build temples in suburban Mormon villages, leaders increasingly have shifted their attention towards needed downtown revitalization efforts in Salt Lake City, Ogden, and elsewhere, in part to protect the environment around their temples in those cities. Keeping the surrounding areas clean and free from urban decay certainly enhances a temple’s spiritual atmosphere and character, and thus explains why so much of new Mormon urbanism now focuses on downtown revitalization. In the process, the church’s presiding bishop, who has traditionally overseen the church’s welfare arm, has become active in city planning projects and initiatives. The first significant effort along these lines took place in the mid-1990s when Salt Lake City and the church worked together to convert a pair of parking lots near Second Avenue and State Street into parks. For the first time since 1905 when City Creek was first paved, water would once again bubble through the parks on land that had once been part of Brigham Young’s garden plot. H. David Burton, then serving as first counselor in the Presiding Bishopric noted that the parks served as “a nice buffer between the church campus and the residential communities to the north and east. It’s going to be gorgeous, to bring City Creek to the surface and have a historical reminder of what’s happened on

---

560 “Temples in Utah” LDS Church News April 23, 1994; “20,000 see statue lifted atop Mount Timpanogos Temple,” LDS Church News July 22, 1995; Dennis Romboy, “Road to temple falls behind schedule,” Deseret News February 8, 1996.
561 Dennis Romboy, “Temple road will be one more traveled in Am.F.” Deseret News August 8, 1996.
the site, not only for the church but for the community.” The church promised to help construct the parks after paying $2.3 million for an 84,000 square foot section under Main and South Temple and a portion of property under the Crossroads Plaza to construct underground parking structures.562

In 1998 the church began negotiations with the city to close a section of Main Street between North and South Temple and create an open-air plaza connecting Temple Square with the Church Administrative complex to the east. The proposal promised to “expand Temple Square gardens to provide pleasant walkways, and open space uniquely designed to enhance cultural events and displays in downtown Salt Lake City” as well as to provide additional underground parking space. “When you can combine utility with beauty you do a very significant thing. That’s what we feel is happening here under this proposal,” Gordon B. Hinckley remarked at the press conference announcing the plan.563 The city set the price tag at $8.1 million and the church gladly forked over the money. For its part the city retained a public-access easement. When the church placed restrictions on the easement (no smoking, drinking, “disorderly speech or conduct”), controversy erupted and the American Civil Liberties Union became involved, challenging the plaza sale in federal courts. Part of the problem was how each party interpreted the original plaza proposal. Was the plaza to be a public park or church property? Now serving as Presiding Bishop, David Burton contended, “From day one we’ve indicated that this would be a bridge between Temple Square and the

563 “Proposal to turn street into a plaza,” The Deseret News December 5, 1998.
administration block. It will be a park, and the public will be welcome, but obviously there have to be some standards of decorum and standards of behavior connected with it.\textsuperscript{564} In October 2002 the Tenth Circuit Court ruled in favor of the ACLU, indicating that the problem could only be solved if the city ceded its easement to the church—something that Salt Lake City Mayor, Rocky Anderson was initially unwilling to do until the church offered to exchange some of its property in Salt Lake City’s West side for the easement.\textsuperscript{565}

As the plaza controversy wound down, the church launched its largest redevelopment project yet by purchasing the Crossroads Plaza mall in 2003. It was not the first time the church had been involved in mall building. In fact, efforts during the 1960s to save the church-owned department store, Zion’s Cooperative Mercantile Institution (ZCMI), from going under by moving branches out into suburban shopping malls, may well have accelerated downtown Salt Lake’s demise.\textsuperscript{566} Partnering with Taubman Centers, a realty firm headquartered in Michigan that specializes in shopping malls, the church then turned around and constructed City Creek Center, a mixed-use development that “combines more than 100 stores, offices and high-end residences.” The $1.5 billion complex takes up twenty acres of downtown space and is “accented with


\textsuperscript{566} “ZCMI in the Salt Lake Market: A Consumer Survey,” 1957. Research Services, Inc. Salt Lake City, Utah, 5, 58. MS 16486 Box 150. LDS Church History Library, Salt Lake City.
fountains, a synthetic creek, a retractable glass roof and a pedestrian skywalk over Main Street.”567 The initial redevelopment plan came from Salt Lake City planning director and University of Utah professor Stephen Goldsmith, who in 2002 approached H. David Burton with drawings and suggestions for how the downtown area might be converted into mixed-use housing and shopping. Still battling the ACLU over the plaza at Temple Square, Burton listened attentively but nothing seemed to come from the meeting. “About a year after leaving my position as planning director I learned that Bishop H. David Burton was actually interested in moving forward with the idea.”568 The church jumped on Goldsmith’s idea largely because it promised to halt Salt Lake City’s downtown deterioration. “We feel we have a compelling responsibility to protect the environment of the Salt Lake Temple,” President Hinckley explained in the April 2003 General Conference. “The Church owns most of the ground on which this mall stands. The owners of the buildings have expressed a desire to sell. The property needs very extensive and expensive renovation. We have felt it imperative to do something to revitalize this area.” He emphasized the project would not be paid for with sacred tithing moneys. In contrast to temple building or meetinghouse construction, which is paid for by tithing funds, the church viewed the mall complex as an investment. “Funds for this have come and will come from those commercial entities owned by the Church. These resources, together with the earnings of invested reserve funds, will accommodate this

567 Tony Semerad, “City Creek Center: Boon for downtown or one of SLC’s ‘biggest mistakes’? Slat Lake Tribune May 11, 2015.
Preliminary plans released in October 2003 called for a complete redevelopment of Salt Lake City’s downtown: retail and office space, high rise apartment complexes, and the construction of a new downtown facilities for the BYU Salt Lake Center and LDS Business College. “Plans are designed to attract visitors and residents to downtown as well as spur investment in the area,” an article for the Ensign explained, “The campus relocations alone will bring 4,000 students to the downtown area.”

In the early 2000s the church’s revitalization efforts also targeted Ogden’s struggling downtown, once again to protect the environment around the Ogden Temple located in the heart of the city’s Central Business District. Since 1869 Ogden had relied on rail traffic, earning the nickname “Junction City.” Following World War II the city’s transportation network shifted dramatically as freight and passenger traffic transitioned from trains and rails to automobiles and concrete interstates. In 1967 when the church announced plans to build the new, modernistic looking temple, Ogden still seemed to possess a vibrant, active downtown. Accessibility figured high in selecting the temple’s location. “While general authorities would like to place the temple in a prominent location where it would be seen from all points, they emphasize it should not be considered just as a landmark, but as a place to work and worship,” an article for the city’s Ogden Standard Examiner noted.571

Ogden’s declining downtown became painfully evident in the years following the temple’s 1972 dedication. A 1977 revitalization plan observed, “The power structure within Ogden City, business, financial, and governmental was not welded into a cohesive unit to deal with problems within the central business district that were, and still are, of a complexity and magnitude to demand a completely united effort to precipitate significant action.” The plan advocated the construction of a downtown mall as a way to “capture a significant portion of the available untapped market” and to replace the district’s industrial character with retail and office space. The plan recognized the Ogden Temple as a “dominant landmark” and suggested that “intensified residential development” should highlight “this prestigious institutional complex.”

The Ogden City Mall did very little to revive the downtown; it may have even exacerbated the problem by moving storefronts inside the mall’s cumbersome big box. By the mid 1980s and 1990s Ogden City officials were still struggling with a declining downtown. Ogden’s fortunes began to change when Matthew Godfrey became mayor in 1999. The twenty-nine-year-old accounting graduate from Weber State University, who was serving as Bishop of his local ward when he was elected, launched the city on a lightning revitalization campaign that finally began to pay. In 2002 Godfrey convinced the city to level the mall and replace

---

573 “Preliminary Master Plan for Ogden Union Station, Ogden, Utah” (August 1984), 8, 20. Weber State University Special Collections, Ogden, Utah.
it with The Junction, a modified mixed-use development not unlike Salt Lake City’s City Creek complex.\footnote{Ogden City Undergoes a Renaissance,” KSL.com, June 12, 2007. \url{http://www.ksl.com/?sid=1342471}. Accessed June 11, 2015.}

For its part the church proved a ready partner in Godfrey’s revitalization efforts. In the late 1990s, as Godfrey was just getting elected, the church started acquiring property surrounding the temple, gutted it and built the Colonial Court apartment complex. W. Mack Lawrence, chairman of the board for the church-owned Zions Securities commented, “We’re very pleased to be part of the changes we see in Ogden. We want to get Ogden back to the prominence it once enjoyed.” Godfrey called the complex “the catalyst” for revitalization projects and believed other developers would take note.\footnote{Bruce Wallace, Apartments give Ogden new vitality,” Deseret News October 14, 2000.}

The climax of these efforts came in February 2010 when the church announced that the Ogden Temple itself would undergo massive renovation, an “architectural facelift.” The 1960s era design featured an exterior of “white cast stone, gold-anodized aluminum grilles and bronze glass panels” that no longer matched Ogden’s new trendy atmosphere.\footnote{Jack E. Jarrard, “Two New Utah Temple Drawings Win Okay,” LDS Church News, February 3, 1968.}

Keith B. McMullin, who served in the Presiding Bishopric with H. David Burton, observed. “We are excited with the announcement today of improvements to both the building and the grounds. These improvements will not only help us meet the increased needs at a busy temple but will also be part of the
enhancement and beautification of downtown Ogden.”\textsuperscript{578} The 2014 open house for the new reconstructed temple exceeded all expectations. “This is the most-visited site in downtown by quite a large margin,” Godfrey commented. “If you set aside the spiritual benefits, and there are many, it has driven tremendous activity to the core, and that’s only going to grow.”\textsuperscript{579}

The church’s downtown revitalization efforts have not been without their critics. Completed in 2012, Salt Lake City’s City Creek complex brings in $250 million annually in state taxes and lures approximately sixteen million people to Salt Lake City’s downtown. Jason Mathis, executive director of the Downtown Alliance, a consortium of downtown store owners, observed, “Main Street is thriving and it would not be if City Creek Center had not been built.”\textsuperscript{580} Goldsmith, who first presented the idea to the church, criticized the end product, especially the City Creek Bridge, a glassy walkway crossing Main Street that threatens to disconnect visitors from city streets and pathways. Goldsmith observed that despite the mixed use planning, the space felt contrived—even constricting. “The control as one enters the Center is…marked by clear signage reminding us how to be civil and describing the consequences if our civility is suspect,” he remarked. “Once one enters, the citizen is not the visitor in a private place and, as noted by the directories at each entrance, ‘…management reserves the right to prohibit


\textsuperscript{579} Tad Walch, “Demand for Ogden Temple open house tickets boosts LDS spirits, local businesses” \textit{Deseret News} July 29, 2014.

\textsuperscript{580} Tony Semerad, “City Creek Center: Boon for downtown or one of SLC’s ‘biggest mistakes,’ \textit{Salt Lake Tribune}, May 11, 2015.
any activity or conduct which is detrimental to or inconsistent with a first-class, family oriented shopping center.”

Some have wondered at the church’s intentions in developing complexes like City Creek that appear so blatantly counter to its spiritual mission. “Brigham Young would be rolling in his grave,” Richard Markosian wrote for Utah Stories. “The malls are full of chain stores which send the profits to Wall Street and corporate headquarters. The former local businesses supported local newspapers, local farmers, local ad agencies, attorneys and office firms—the service providers and suppliers of local business.” In a post titled “The LDS Church, the Prophet Amos, and the City Creek Mall,” Mormon blogger Jana Riess pointed out, “Spending a billion and a half dollars on a den of luxury consumption is a moral failure. It just is. A more modest, scaled-down plan to revitalize Salt Lake’s once-thriving downtown would have been enough. The rest is vanity, calculated to impress. It is only ironic that the mall contains a luxury store called True Religion Jeans (opening Summer 2012). Whatever else it may be, this mall is not true religion.” It is also clear, for instance, that the upscale urban living advertised at City Creek is not meant for young families with four or more children, a traditional Mormon mainstay. Condos at 99 West have only two to three bedrooms. The price tags range between $850,000 to just
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over $1 million.\footnote{City Creek Living, 99 West South Temple, \url{http://citycreekliving.com/wp-content/uploads/99west_price_schedule.pdf}. Accessed June 9, 2015.} And what about shops that are open on Sundays or restaurants serving alcohol?

In 2010 interview with the \textit{Deseret News} H. David Burton addressed these concerns and outlined the church’s emerging real estate policy. Burton stressed the investment value of developments like City Creek for the church and community at large. Burton observed that had he foreseen the 2008 recession, “I may have not suggested we proceed this quickly with the City Creek project.” Weighing the relative merits of the development in terms of jobs and tax base for the city and state, he concluded “When you get the secondary impact of those 1,700 prime jobs and the multiplier effect, it is a substantial contribution to this state and this community…Any parcel of property the church owns that is not used directly for ecclesiastical worship is fully taxed at its market value.” Finally Burton stressed that in embarking on redevelopment projects the church was only building on Mormonism’s long history of city planning. “This has been the objective of the church for all these years, to make certain that this desert blossom, this desert thrive and that it is a beautiful, safe and lovely place…It started in Kirtland, it continued in Nauvoo. Think about what took place in St. George, in Manti, in Logan and finally Salt Lake—and then it goes on from there. But community development has always been part of the DNA of the church [and] it continues today.”\footnote{“Mormon leaders and Salt Lake City work together to transform land,” \textit{Deseret News} March 7, 2010.}

H. David Burton’s use of history to sell the church’s downtown revitalization campaigns helped establish a rationale for additional, large-scale regional planning
efforts, which, while not exclusively church-directed or administered, emerged out of Utah’s cohesive Mormon-Republican political base. The most significant of these efforts has been the establishment of a non-profit planning agency, Envision Utah. Ironically Envision Utah had its start in 1988 with creation of the Coalition for Utah’s Future in 1988. At the time Utah’s population was actually shrinking as people migrated out of state for employment. A broad base of community business leaders convened to figure out how to attract economic growth and to discuss a range of related topics: “affordable housing, neighborhood and community issues, education, children, wild lands, healthcare, rural economic development, water, air pollution, demographics, transportation, and information technology issues.” By the mid 1990s, however, the coalition faced a different set of problems: rampant development and growth and the attendant quality of life issues. To confront these challenges, the Coalition for Utah’s Future created a special subcommittee, the Quality Growth Steering Committee in 1995 to research these and attendant issues and report back to the main coalition board. The steering committee included both private and public stakeholders: businessmen and developers, personnel from the Governor’s Office of Planning & Budget, state legislators, and local urban planners. The process by which the subcommittee used to make their final recommendations came to be known as Envision Utah. Robert Grow, who served as Envision Utah’s first chair and, after a brief stint as an LDS mission president in California, continued to head the organization in 2015, specifically eschews the term


“planning,” preferring “visioning” instead. Apparently planning implies overt government control and regulation, something many Utah Republicans fear and deride. Visioning seems less divisive.

Envision Utah hoped to broaden support for urban planning (or visioning) by presenting the public with several different kinds of growth scenarios for their city and asking them to vote on which scenario they desire and value the most. Public participation in the research process eases the appearances of top down regulation and control and, instead, with its emphasis on volunteerism, functions a little like a local Mormon ward council. In the initial “Values Analysis” phase of research, for example, Envision Utah asked residents to assess and analyze what they most valued about the area in which they lived. “Care is taken to ensure equal demographic representation,” Envision Utah guidelines emphasized. “This task is important because it helps elected officials and planners understand how growth, transportation and environmental issues can be solved to respond to residents most fundamental values about quality of life. This analysis also helps local leaders communicate the benefits of growth planning more effectively with residents.”

Envision Utah encouraged mayors to send out specially addressed invitations to residents, encouraging them to take part in the planning process. In public workshops and presentations, residents learned about growth projections for their area and the associated stresses on local amenities like air quality and infrastructure. Break out
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sessions engaged city planners, residents, businessmen, and land owners in mapping exercises, where each group earmarked areas on the map for growth and conservation, using colored chips to represent different types of growth—industrial and commercial, residential, and mixed-use. From these results, Envision Utah prepared scenario maps that articulated the occurrence of future development and matched them with quality of life concerns. This allowed individual residents to evaluate each scenario based on its attendant consequences. The final “Vision Document” established “a general framework for growth” that could be used to implement a final plan for the city. But even then the plan was not entirely finished. “Ideally, there is an on-going caretaker for the vision to make a difference over time. This task involves working to identify an organization, or the development of a coalition of interests, to continue the dialogue about growth decisions into the future and to keep the Vision alive.”590 As Alan Matheson iterates, Envision Utah’s approach is unique because it is about principles, not master planning. “It does not specify land use on particular parcels. Such detail would have generated fierce opposition and threatened public support... It contemplates contiguous expansion of existing communities and strongly discourages leapfrog development into surrounding rural areas.”591

Not everyone was on board with Envision Utah. One man from Provo believed the organization rigged their polling methods. “I think Envision Utah wanted a particular

answer and phrased the question to get it…Is it possible that Envision Utah is trying to create the illusion of public support for its program so that it can mislead the community into funding their program?"\textsuperscript{592} A man from Murray in Salt Lake County believed the whole process trammeled private property rights. “What I fear is that movements such as ‘Envision Utah’ will bring to pass governmental regulations that make it both unprofitable and illegal for a landowner to dispose of his property as he desires, thus forcing him to abandon both his property and his dreams to what is euphemistically known as the ‘greater good.’"\textsuperscript{593} Utah County proved particularly obstinate.\textsuperscript{594} Just outside of American Fork, the town of Lindon believed Envision Utah would impose a “cookie cutter” image on the town and erase its rural quality.\textsuperscript{595} Nearby Pleasant Grove city council member, Freeman Andersen, went so far as to call Envision Utah a socialist program.\textsuperscript{596} To quiet the naysayers, the LDS church-owned \textit{Deseret News} countered with a scathing editorial. “Groups with hidden agendas do not operate in the open. They don’t send hundreds of thousands of ballots to people, asking for their candid opinions. They don’t hold 75 public workshops in an effort to learn what the public wants…Nothing Envision Utah decides will automatically become law. Utahns still have democratic

\textsuperscript{596} Sharon Haddock, “Pleasant Grove cool to Envision Utah folk,” \textit{Deseret News} April 19, 2000.
governments on the local and state levels. Each city and county still must come to grips with growth in its own way and according to its own needs.”

Despite the criticism, Envision Utah enjoys a surprising degree of success and notoriety from the professional planning community outside Utah. Alan Matheson Jr. asserts that the organization’s strong voluntarism sets it apart from other planning organizations. While not every city along the Wasatch Front has accepted Envision Utah’s coordinated planning services, support appears to be growing. “Envision Utah’s effectiveness derives from the strong public voice and compelling technical analysis on which it is based. It also derives from strong partnerships. The governor, lieutenant governor, president of the senate, county may and many municipal mayors have served on the Envision Utah Steering Committee and support its efforts.”

Individual Mormon involvement was key. As of 2015, H. David Burton, now released from his calling as Presiding Bishop, sits on Envision Utah’s Board of Directors. As University of Utah architecture professor Brenda Sheer observed in an article for the *Brookings Mountain West*, “Although the leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS) were not initially enthusiastic, they also eventually accepted the tenets of the QGS [Qualitative Growth Strategy] in their own commercial developments…Remarkably, the LDS church, which has very large land holdings around the world and in Utah, now regularly works to plan its developments using quality growth and sustainable principles that leaders became aware of in Utah.” While Scheer seems to think Envision Utah rubbed off on Mormon leaders, it may have been the other way around, particularly since
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the stake holders she mentioned are typically practicing Mormons. “To be sure, the Beehive State is staunchly Republican and dominated by the religious culture of the Mormon Church,” Scheer concedes, “Such homogeneity results in relatively homogeneous values that make it easier to find consensus.”

More interesting is the way in which Envision Utah has affected other Mormon strongholds. An article in the *Arizona Republic* specifically cited the planning agency as a model Arizona might comfortably adopt. “To align the visions of elected leaders with the people they serve, Arizona may have to become more like Utah.” Watching changes in Utah may well have inspired Mesa to adopt Valley Metro’s controversial light rail project. In 2004, just as Arizonans prepared to vote on Proposition 400, which promised to fund the light rail construction, then governor Janet Napolitano flew to Salt Lake City to meet with church hierarchy. Although Napolitano hoped to gain greater insight into Mormon cultural values so she might more effectively work with Mormon legislators, the talks ended out revolving around Mesa’s downtown. Once again church leaders expressed concern over the neighborhood surrounding the Mesa Temple and offered to invest money and planning experience to help revitalize the area. McMullin specifically
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raised the question of public transportation and requested the light rail be extended to
include a stop at the Mesa Temple.\textsuperscript{601}

Ironically, Mormon legislators in Arizona were incensed at what they perceived to
be church meddling—McMullin’s comments left them scrambling. “The church only
takes a position on moral issues,” Representative Russell Pearce from Mesa reminded
Mormon voters. “They don’t get involved in political issues. They don’t even know the
details of this. They have no business commenting on this.” Representative Chuck Gray,
also from Mesa, observed that the light rail in Mesa would never be successful as in
Phoenix or nearby Tempe. “Mesa is not a capitol city. There’s just not the business and
all of the traffic that flows to areas around our temple.” He continued, “I wish that the
governor had taken an interest in coming to our Mesa Temple, and taken an interest in
what our church does here. It would have been helpful if she’s really trying to bridge a
gap between herself and LDS legislators.”\textsuperscript{602} Proposition 400 passed in the November
elections that year and now the light rail is seen as a key component to downtown Mesa
revitalization plans. In March 2015, as the light rail’s extension down Mesa’s Main Street
neared completion, Mayor John Giles observed, “At City Hall, the phone is ringing off
the hook with smart, intelligent, seasoned real-estate developers that are lining up to be a
part of what’s happening in downtown Mesa right now. As these stations continue to

develop, you’ll see thousands and thousands of Mesa residents given the opportunity to use light rail.\footnote{Maria Polletta, \textit{Arizona Republic} March 24, 2015. \url{http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/mesa/2015/03/24/mesa-mayor-rail-extension-will-revive-downtown/70386466/}. Accessed June 17, 2015.} Per McMullin, the light rail included a stop at the Mesa Temple.

Moreover Mormon-style new urbanism, which blends temple building, downtown revitalization, and regional planning, appears to be spreading outside Utah. In early 2014 the church released plans to construct a temple and meetinghouse in downtown Philadelphia—complete with a buffer of apartment complexes and City Creek-like storefronts, parks, and underground parking—all a few short blocks from Philadelphia City Hall. Dale Bills, spokesperson for the church’s real estate division, Property Reserve, Inc., observed that the complex “meets the needs of an expanding employment base in Center City.”\footnote{Spencer Hall, “LDS Church to develop 32-story building in downtown Philadelphia,” KSL.com, February 15, 2014. \url{http://www.ksl.com/?nid=1284&sid=28726825}. Accessed June 12, 2015.} Philadelphia’s Planning Commission Design Review Committee passed the initial plan with little fanfare. Their only caveat was that the public access to all garden areas be maintained and that the church “uses a higher-grade material than blacktop in a public courtyard.”\footnote{Kellie Patrick Gates, “Mormon apartment tower, meetinghouse complex passes design review,” philly.com, August 8, 2014. \url{http://www.philly.com/philly/news/Mormon_apartment_tower_meetinghouse_complex_passes_design_review.html?c=r}. Accessed June 12, 2015.} Architectural critic Inga Saffron lambasted the church’s architectural design for being too eclectic, blending a “a 1920s-style apartment tower with a teensy redbrick meetinghouse that looks as if it was dragged across town from the colonial-era Society Hill. As if that wasn’t enough, those retro buildings will join a snow-white, double-spired, French classical Mormon temple.” The complex looked
to be “one of the weirder ensembles produced in 21st-century America outside of Las Vegas.” But the city planning was brilliant. “Unlike virtually every other developer working in the city, the Mormons are willing to pay a premium to bury the parking for the tower and the temple,” converting an area of Philadelphia bisected by a cloverleaf and parking garages into an attractive pedestrian walkway. Safron attributed the church’s design to its business model and a need to upgrade and maintain the area around its proposed temple. “Since the Mormons finance their own projects, and don’t flip them to big holding companies, they’re willing to spend more up front to make their buildings last.” Thanks to the church’s efforts, “this empty zone will be transformed into a participating part of the city again.”

In his final General Conference address in October 2007, Gordon B. Hinckley focused his remarks on the progress of the church. The urban dimensions of the church’s growth could not be ignored. Echoing Joseph Smith’s prophecies concerning the expanding City of Zion, Hinckley stated, “Today, we have become the fourth or fifth largest church in North America, with congregations in every city of any consequence… Our general conferences are carried by satellite and other means in 92 different languages. And this is only the beginning. This work will continue to grow and prosper and move across the earth.”
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Dale Morgan was right in his assessment of Mormon urbanism. “Clearly the [Salt Lake City] owes much to the Mormons. Mormonism is profoundly indebted to the city for what it is today.” The city “now, as always, serves the function of adjusting Mormon mores and ideology to the exactions of American society.” As Morgan suggested, the forms and functions this urban life takes rests on how and what Mormons choose to appropriate from outside the Kingdom. In the nineteenth century, Joseph Smith infused his theology with urban visions and dimensions. Brigham Young used agrarian villages to colonize and dominate the land. In the mid twentieth century, as Mormon families wholeheartedly adapted to suburban life, standard plan meeting houses replaced the old agrarian village, their narrow steeples visible from the interstate freeway. Not surprisingly, as urban planners now work to create walkable cities and mixed use housing, Mormons find themselves in the business of revitalizing downtown districts and encouraging planning initiatives characterized by old models of Mormon volunteerism. Much, if not all church-directed planning revolves around temple building and preservation.

Thus, Mormons continue to focus so intently on cities because, as Joseph Smith envisioned, urban life builds church members’ spiritual and temporal well being. Admittedly, the fruition of a twenty-first century Mormon urbanism has yet to be defined or fully articulated, but it does promises to reinvigorate a sense of planned urbanism within Mormonism, perhaps not seen since the nineteenth century. What will this urbanism look like? How does it relate to Joseph Smith’s original conceptions for the

City of Zion? In what ways does it significantly depart from Smith’s plat? What might the consequences be for Mormonism’s new urban vision? Like Joseph Smith’s original City of Zion plat, Mormonism’s new urban face is fraught with both opportunity and controversy.
CHAPTER 8

MEMORIALIZING MORMON URBANISM

Today, as we look over this magnificent city, as we travel up and down this state, we recall the words of Isaiah: “The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall…blossom as the rose.”

--Gordon B. Hinckley, 1996

I visited This Is the Place Heritage Park not too long ago. It was on a quiet afternoon a few days before the LDS church’s October General Conference. I flew into town from Mesa, Arizona, where I was finishing up graduate school. The monument for which the park is named marks the spot where wave after wave of Mormon pioneers emerged from the mouth of Emigration Canyon and surveyed their new valley homeland. The cool air was a welcome relief from Arizona’s searing summers, which can last well into November. At least it’s a dry heat, the locals gently taunt. I brought a sweater, anticipating Utah’s fickle fall, but soon tied it around my waist. It might sleet tomorrow, but today, at least, was perfect. Silhouetted against the vivid blue sky, hints of gold crept around leaf edges. A carpet of green lawn graciously spread across the monument site, a significant contrast from the carefully raked rocks I had grown accustomed to seeing in Arizona. Of course I knew these acres of well-manicured lawn soaked up the water, more than the Wasatch oasis could naturally provide, but as I gazed at its abundant lushness I could almost hear Brigham Young exult, “See. We did it! We took of these elements, these mountains and streams and with the help of Almighty God, we redeemed this land.”
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Many of my ancestors passed this way—William Henry and Martha Jennings Adams, Lewis and Susannah Perkins Whitesides, Maren Kirsten Jensen. As a child, Susannah fondly remembered sitting on the lap of the Prophet Joseph in Nauvoo. After a brief stay in Council Bluffs, Iowa, William Henry and his family started west in 1848, traveling with the Willard Richards Company. “It was quite a trial for a green Englishman to yoke up cattle and cows, take what is called a bullwhip and start out, but as luck would have it, there were Yankees along who were right at home at that kind of work and they were all willing to help one another as much as they could,” William Henry remembered. “By persevering and hard work for a while, we, that is my wife and I, (she could drive as well as I) got along all right and by the time we reached the valley, we got to be as good bull-whackers as the rest.” Upon their arrival in Zion, the family stayed in Salt Lake City until the summer of 1850 when William Henry joined Philo Farnsworth and John Mercer on an exploration party south into Utah Valley. That fall Adams relocated his family to Battle Creek, which settlers later called Pleasant Grove, euphemizing the previous Mormon-Indian encounter for which the site was originally named. The first two summers went well. However in August 1852 Martha became ill and died. Grasshoppers or “Mormon Crickets” then decimated the 1853 and 1854 growing seasons. According to one family history, eight-year-old Will Jr. dug “thistles, segos, and mushrooms” to help keep the family alive.610

Others like Maren Kirsten Jensen left her hometown of Rakabbii Denmark as a young, unmarried woman. Upon being baptized, her family disowned her. As the ship pulled away from the harbor, she heard some one cry, “Good-bye—there goes Denmark.” She journeyed across the plains with a family who kept milk cows. Each night Maren had the terrifying task of separating the family’s cows from the rest of the company’s herd and milking them. A granddaughter remembered Maren as a “hard driving, forceful woman and showed little of the affection she felt for those about her, did not express the gratitude she felt for kindness shown her, nor did she expect others to show gratitude to her.” In her old age, rheumatism crippled her hands. “One would marvel to see her work and wonder how she could hold a needle with her poor misshapen hands.”  

Many of my ancestors remained faithful Mormons, but some did not. The Milton ward records list one ancestor as “weak in the faith.” Another one sold his summer whisky in the winter; his subterfuge was discovered when the summer whisky froze and cracked the bottle. Even Lewis Whitesides nearly pulled up stakes and moved to California. Most of his siblings had continued on West and after enduring the drought year of 1855 and a particularly harsh winter in 1856, Lewis decided to join them. Susannah refused to cooperate, but her protests were to no avail. Lewis’s mind was made up. The night before they were to leave, six inches of snow blanketed their Layton farm. “Whether my father regarded the bad weather as a bad omen or not, I don’t know,” their son Ed later recalled, “but the wagon was promptly unloaded and the proposed venture was given up to the delight of my mother. You couldn’t make her believe but that the
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change of mind was an answer to her prayers." Ed’s sister, Elizabeth, married E. P. Ellison. Far from Zion’s core, the California Whitesides brothers drifted from the church; their Mormon heritage is but a memory.

There is perhaps no better place to understand Mormon urban traditions than the This is the Place Heritage Park. Appropriately designed and sculpted by Brigham Young’s grandson Mahonri M. Young, This Is the Place monument was dedicated July 24, 1947, the crowning event for that year’s spate of centennial activities and celebrations. According to LDS church President George Albert Smith the monument committee spent hours selecting the site, meticulously walking the ground, comparing its landforms with descriptions found in pioneer diaries and journals. From this vantage point, the entire valley lay before the viewer. “No one standing there can gaze at the city, the lake, the smelters and factories, the trees and farms, without sensing the reality of what was in the mind of Brigham Young as he took his first look over the desert expanses,” a 1934 Deseret News article opined. Even by today’s standards, it is large and imposing—in 1947 the monument rivaled any of those then constructed in the United States. Towering on a 60-foot high central pedestal, Brigham Young, and his counselors, Heber C. Kimball and Wilford Woodruff, stand in contemplative silence, surveying the valley floor below them. Two additional pillars flank the central pedestal and depict key historic events and figures who preceded the Mormon arrival: Friars Dominguez and
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Escalante, the Donner-Reed party, Shoshone Chief Washakie, explorers, traders and trappers.

Yet it is the pioneer village adjacent the monument that best encapsulates Mormonism’s mythical village past while at the same time articulates the intimate connection between the church, Mormon developers, and the purposeful construction of a cultural landscape. For nearly thirty years, the This Is the Place monument stood lonely on the mountain bench. Then in 1971 the Utah Legislature funded a plan to create a replica Mormon Village to revitalize the park’s image. Today “Old Deseret Village” is replete with tree-lined, gridded streets, empty irrigation ditches, and rows of replica historic buildings and homes. Some of them are the real deal. In 1973, when I-15 threatened to destroy Brigham Young’s Forest Farmhouse, preservationists moved it to the park. Other houses followed, trucked there from all across the state, a menagerie of pioneer relics. Although the state expanded construction on the Deseret Village as part of its 1996 centennial celebrations, two years later it offloaded much of the fundraising and overhead costs to a private foundation, headed by none other than Ellis Ivory. Currently the park is in the process of expanding, introducing a curvilinear graveled
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roadway to the foursquare grid.\textsuperscript{617} When Envision Utah first inaugurated its drive for citizen engagement and planning, it chose Old Deseret Village.\textsuperscript{618} This Is the Place Heritage Park and its associated village says much about how Mormons look with pride on their urban tradition, even as they alter and appropriate that tradition in seemingly disparate ways.

Yet the village is surprisingly authentic, though not in the way its founders intended. Aside from Washakie, who stands on the monument’s east face stoically holding a peace pipe, the park’s small Native American Village is far from Old Deseret’s center and appears displaced and segregated. It is as though the park’s planners, not unlike their Mormon ancestors, surveyed the village center and took note of Utah’s indigenous peoples only as an afterthought. The park’s financial struggles and ultimately semi-privatized status likewise contain a muted reality. Not unlike Ellis Ivory, early twentieth century Mormon irrigationists and capitalists preserved the village system’s economic relevance and vitality. With a nod from Mormon hierarchy men like Jesse Knight and E. P. Ellison created the agrarian reality Old Deseret Village seeks to portray.

Today the decorative irrigation ditches that line the village streets are dry while the University of Utah’s research park encroaches on the park’s western edge—reflecting the post World War II changes Wasatch Front villages experienced. The park’s


curvilinear gravel roadway bespeaks the Front’s current suburban existence and is suggestive of the kind of gendered life Mormon suburbia imposed. For instance, in 1977 park officials moved Mary Fielding Smith’s one room Mill Creek adobe home to Old Deseret, locating it in the park’s far northeast corner where topography best conformed to the houses original setting. As the widowed wife of Joseph Smith’s brother Hyrum and mother to the church’s sixth president, Joseph F. Smith, Mary Fielding typified all that a Mormon wife and mother should be with her unwavering devotion to faith and family. In 2013 the church’s ward auxiliary training program focused on “Strengthening the Family and the Church through the Priesthood.” One of the training videos featured Mary Fielding Smith’s small home. “It’s a treasure to be inside here. As you look at it and get a feeling for what was occurring here with her family,” M. Russell Ballard commented. The video highlighted several activities that should occur in Mormon homes—family prayer and scripture study—and observed the special supports wards offered to women raising families alone. Presiding Bishop, Gary E. Stevenson, noted, “We read…that only the home is as sacred as the temple. And so we have this sacred place and it’s sacred because of the spirit that dwells here. And that comes through righteousness. Righteous mothers, righteous fathers holding the priesthood—it’s universal around the world.”

So far Old Deseret lacks a temple or a shopping mall complex, but development continues to keep pace in the hopes of drawing more funding and support to the village.
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foundation. In 2007, Ellis Ivory put forward a plan to lease twelve acres of parkland to the University of Utah for a three-story office building and parking lot. When that failed, he pressed for the construction of a new 7800-foot reception center that now dwarfs Brigham Young’s farmhouse nearby. Critics have questioned Old Deseret Village’s authenticity, citing the replica structures and houses as cases in point. In 1983 the Department of Interior conducted a sweeping inventory of the park and concluded that pioneer village needed to go. “Relocated buildings have no historical relationship to the historic landmark and detract from the landmark’s integrity,” the report concluded, adding, “A portion of Pioneer Village will remain visible the historically significant vista of Emigration Canyon. Its removal from the landmark boundary is the only feasible solution to preserving the landmark’s integrity.” Likewise historian Jared Farmer has lambasted the church for promoting runaway real estate development, “cooperating with flip-and-run developers to build chapels in advance of subdivisions.” There is some truth to Farmer’s assessment. In one development project alone Ivory Homes managed to squeeze “1,100 homes, 900 apartment units, a shopping area, two schools, a park and an LDS stake center” onto a 300-acre tract near the Salt Lake Airport. As of 2012 church
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properties in Salt Lake County held through its development arms, Property Reserve Inc. and Suburban Land Reserves, figured at over 200 parcels.\textsuperscript{625}

As Heritage Park demonstrates, Mormon urbanism has always been about purposeful landscape construction. Real estate has been central to this mission. Joseph Smith’s 1833 City of Zion plat that first introduced a thoroughly urban component to Mormonism was conceived during a time of rampant frontier land speculation and economic changes. In such a context Smith saw an opportunity to revolutionize and redeem relationships between people and God. In his gridiron City of Zion plat, he envisioned a new, covenanted society, one which unabashedly sought after material wealth and learning—the finest civilization had to offer—only to consecrate these for the good of the whole. Brigham Young carried this vision west where he used it to launch his own impressive colonization scheme, creating the foundation for today’s Wasatch Front urban corridor. In the mid twentieth century, Mormon families wholeheartedly embraced American suburban ideals, allowing these ideals to color and then define key ideas regarding gender and family life. Today as the church plays an increasingly visible role in urban planning and downtown revitalization efforts, partnering with citizen-led organizations like Envision Utah, one wonders what Old Deseret will look like in fifty years. If the city, as Dale Morgan suggested, truly has the power to mold “Mormon mores and ideology to the exactions of American society,” Mormons will increasingly find themselves in difficult positions of compromise and negotiation.\textsuperscript{626}

I must confess, despite the fact that I grew up in Mormon suburbia and witnessed much of the Wasatch Front’s transition away from agrarian land use patterns, I cringe when I see Ellis Ivory’s red elephant banner waving in a hay field or fruit orchard. I feel a little like my great-great grandfather, Will Adams Jr. must have felt about the Orem railroad. When he realized the Orem was destined to bisect his farm, Will fought to have the line rerouted, but to no avail. When the contractors arrived to lay the tracks and electric lines, so the family story goes, Will relocated his collection of beehives as near as possible to the toiling workmen. 627 Despite the bothersome bees, steel cars eventually rattled through the Adams farm seven times a day, compressing the distance between Salt Lake City and Provo to a mere hour and forty-five minutes. 628 Today I drive across Will Adams’s farmland every time I visit my sister and her family. They live in a town house on the north end of Pleasant Grove.

---
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