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In this issue

Few aspects of Utah history have been as richly celebrated and loudly acclaimed as that of agriculture. One hears again and again of the famous wager by Jim Bridger that corn could not be raised in the Great Basin, and even the most laconic statement of Utah agricultural tradition is sure to include some version of the seagull and cricket saga. Less spectacular but equally standard fare for our textbook histories is mention that the pioneers of 1847 diverted irrigation water from City Creek within hours of their arrival and that they were able to harvest seed potatoes that fall. Yet through it all the history of Utah agriculture has generally escaped disciplined analysis. The result has been great breadth but virtually no depth. Only very recently has this situation begun to show signs of change. In the hope of lending encouragement and impetus to these new directions, this issue of the *Utah Historical Quarterly* is devoted exclusively to agriculture.

In his recent statehood address, a prominent historian cast the study of Utah's agriculture into a conceptual framework which is at once insightful and challenging. Early land disposition and a detailed look at the politics and personalities of the United Order are additional topics for scholarly exploration here. The remaining articles are largely given to personal reminiscences. These reflections — on sheep in southern Utah, on drought and depression in eastern Utah, and on irrigation in western Utah — should be sufficient to suggest that from Utah's richly varied agricultural spectrum has emerged a distinctive ethos. Born of hope and nurtured by a tenuous optimism, it takes its character primarily from the haunting realization that the line between success and failure has always been exceedingly fine.
The "Americanization" of Utah's Agriculture

BY CHARLES S. PETERSON

Threshing in A. T. Richins's yard at Grouse Creek. Utah State Historical Society collections, gift of Mrs. E. G. Wright.
CLOSE TO THE HEART of Utah is the heritage of its farms and towns and people who have made their homes in them. In no other western state did the process of rural homemaking based on farm economy begin so early nor play a more meaningful role than in the development of our state. Mormon-Gentile relations, mining, transportation, manufacturing, military spending, and urban sprawl have each in its own time placed a stamp upon our past; but cutting across all of these has been a basic dependence upon agriculture and a commitment to rural living. It is, therefore, quite proper that the Utah State Historical Society has chosen farming and rural living as its theme to commemorate Statehood Day 1974 and has placed the ceremonies here in Cache valley where agriculture is strong and the attributes of rural life are evident on every hand.

In a prize-winning book of 1971, Gustive O. Larson has written of the "Americanization" of Utah for statehood. Tracing the long political struggle between the Mormon church and the United States government, Larson points out that for statehood to come it was necessary for Utah to make certain concessions as to mixing church and state, and, as the symbol of these concessions, to give up polygamy. This accomplished, Larson takes his reader through the dramatic events of the 1890s, through the emergence of two-party politics, through the trial and victory of a seventh constitutional convention and then seventy-eight years ago today to the cherished goal of statehood.¹ Fulfilling the fondest political dream of the territory, it was a splendid moment. Politically the entire decade was important. It was, perhaps, and I say this with due deference, Governor Rampton, the key decade in the entire history of Utah. The territory had in effect joined the Union. Thereafter the full benefits of home rule and sovereign statehood were in its grasp.

The release from controversy and the drama of political events have blinded us to the fact that Utah was Americanized in other respects as well during the 1890s. The decade was equally significant for changes in Utah's agriculture. A shift from self-sufficient and subsistence farming to commercial agriculture characterized the decade. That shift was quite as much a process of Americanization as were the political changes, and in its implications for the rural

¹Gustive O. Larson, The "Americanization" of Utah for Statehood (San Marino, Calif., 1971).
patterns that had dominated life in the territory, its portent was quite as significant. Since we are concerned this evening with the impact of agriculture and rural life upon statehood, it is appropriate that we examine the heady and shifting days of farming in the 1890s. It is the more appropriate because Cache County led out in the process of change, playing a key role in the initial experiments with commercial farming and more lately through the continuing influence of the Agricultural College and University. However, it is more than appropriate that we look at the changes in farming life in the years around statehood. It is important. The nationalizing of Utah’s agriculture in those years led straight to today. The focus of Statehood Day 1974 upon these changes points with force to the need for a much broader historical analysis of this important aspect of our heritage.  

Little has been written on the history of agriculture in Utah. The nearest thing to a general treatment is William Peterson, “History of Agriculture in Utah,” in Wain Sutton, ed., Utah: A Centennial History, 3 vols. (New York, 1949). Running to 230 pages this section of the Centennial History brings agriculture to 1947 and attempts a general coverage. Unfortunately, it was prepared in haste by several authors and is not well integrated and is of varying quality. Fortunately, the settlement process, which relates closely to agriculture, has been thoroughly studied in its Mormon context, and much work has been done dealing with the small farmer and pioneer villages in which he settled. Among the best of these are: Leonard J. Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830 - 1900 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958); Nels Anderson, Desert Saints, The Mormon Frontier in Utah (Chicago, 1942); Andrew Love Nell, History of Utah 1847 to 1869, Leland Hargrave Creer, ed., (Salt Lake City, 1940); and H. H. Bancroft, History of Utah (San Francisco, 1890). Local histories that treat the village-farm and other aspects of agriculture and rural living include the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers centennial histories for the various counties and A. K. Larson, "I Was Called to Dixie”; The Virgin River Basin: Unique Experiences in Mormon Pioneering (Salt Lake City, 1961); Charles S. Peterson, Take Up Your Mission: Mormon Colonizing Along the Little Colorado River, 1870 - 1900 (Tucson, 1973); and Joel E. Rickis and Everett L. Cooley, eds., The History of a Valley—Cache Valley, Utah-Idaho (Logan, Utah, 1956). Treating 19th-century agriculture are: E. L. in the Nineteenth Century by C. L. M. The Mormon Village: A Pattern and Technique of Land Settlement (Salt Lake City, 1952), and Joseph A. Geddes, "Farm Versus Village Living in Utah,” Utah State Experiment Station Bulletin 246 (1934), “Farm Versus Village Living in Utah” Utah State Experiment Station Bulletin 269 (1936), and “Modification of the Early Utah Farm Village,” Yearbook of the Association of Pacific Coast Geographers, 8 (1942). Pioneer diaries are also useful for understanding Utah’s agriculture. Two of special use in reflecting the Mormon village-small land holding pattern as well as the character of the early livestock industry are Robert Glass Cleland and Juanita Brooks, A Mormon Chronicle: The Diaries of John D. Lee, 1848 - 1876, 2 vols. (San Marino, Calif., 1955); and John H. Krenkel, Life and Times of Joseph Fish, Mormon Pioneer (Danville, Ill., 1970). Works dealing with irrigated agriculture include: Charles Hillman Brough, Irrigation in Utah (Baltimore, 1898); George Thomas, The Development of Institutions Under Irrigation (New York, 1902). Farm villages and irrigation are glowingly dealt with in two chapters of William E. Smythe, The Conquest of Arid America, originally published in 1899 (Seattle, 1969). Conservation has been widely treated in numerous technical publications. Useful historical treatises include, Utah Historical Quarterly, 39 (Summer 1971) which features seven articles dealing with facets of conservation and reclamation, most of which reflect directly on agriculture. Less directly oriented to agriculture is Walter P. Cottom, Our Renewable Wild Lands - A Challenge (Salt Lake City, 1961) which collects six bulletins and position papers. The livestock industry has likewise received little historical attention. The Utah Historical Quarterly, 32 (Summer 1964), features nine articles dealing with cattlemen and the cattle industry. Generally useful in understanding the history of livestock are two agricultural bulletins, William Peterson, et al., “Cattle Ranching in Utah . . . 1925,” Utah Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 203 (1937); and A. C. Esplin et al., “Sheep ranching in Utah . . . 1925,” Utah Agriculture Experiment Station Bulletin 204 (1928). Articles on the sheep and wool industry appear incidently in widely scattered works. More specific is Charles S. Peterson, “Small Holding Land Patterns in Utah and the Problem of Forest Water-shed Management,” Forest History, 17 (1973). Useful for the history of dry farming are John A. Widdosoe, Dry-Farming: A System of Agriculture for Countries under a Low Rainfall (New York, 1911); and Grant Cannon, Dry Farming: Moisture is Saved Two Years for One Crop, The Farm Quarterly, (1934). In addition to the published items appearing above the following unpublished works deal ef-
Utah's Agriculture

One can scarcely overstate the extent of agricultural change that took place in the 1890s and the first years of the new century. When 1890 dawned, the territory was very much an outpost of self-sufficient farming. When the decade ended, evidence was everywhere at hand that self-sufficiency had been abandoned and that farmers were seeking the good life in commercial enterprise. Change was as apparent in the products that were raised as it was in the method and purpose of raising them. Change was apparent, too, in the involvement of Utahns in the great agricultural movements of the era. We may thus say that while the process neither began nor ended with the decade, the effective Americanization of Utah agriculture was achieved during the years immediately before and after statehood.

Self-sufficiency as a territorial policy had still been strong in the 1880s. This was apparent in many ways but as good a way as any to call attention is to examine the *Utah Industrialist*, a monthly magazine established in 1881, published at Provo, and, as its masthead stated, “devoted to the development of Utah’s resources.” From first to last the *Industrialist* leaves no doubt that farming was Utah’s first industry. Page after page runs to articles on “Fruit Trees,” “Strawberry Culture,” “Does Farming Pay?” and “Cure for a Kicking Horse.” An amazing diversity of small home industries were reported, most of them depending upon local production of wheat, wool, fruit, leather, or other agricultural products. Debt and use of credit were decried, and home industry was extolled and commercial sale of agricultural products out of the state denounced in tones that might have warmed Brigham Young’s heart.

But the primacy of agriculture as reflected in the *Industrialist* is not only economic; it is philosophical as well — nowhere better evidenced than in an effectively with varying aspects of agriculture and rural life in Utah: Clair Anderson, ed., “History of Grazing,” a WPA Writer’s Project study of grazing in Utah; this work exists in manuscript form at the Utah State University Library and the Utah State Historical Society. Feramorz Young Fox, “The Mormon Land System: A Study of the Settlement and Utilization of Land under the Direction of the Mormon Church” (Ph.d. diss., Northwestern University, 1932), is useful but is limited by its heavy dependence upon the pattern of Mormon colonization which is used as chronological backdrop. Also making valid contributions are George L. Strebel, “Irrigation as a Factor in Western History, 1847-1890” (Ph.d. diss., University of California, 1966), most of which deals with Utah; R. V. Francaviglia, “The Mormon Landscape: Existence, Creation and Perception ...” (Ph.d. diss., University of Oregon, 1970); and Norah E. Zink, “Dry Farming Adjustments in Utah” (Ph.d. diss., University of Chicago, 1937).

3 Leonard J. Arrington recognizes the important changes in Utah’s agriculture during this period. See Great Basin Kingdom, 390 - 92; Beet Sugar in the West (Seattle, 1966), 18 - 76; and Arrington’s chapter on the “transitional” period in Cache valley, in Ricks and Cooley, eds., History of a Valley, 205 - 39.

4 *Utah Industrialist*, 1 (1888), coversheet, 19 - 20, 102.
anonymous poem entitled “The Farmer Feedeth All” extracted from the October 1887 issue:

My lord rides through the palace gate
My lady sweeps along in state,
The sage thinks long on many a thing
And the maiden muses on marrying;
The sailor plows the foaming sea,
The huntsman kills the good red deer,
And the soldier wars without a fear;
But fall to each whate’er befall
The farmer he must feed them all.

Man builds his castles fair and high,
Wherever river runneth by:
Great cities rise in every land,
Great churches show the builder’s hand,
Great arches, monuments and tower,
Fair palaces and pleasing bowers:
Great work is done, be it here or there,
And well man worketh everywhere,
But work or rest, whate’er befall
The farmer he must feed them all.\(^5\)

Although a significant amount of Utah wheat was exported during the 1880s and livestock became an increasingly commercial enterprise, it is clear that for the contributors of the *Industrialist* and probably for most of its readers agriculture was the queen of a system that was still tied to the self-sufficient farm village and contained largely within the territory.

What happened to agriculture during the 1890s is vividly seen in the changes that took place in land. In the first place, it was the decade of greatest increase in farm acreages ever experienced by Utah. This can be illustrated in several ways. The total land in farms increased almost fourfold, from 1.3 million acres in 1890 to 4.1 million acres at the century’s turn. Improved farmlands nearly doubled, and irrigated acreages increased by 348,000 acres or 132 percent. The upward thrust in total land held in farms spent itself during the 1890s, but the advance in improved and irrigated acreage continued, showing respective increases of 79 percent in the census of 1910.\(^6\)

\(^{5}\) P. 121.
Back of this remarkable expansion in farm acreage were two land developments that were altering the physical as well as the social and economic forms of Utah agriculture. The one, land entry under federal provisions for 160 or more acres, had been a factor of increasing importance since 1869 when federal lands (all of Utah until that time) were opened for legal entry. The effect was twofold. Holders of small village farms, who had worked their land since pioneer times but had never owned it, had been able to get legal titles. In the second place, the physical form of Utah’s land pattern had undergone a marked change. The new homestead farms were larger. They were also located on highline canals and along roads at a distance from the farm villages, reducing the near monopoly the older pattern had once held on the landscape. During the 1890s land entry under homestead and other federal provisions came to a new high as did sale of farms of substantial size from state lands, railroad grants, and other private holdings. The important point in our context is that a typically American system of land distribution based on federal land provisions, grant lands, and speculation had been superimposed upon the pioneer pattern. It is significant that during the 1890s this system played a key role in conveying more farmland into private ownership than had been passed into private hands in all previous decades.

The second great development in evolving land patterns was dry farming which came into its own in the decade following statehood. In some degree dry farming was blundered into through accidents of farming during the previous decades, but it was also the product of the more expansive spirit of the 1890s. Folklore in various localities, including Cache valley’s Clarkston, suggests that Brigham Young predicted the benches of the territory would one

---

day be covered with wheat fields. Whether his prediction rested on the Mormon assumption that the elements would be transformed by divine interposition for the sake of the righteous or whether he anticipated that methods then known could be refined to permit successful dry farming is not known. But it is clear that for several decades most Utahns were convinced irrigation was an absolute necessity. Indeed, the first successful dry farming experiences were sometimes met with disbelief. The story is told of David Broadhead, a Juab County farmer, who was jailed for perjury when in the process of filing on a homestead on unwatered Levan ridge he filled out an affidavit swearing he had raised wheat without irrigation. He


9Indicative of Mormon thinking that attributed the fact that dry farming proved possible to divine influence upon the climate is the following from the *Millennial Star*, the Church's organ in England: "The blessings of God have rested upon the efforts of the pioneers in reclaiming the desert. Many streams have been greatly increased in volume, and in some places new springs have burst forth in the desert. In some places where, twenty years ago, there was scarcely water sufficient for the needs of a few families now there are large streams capable of irrigating thousands of acres. The rainfall has greatly increased in some localities. A few years ago it was considered impossible to raise crops without irrigation; now quite a proportion of the land under cultivation is tilled without artificial irrigation. (Italics mine.) J.H. Ward, "Past and Present," *Millennial Star*, 46 (1884), 520 - 22.
apparently regained his freedom, as he later proved up on the place and fittingly named it Perjury Farm.\textsuperscript{10}

Investigations at Utah's Agricultural College in the late 1890s led to the establishment of the science of arid farming there and to the creation of six experimental farms spanning the length and breadth of the state by 1905. Under the leadership of John A. Widtsoe, the movement worked out the techniques of dry farming, applied capital and technology, and attracted thousands of hopeful young people to its banner.\textsuperscript{11}

One such was Will Brooks. Educated at the Agriculture College in the days of Widtsoe's greatest enthusiasm, Brooks ramrodded a crew for the Utah Arid Farm Company, a commercial enterprise which took up 8,000 acres in Juab County. The following year Brooks moved to San Juan County, momentarily an El Dorado of the new life, where he homesteaded and took desert entry on several hundred acres, managed the experimental farm there, got in the livestock business, opened a store, and taught school, all within a year or so of his arrival.\textsuperscript{12} Times had changed, indeed, since the Hole-in-the-Rock pioneers had pinned their hopes on the farms of a tiny and flooding beach at Bluff on the San Juan River in 1880.\textsuperscript{13}

But for many, dry farm homesteading was almost as surely a subsistence business as Bluff had been. It was not, however, part of the old order of self-sufficiency, for its goals pointed beyond the subsistence period to the good times of cash sales and land speculation.\textsuperscript{14}

More clearly in the focus of the new commercialism were the great land and water development projects. Beginning in the late 1880s many of these came full cycle in the nineties, adding a patently speculative element to the great land boom of the decade. Scattered throughout the state, none of these enterprises gave brighter prospects than did the Bear River Canal project.\textsuperscript{15} Hinging their hopes on eastern capital, modern technology, diversion of the Bear River, and upon the railroad grant lands of northern Utah, its promoters put together a complex scheme of development. To be included

\textsuperscript{10}Grant Cannon, "Dry Farming . . .," The Farm Quarterly (Winter 1954) 43.
\textsuperscript{11}See John A. Widtsoe, Dry Farming. The entire book deals with the developing science and chapters 12 and 13 with the movement's history.
\textsuperscript{12}Juanita Brooks, Uncle Will Tells His Story (Salt Lake City, 1970), 95 - 145.
\textsuperscript{13}See David E. Miller, Hole-in-the-Rock: An Epic in the Colonization of the Great American West (Salt Lake City, 1959), and Cornelia Adams Perkins, Marian Gardner Nielson and Lenora Butt Jones, Saga of San Juan, 2d ed. (n p., 1968), 60 - 61.
\textsuperscript{14}Zink, "Dry-Farming . . .," 35 - 48.
\textsuperscript{15}Brough, Irrigation in Utah, 85 - 95.
were two great canal systems, land promotion campaigns in Utah and the Midwest, proposals for a vast orchard region, and municipal and irrigation waters as well as electricity for communities as far south as Ogden.16

Never completely successful, the bonanza land and irrigation companies were in full keeping with the commercialism of the time and persisted well into the twentieth century. Jessie Knight, for example, undertook a project on the Blue Bench of Duchesne County in the years around World War I.17 The big range on Cache valley’s west side also went through a series of “boom or bust” promotions in the first decades of the century. Involving Heber J. Grant, soon to be Mormon president, the promoters divided and subdivided planted orchards and sold to people as far away as Florida in their attempt to keep the development moving.18

Farther south, near Moab, the Valley City Company, consisting primarily of Indianapolis bankers, made grand (but as it ultimately proved, abortive) plans to impound flood waters in the washes between Green River and Moab. It was hoped that thousands of acres could be irrigated — some said as high as 250,000 acres.19 In the years after the century’s turn an earthen dam was built and a vigorous promotion mounted in Indianapolis and elsewhere. In 1908, the dam gave way and the hope of Valley City’s future with it, but still to be found in the Moab area are a few of the settlers who succumbed to the Valley City dream.

Ironically, indebtedness is another index to the changing times of the 1890s and the decades that followed. Under the old order,
most farmers had worked their small farms without benefit of a commercial economy and had little to do with money. For many life went on reasonably well without it. Reporting on local conditions, one Mormon farmer expressed the situation well when he recorded in his diary, "in these parts good health and . . . prosperity prevail — except in money matters."\(^{20}\)

The basic accuracy of this appraisal was apparent in the extremely low level of mortgaged farms throughout the entire territorial period. Both church president Wilford Woodruff and Utah's first state governor, Heber M. Wells, cited this enviable record to separate irrigation congresses during the 1890s as evidence that small, irrigated farms were most profitable.\(^{21}\) But the very forces of commercialism they were sponsoring at the irrigation congresses had begun to alter the mortgage pattern even as they spoke. In 1890 only 597 or five percent of Utah farms were encumbered. By 1896 when Heber M. Wells made his proud report, the number had doubled, and by 1900 it had increased again to nearly two thousand, making nearly a fourfold increase of mortgages in ten years. Looked at in light of the upward surge in total farm acres, this may not have been out of line, but once started the trend continued. In 1910, 4,500 or twenty-five percent of all farms were mortgaged and by 1920 the figure had risen to forty-eight percent, or to nearly 10,000 units.\(^{22}\)

Elsewhere in frontier America, farm mortgage had long been an acute problem, one of the many giving rise to the Populist protest in the late 1880s and early 1890s. Thus the rush to take on the characteristics of the national farm economy brought with it the burdens of farm mortgage for many Utahns.

---

\(^{20}\)"Journal of Levi Mathers Savage," original and typescript, Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; typescript edited by Ruth S. Hilton, p. 46.

\(^{21}\)Deseret News, September 17, 1891; and Smythe, Conquest of Arid America, 71.

The shift to commercial agriculture also showed itself sharply in the cropping patterns of the state. Sugar beets, dairying, livestock, wheat, truck crops, and orchards were all seen in terms of markets that reached more and more beyond the state boundaries. Since time prohibits an examination of developments in each of these crops, we shall look briefly at fruit farming.

The 1890s and the first decade of this century were a boom time for the orchard business. But interest in horticulture was not new to Utah. Early colonists had planted orchards and berries almost immediately on arrival. Thousands of family orchards soon graced the territory, and fruit was entered into the local barter and peddled at army installations, mining towns, and to immigrants. Nurseries flourished, and through trial and error, areas suited by climate and soil to fruit production were recognized.

Information on developments in cropping patterns generally may be found in William Peterson, "History of Agriculture in Utah" in Wain Sutton, Utah: A Centennial History; Leonard J. Arrington in Great Basin Kingdom, 387 - 91, and in Beet Sugar in the West; and Fred G. Taylor, A Saga of Sugar, Being a Story of the Romance and Development of Beet Sugar in the Rocky Mountain West (Salt Lake City, 1944). For livestock see references in footnote 2 above. Other relevant material is scattered.

See Richard F. Burton, The City of the Saints, and Across the Rocky Mountains to California (New York, 1862), 269 - 70; and the Farmer’s Oracle, May 22, 1863, and August 11, 1863. Published at Spring Lake Villa, Utah County, the Oracle carried many articles and advertisements dealing with horticulture.
But pioneer orchards were not kept up. The early assumption that fruit could be raised any place in the territory proved unsound. Blight and pests hit the territory. By 1890 few boasted about Utah fruit. Then with the awakening of the 1890s, fruit was hailed as one of the bonanza crops. Great irrigation projects were built on its prospects. Small farmers through the length of the state became aware of it. Orchard associations were organized, delegations sent to fruit-bearing regions, and orchards planted. Cache valley, where the value of orchard products had been $3,204 in 1890, marketed fruit amounting to $65,432 in 1910, and reached a peak of nearly $200,000 by 1920. Encouraged by promotion of the land companies, good markets, and by favorable shipping rates and facilities, what one writer has called the speculative planting went on until 1912 when over 43,000 acres were in orchards. Then as trees came into production, the bottom fell out of the market. Burton T. Tew's account indicates the problem:

The fruit really did well. We had wonderful crops of beautiful peaches, but we were about ten days later than the Grand Junction area. We sent them by consignment to St. Louis and other mid western cities. The market was glutted. No demand anywhere, so the peaches were dumped into the river and we were billed for the cost of the dumping besides the cost of the freight plus the cost of baskets and packing and picking and growing and taxes on the land.

Then as now frost often frustrated the best hopes. Tew's rather dramatic account of a battle with the weather on Mapleton bench is worth recounting here:

We bought hundreds of smudge pots filled them with about a bushel of coal apiece, put some waste cloth at the bottom which had been soaked in kerosene. That spring was plenty cold so we were ready when the peaches were in bloom. I remember how we ... sat or laid around the stove and every few minutes one of the boys checked the thermometer. The temperature kept getting lower until one o'clock when it got down to 32 degrees. We each lit up a torch and started running through the orchard lighting the smudge pots as we went. We covered twenty acres in a short time. It was a beautiful sight and as we looked across town we could see Joseph Malmstrom making new fires through his orchard. We could tell where he was as the new flames leaped up in the

---

25 Brough, Irrigation in Utah, 85-95.
27 Ricks and Cooley, eds., History of a Valley, 211.
29 Burton T. Tew, "Life Story." A copy is in the writer's possession.
darkness... the fires started going down by three or four and the cold kept coming down on us. So we hooked up the team and raced to Uncle Charles Bird's coal pile, loaded up, got him out of bed to weigh us and hurried home. We used up all the coal Uncle Charles had. That is, the fruit growers did, for there were other people as frantic as we. Then we decided to try and save five acres of the best fruit by the house. We would load 20 or 30 pots in the wagon from the outer area and bring them in on the wagon bed still burning, dump them out and go for more, but the wagon got so hot on one of the trips that it burst into flames. It scared the horses and we finally stopped the team and all got hold of the wagon bed and rolled the bed with the fire flaming away right off the running gears. That ended our effort for the night. No coal, no wagon to fight with... so we lay down to sleep just as it got daylight. We didn't have enough peaches to fill our own bottles that fall.30

Sobered by this kind of experience, hundreds of orchard men turned their attention elsewhere. Pulling out as many as 140,000 trees per year, they reduced 43,000 acres of orchard in 1912 to 29,000 in 1916.31

But the quest for profit went on. The fact that it was not met with great success in any single product kept Utah's farming diversified. It also slowed the rate of movement away from farming as a way of life.32

The outward thrust of Utah's agriculture during these years was apparent in other ways as well. Utahns were very active in a number of great national movements of the time. This was particularly true of the irrigation congresses. Several of the congresses met in Utah, including the first one in 1891. The movement's chief organ, *Irrigation Age*, was published in the state for several years, and the story of the development of Utah irrigation played yeoman service in popularizing irrigation throughout America.

The outward reach of Utah's agriculture was also apparent at the great Chicago exposition of 1893 at which a costly pavilion was erected featuring the territory's agriculture. In creating the agriculture exhibits, Professor J. W. Sanborn of the Agricultural College had canvassed the entire farming community to be sure full representation was given. Among other things, he sought to portray pioneer farming through the display of homemade farm equipment
and anticipated the development of a permanent farming museum at the college as one of the spin-off advantages of the Chicago display.  

The early conservation movement, too, had its full complement of Utahns. Frank Cannon, senator for a short time immediately after statehood, supported President Grover Cleveland’s withdrawal of the Uintah Forest in 1897 rather than joining his colleagues from other western states in opposition. Reed Smoot, though always oriented to business, became a powerful figure in conservation during the years after 1900, as did the state’s first three governors.  

As final evidence may be cited the role of John A. Widtsoe in dry farming. One of the movement’s great scientists, he was also numbered among its greatest promoters on the national and international scene.  

---

33 E. A. McCaniel, *Utah at the Worlds Columbian Exposition* (Salt Lake City, 1894); and Jeremiah Wilson and J. W. Sanborn, Letterpress Book, Merrill Library, Utah State University, Logan.
35 Widtsoe, *Dry Farming*. 
As I have made this examination a few impressions have grown. While they are little more than impressions, some of them merit brief mention.

Most Utahns, particularly its Mormon society, wanted statehood and the symbol of belonging to the larger society of America that it implied, with a fervor that is difficult for us to grasp after seventy-eight years. Once they had achieved this membership, they went about the business of proving that they merited it with enthusiastic and sometimes uncritical energy. This seems evident in the drive to statehood itself — it also is obvious in the changes in agriculture. There can be no doubt that agriculture's transformation was economically motivated, but the very importance given economic considerations was itself a move to conformity and part of the quest for acceptance.

A second impression is that a number of forces making for change in Utah's farm scene reached a peak in their capacity to modify agriculture during the 1890s. As a result, much was changed. Farming became a business rather than a way of building the Kingdom. Technology became increasingly important and manpower less so. Patterns on the land were permanently modified. A land rush that quadrupled acreage in farms had its impact. The four-square village with its small farms lying adjacent still comprised a dominant pattern; but line villages, growing cities, and dispersed homesteads and dry farms now became the setting in which a growing proportion of our population existed. In the sense that these emerging forms reflected national patterns, the need to conform noted above was gratified and helps explain the haste with which the new was superimposed upon the old.

One gains the clear feeling that the economic prospect of the moment was paramount. Little long-range planning appears to have been done. This was true at every level, including the man in the field, the speculative land company, and government. While the efforts of John A. Widtsoe and others at the Agricultural College and in the extension movement represented planning of a sort, they unfortunately did little to anticipate, plan, and direct the sweeping social changes implicit in the scientific and commercial agriculture they were working to promote. Likewise, there is little evidence that discipline in utilization of natural resources featured in the scheme of things. Such planning as there was generally related to economic goals.
 Farmers themselves were often uneasy during the new period and responded quickly — perhaps over quickly — to any prospect of profit in their enterprise. A few farm diaries exist for the decades after statehood. Providing a compressed view of time these give the impression of an almost frantic quest for profits as farmers changed from hay, to berries, to apples, and then to peaches, and from wheat, to beets, to carrots, or peas, to dairy cows and to poultry, and sometimes repeated the process in whole or in part. As the search for elusive markets went on, change came near being the common denominator. Evidence that farming was still a rural, slow-paced way of life characterized by thrift, home gardening, a cow, and a few chickens is to be found in plenty. But such evidence is countered by increasing indications that an almost desperate quest for commercial success characterized the lives of progressive farmers.

There is some suggestion that the decade after 1900 was characterized by a retraction from commercialism in some phases of agriculture. Reaction to overextension is particularly apparent in the case of land. The 4.1 million acres listed in total farmlands in 1900 had dropped by nearly a million acres in 1910, indicating that in spite of opening the Uintah Indian Reservation lands to homesteading and of such developments as the Valley City project the land boom was not able to maintain itself. Closer examination may well prove that re-
traction and consolidation touched other aspects of farming as well.

However, if evidence does indeed point to a retraction it was not a withdrawal to the self-sufficiency of the insular Utah of the decades prior to 1890. It was rather a withdrawal to something more in keeping with the general American feeling that farming ought to be a way of life rather than a business.

The question remains. Does the agricultural experience of the 1890s have a meaning for today? We have enjoyed—or undergone—the greatest material boom in the history of mankind since World War II. An energy crisis is now upon us. A land crisis with the accompanying problems of food shortages, space utilization, and water development may not be far behind. Nationally, highways blanket land equivalent to the state of Indiana. In terms of arable lands, the cost of transportation is doubtlessly as high for Utah. Subdivisions move relentlessly into
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Reaping dry-farm grain ca. 1900 near Nephi. Utah State Historical Society collections, gift of the Philadelphia Museum.
prime farm ground, limiting both the variety and total amount of products raised locally. Fewer people than ever before live on and work our farms. Canneries and sugar factories which a few decades ago worked throughout the state now stand closed, with the exception of sole survivors at Smithfield and at Garland.

Do we know what it means for Utah? The boom of recent decades may well suggest a time of consolidation. Certainly it demands a more considered utilization of farmlands adjacent to our population centers. It may also require a reexamination of farming methods including the commercialism and speculation upon which farming now rests. The forward thrust of agricultural sciences which in the past has rejected what it has defined as outmoded with an almost ruthless self-assurance may find it necessary to temper its march into the future with an occasional glance rearwards. A full understanding of the forces that have impelled the development of Utah's food production and the relation of the state's society to it will be necessary to sort out the meaning and priorities of local, regional, and national markets and distribution systems. Possibly of even greater import is the need to understand the instincts and human needs served by the rural life we have progressively given over since 1896.

A statehood commemoration focusing on rural life and agriculture represents a good beginning, for much of Utah's vitality lies in its farm heritage.

---

**CORN HUSKING**

One of the many happy times of early days was the corn husking bees. It was most generally at night. We would have six or eight lanterns these were hung around the large pile of corn. Then the crowd would gather and begin the work or fun for it was fun. Every girl was eager to find a red ear of corn. It meant she would [be] the lucky one of the evening. She would be the first to be married. But the boys all shun[ed] the red ear for it meant he would lose the girl he went with. After the corn was husked there was always a good supper waiting in the house and after this came the dance which was the main feature of the evening. (Interview with Annie Peterson Jensen, Manti, conducted by Sterling Haws for the Federal Writers' Project, 1938, typescript, Utah State Historical Society manuscript file A1188.)
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Establishing and Maintaining Land Ownership in Utah Prior to 1869

BY LAWRENCE L. LINFORD
When the first company of Mormon pioneers entered Salt Lake Valley in July 1847, federal legislation extending the national land system to the Mountain West had not yet been enacted. In fact, not until 1869 would they and the thousands who followed them be able to obtain legal title to their land. During this interim period of more than two decades, the Mormons formulated under authority of the church a system of land description that was an adaptation of the rectangular survey they had known in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. They also borrowed something from both the New England town and the Midwest claim association. This system controlled surveying, recording, and conveyance of the urban and rural lands which supported a population of approximately one hundred thousand persons, their residences, businesses, and farms. It was a system unique in the history of American land settlement, and this paper seeks to detail a portion of the story.

Church and Territorial Governance

In order that the land might be properly surveyed and organized and in fairness to the numerous pioneers who were expected in Salt Lake Valley by the autumn of 1848, Brigham Young declared on July 25, 1847, that “no man should buy any land . . . but every man should [have] his land measured off to him for city and farming purposes, what he could till. He might till it as he pleased, but he should be industrious and take care of it.”1 It was subsequently announced that wood, timber, and water would be regarded as community property, disallowing any private ownership of these necessary resources. Since there appeared to be a scarcity of timber, only dead wood was to be used as fuel.

Brigham Young’s purpose was quite clear. If this colonization attempt in the arid West was to be successful, the settlers necessarily needed an opportunity to acquire suitable acreage for their sustenance. To have allowed land speculation on the part of a few would almost certainly have meant the creation of unnecessary antagonism and possibly even the failure of this society. Moreover, by this date the actual amount of water available for irrigation and other uses
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1Wilford Woodruff Journal, July 25, 1847, Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
had not been ascertained, but it was apparent the number of acres that could be placed under cultivation in the foreseeable future would be restricted.

Until such time as they would receive their land allotments, the pioneers settled themselves in temporary dwellings and farmed in communal fields. Grain and vegetables were planted within days of their arrival in the valley. For shelter and for protection from the Indians, they constructed a fort on a portion of what is known today in Salt Lake City as Pioneer Park. Here they lived until at least the autumn of 1848 — many remained even longer in order to complete the construction of their permanent residences before leaving the fort — preparing for the orderly settlement of the valley.

On August 2, 1847, Orson Pratt and Henry G. Sherwood began the survey of Great Salt Lake City. By August 20 the survey of Plat A was completed. It included 114 blocks. The land selected for urban purposes was divided into ten-acre blocks, each containing eight lots of one and one-quarter acres measuring ten by twenty rods. The streets were eight rods wide. Only one house could be constructed on each lot, and this had to be set back twenty feet from the front of the property.\(^2\)

The apostles selected a number of these lots for their personal use during August 1847, but general distribution of the land was not made until the autumn of 1848, after Brigham Young had returned from Winter Quarters, Nebraska. On September 24 President Young and Heber C. Kimball were chosen to distribute the town lots.\(^3\) Each applicant received his plot by lottery so no one would feel he had been dealt with unjustly. Thomas Bullock maintained a record of the land distribution.\(^4\) A fee of $1.50 was paid for each lot acquired: $1.00 of this sum was to cover surveying expenses, and the remainder was considered a filing fee. Each man's receipt for his land became his deed for the purposes of maintaining his claim and the conveyance of the land in the future. Unmarried men were not given an allotment, but polygamists were entitled to receive one for each family.\(^5\)

\(^2\)Feramorz Young Fox, "The Mormon Land System: A Study of the Settlement and Utilization of Land under the Direction of the Mormon Church" (Ph. D. diss., Northwestern University, 1932), 41.
\(^3\)"Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," September 24, 1848, LDS Archives.
\(^4\)Hugh O'Neil, "Resume of Laws Affecting Title to Utah Lands," The Improvement Era, 47 (July 1944), 430 ff.
Within days the lots in Plat A had been distributed. The desire for land not satisfied, Plat B containing sixty-three additional blocks east of Plat A was surveyed and readied for distribution during 1848. Plats A and B were divided into nineteen ecclesiastical wards, a bishop presiding over each ward. Under the supervision of each bishop, fences and irrigation ditches were constructed for the benefit of all ward members.  

By autumn of 1848 plans had been formulated for the distribution of a tract of farmland known as the "Big Field." Writing to Orson Hyde and others, Brigham Young noted:

> It is our intention to have the five acre lots next to 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, which will be seventeen miles and fifty-three rods long, eight feet high, and to the end that every man may be satisfied with his lot and prevent any hardness that might occur by any 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.

Those settlers wanting farmland were asked to register with a clerk and to indicate the number of acres they desired. By October 1848, 863 applicants had asked for a total of 11,005 acres. This demand for land within the "Big Field" was so great that in the end only five- and ten-acre lots could be granted. As the need for more farm acreage increased, other lands were surveyed and distributed with the understanding that each property owner should fence his land against animal and human trespass.  

Any disputes which arose as a result of this system of land distribution were resolved by the ecclesiastical authority of the church. Often such a decision was nothing more than a declaration on the part of the church authority in whose jurisdiction the dispute arose. In 1854 Marriner W. Merrill "located some land outside the margin of irrigation" which he later learned was claimed by Goudy Hogan. Merrill related the following:

> I applied to Brother Hogan to buy his claim as he had plenty of land without it, and as it had cost him nothing I thought I was entitled to a portion of the public domain to build a home upon. Brother Hogan
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"Ibid.

"Journal History," October 9, 1848.

refused to sell or let me have the land or any portion of it, and I felt that he was selfish and did not love his brother as the precepts of the Gospel require. So I applied to the Bishop, John Stoker, but did not get any encouragement from him, he letting me think there was no water for the land and that it was worthless to me. But I did not view things in that light exactly, although I was not at that time acquainted fully with the importance of irrigation to mature crops. So I applied to the Territorial Surveyor, Jesse W. Fox, who was very kind to me and gave me all the information he could about the land, and even took me up to President Young’s office to talk to him about it. President Young not favoring the policy [sic] of one man claiming so much land . . . directed the surveyor, Brother Fox, to make me out a plot of the land for the 100 acres and also to give me a surveyor’s certificate for it, which was done, and on presenting my claim to Brother Hogan he was very angry and said many hard things to me, but he surrendered his claim and I was the lawful claimant of 100 acres of land by the then rules of the country.\footnote{Marriner Wood Merrill, “Autobiography,” LDS Archives.}

In the absence of federal legislation providing for a territorial government in Utah, representatives of the settlers convened March 15, 1849, to adopt the constitution of the state of Deseret, a provisional government. Thereafter, a General Assembly was elected which consisted of a Senate and a House of Representatives; Brigham Young was elected governor. The first session met July 2, 1849, and under the constitution enacted laws to govern the people. On April 5, 1851, the provisional government was dissolved in preparation for the territorial government. The organic act creating the territory of Utah passed Congress September 9, 1850, but it was not until September 22, 1851, that the first legislature of the new territory convened. Brigham Young retained his office in the new government. Once in session, the assembly, by means of a joint resolution, adopted all of the laws enacted by the provisional government of the state of Deseret which were not repugnant to the organic act as a basis for future legislation.\footnote{Utah Territory, Acts, Resolutions and Memorials . . . of the Territory of Utah from 1851 to 1870 . . . (Salt Lake City, 1870), 108.} Therefore, the laws of these two legislatures will be considered one body of law for present purposes.

On March 2, 1850, Governor Young approved two important pieces of legislation. Under the provisions of “An Ordinance creating a Surveyor General’s Office,” a surveyor general was to be elected by the General Assembly and made responsible for continuing the surveys of the state, making them “correspond with the
original survey of Great Salt Lake City." As new lands were surveyed, certificates issued by the surveyor general or his subordinates located in each county were given to the claimants. The certificates were considered proof of legal possession for "the amount of land therein described."  

The second enactment was "An Ordinance in relation to County Recorders" who were charged with the responsibility of recording "all transfers or conveyances of land or tenements, and all other instruments of writing and documents suitable, necessary and proper" to such conveyances. Further, these officers were to record "town and city plats, and plats of all surveys of lands, roads, and surveys of public works" which were of a permanent nature and located within the bounds of their respective counties.

In 1855 the territorial legislature found it necessary to set forth the duties of the county surveyors more specifically. The surveyor was required to maintain a book recording all the surveys made within his county and a record of all certificates issued. The act also provided that each certificate should "certify the number of block and lot, with the number of acres or square rods in each lot, and to whom given." Before this certificate became legal proof of land possession, it had to be countersigned by at least one selectman of the county and filed in the county recorder's office within thirty days of its issue. By 1855 both receipts issued at the time of the initial land distribution and surveyor's certificates issued for later surveys and recorded in the proper county office were accepted as official documents establishing proof of ownership — legal title as yet being nonexistent in Utah.

Legal authority supporting the claims of ownership and their conveyance was derived from legislative enactments. The General Assembly of the state of Deseret, which had the power to incorporate communities, granted municipal charters spelling out local property rights to several of the larger settlements. Each of these incorporated communities received an area of twenty or more square miles. This was sufficient to include the settlement itself, lands then under cultivation, and an area of virgin lands which would allow the community to expand within its incorporated limits.

---

11State of Deseret, Laws and Ordinances of the State of Deseret (Salt Lake City, 1919), 96.
12Acts, Resolutions and Memorials . . . of the Territory of Utah, 80.
13Ibid., 82.
Photocopy of original Weber County land certificate shows Aaron Y. Farr as claiming two lots surveyed by Jesse W. Fox.

A sample enactment is the January 9, 1851, ordinance incorporating Great Salt Lake City. After delineating the bounds of the city, the legislation provided that

the inhabitants of said City, . . . shall have power . . . in all actions whatsoever, to purchase, receive, and hold property, real and personal, in said City; . . . to sell, lease, convey, or dispose of property, real and personal, for the benefit of said City; to improve and protect such property, and to do all other things in relation thereto, as natural persons.\(^{15}\)

That same year, the General Assembly passed acts incorporating the cities of Manti, Ogden, Provo, and Parowan. Each of these enactments contained a property conveyance clause similar to the one quoted.\(^{16}\)

While the necessary particulars to be included in land conveyances had been outlined in at least one previous legislative enactment,\(^{17}\) the Territorial Assembly and governor had, by January 18, 1855, approved the form which such conveyances would “substantially” have to follow in the future:

Be it known by these presents that ______ of ______ the rightful claimant and owner of [here describe the property and its

\(^{13}\)Laws and Ordinances of the State of Deseret, 8-9.

\(^{15}\)Many other cities were incorporated during the territorial period; each charter contained a similar property conveyance clause.

\(^{17}\)An Act to regulate Surveyors and Surveying,” Acts, Resolutions and Memorials . . . of the Territory of Utah, 81.
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location, and, if required, any peculiar rights and appurtenances] do

for the sum of_______dollars paid by_______of_______;
or in consideration of_______good will to_______, (as the case

may be) transfer all my claim to and ownership of the aforesaid prop­

erty to the said ________heirs and assigns. Dated this ________ day

of_______in the year________.18

Again in 1860 the rights of claimants to secure, maintain, im­

prove, protect, and sell sections of the public domain in Utah were

reinforced. In a law approved January 20 “declaring certain things
to be property, specifying the owner thereof, defining the mode for
recovering its possession, and providing for redress of any griev­
ances that may arise from proceedings under this act,” the legisla­
ture of the territory stated

that any person who has inclosed, or may hereafter inclose, a portion or
portions of unclaimed government land, or caused it to be done at his
expense; or has purchased, or may hereafter purchase, such inclosure;
or erected, caused to be erected, or purchased any building or other
improvement thereon, or may hereafter do so, is hereby declared to be
the lawful owner of the claim to the possession of such inclosed land,
and the lawful owner of the improvements thereon and thereunto
appertaining; and he shall be so deemed and held in all legal proceed­
ings, and in all rights and doings pertaining or relating to the aforesaid
property.19

The policy that water and timber were to be held in common
found expression in several enactments adopted by both the Gen­
eral and the Legislative assemblies. Specific individuals were given
the “exclusive right” to control the use of water and timber in the
canyons and around the springs for the benefit of all the settlers. For
example, legislation gave James Rawlins exclusive control of the
road construction as well as the sale and cutting of timber in the “first
Kanyon south of Mill Creek.” He could charge no more than
twenty-five cents per load of wood or timber taken from the canyon.
In Tooele County Ezra T. Benson was given control of Twin Springs
and Rock Springs for mills and irrigating purposes.20 On November
23, 1850, Brigham Young asked the General Assembly to grant him

exclusive control over the timber, rocks, minerals and water, in the City
Creek Kanyon, as far as your jurisdiction extends; in order that the
water may be continued pure unto the inhabitants of Great Salt Lake

18“An Act concerning transfer of land claims and other property,” ibid., 92-93.
19Ibid., 42.
20Laws and Ordinances of the State of Deseret, 2-3.
City; and he agreed to pay into the Treasury of the State, such sum as shall be an equivalent for the timber, rocks, and minerals, between the dividing ridges running down to said Creek, as shall be the valuation of the same; to be decided by a Committee of three, or such other Committee as shall be agreed upon by your Honorable Body.21

The assembly granted the canyon to the governor on December 4 for the sum of $500.

AWAKENING FEDERAL INTEREST

Certainly by the early 1850s the national government was well aware of Utah's land needs, and steps were taken to correct these deficiencies. Reporting to Robert McClelland, secretary of the interior, on November 30, 1853, the commissioner of the General Land Office, related the advantages of extending the land system to the territories of Utah and New Mexico.

The expediency and propriety of early action for the extension of the land system over the Territories of New Mexico, Utah, & c., is suggested and recommended. The population of those Territories is constantly increasing, and no doubt many settlers are improving lands belonging to the government, without the possibility of obtaining titles for them under existing legislation. To relieve this state of things, and to secure bona fide holders in their possessions, without which their energies will be checked and the prosperity of the Territories prevented, it is suggested that proper surveying districts be established and a commission instituted, to ascertain and report to Congress the present condition of the titles therein. . . .22

This opinion was relayed to President Franklin Pierce in the secretary of the interior's report of December 5, 1853. In his message to Congress that very day, Pierce recommended the extension of the national land system to the "Territories of Utah and New Mexico, with such modifications as their peculiarities may require."23

Within two years a surveying district had been created and a surveyor general appointed for the territory. On July 27, 1855, David H. Burr arrived in Great Salt Lake City prepared to begin the survey.24 By September 30, 1856, Burr was able to report the estab-

21Ibid., 4.
22U.S., Congress, Senate, Senate Documents, 33d Cong., 1st sess., 1853-54, no. 1, Serial Set #690, p. 83.
23Andrew Love Neff, History of Utah, 1847 to 1869 (Salt Lake City, 1940), 263.
24Andrew Jenson, ed., Church Chronology (2d ed.; Salt Lake City, 1914), 54.
lishment of an initial point for his survey as well as the running of the base and meridian lines to points located nearly four miles east, thirty-six miles west, eighty-four miles north, and seventy-two miles south from the initial point. He noted that the survey of “one hundred and thirty townships and fractional townships” had been completed and that one survey crew still in the field was expected to be finished with their assignment in the “Sanpete and Youab valleys” before winter.25

Thomas A. Hendricks, commissioner of the General Land Office, communicated to the secretary of the interior additional information which had been received from Burr but had not been included in his annual report from the West. Burr found the incorporated limits of Great Salt Lake City to include “several square miles” which was considerably larger than the 320 acres allowed to a city of its population in the Townsite Act of May 23, 1844. Burr suggested the legislation to enable him “to close the lines of the public surveys upon such limits of the city as it may be proper to recognize.” Hendricks proposed that the “peculiar condition of the capital of Utah” be considered and a law passed which “would award to the city a sufficient number of the legal subdivisions to embrace its present actual improvements, such legal subdivisions contiguous to those improvements to be, of course, laid open for disposal under the general land laws applicable to the same.”26 Despite this correspondence, the condition and status of the corporate boundaries of Great Salt Lake City remained unchanged.

The federal surveys in Utah progressed quite rapidly. By June 30, 1857, it was reported that 1,987,580 acres had been “prepared for market” but “not advertised for sale.”27 Hendricks’s annual report to the secretary of the interior advised that the “surveyor general had abandoned his position, owing to reported hostilities on the part of the Mormon authorities at Salt Lake City.”28 Burr, himself, is reported later as having stated that “his person and life were in imminent danger.”29 Commissioner Hendricks also noted that “representations have been made unfavorable to the surveys

25Senate Documents, 34th Cong., 3d sess., 1856-57, no. 5, Serial Set #875, p. 542.
26Ibid., p. 211.
27Senate Documents, 35th Cong., 1st sess., 1857-58, no. 11, Serial Set #919, p. 79.
28Ibid., p. 93.
29Senate Documents, 35th Cong., 2d sess., 1858-59, Serial Set #974, p. 131. Burr’s anxiety is a partial expression of feelings in Utah Territory that year. By midyear federal troops were moving toward Utah to suppress a “rebellion.” The alarm this action generated among settlers is expressed in the preparations they made to receive the army as well as their attack that September on a company of California-bound immigrants passing through the territory (Mountain Meadows Massacre).
which have been executed in that Territory, but we have no means of judging of the correctness of these statements without actual examination on the ground." Unfortunately, these criticisms were proven true in later years.

With Burr's departure from Utah Territory, the records of the surveyor general were transferred into the care of the governor. Here they remained until the autumn of 1859 when Col. Samuel C. Stambaugh, the newly appointed surveyor general of the territory, arrived in Utah. Since the feeling in the General Land Office was that more land had been surveyed in Utah than was actually needed at the time, Stambaugh's assignment consisted of receiving the records of his office from Gov. Alfred Cumming and placing them in order again. He also was to see if the surveys completed by Burr and his party were as bad as had been reported.

In his report of 1860 Commissioner Joseph S. Wilson recommended to the secretary of the interior no new surveys for the territory of Utah in light of the extensive surveys already completed as well as the lack "of provisions of laws granting preemptions" and the absence of a land district. Two years earlier Hendricks had recommended to Secretary of the Interior Jacob Thompson that

as the Territory of Utah is now in peace, and its people yield obedience to the laws of the general government, it is recommended that it shall no longer be treated as an exception in the legislation for the Territories upon this subject, and that, to place the matter beyond question, the pre-emption policy be expressly extended to that Territory, and that one land district be organized therein, co-extensive with its limits.

However, this advice would not find its way into congressional legislation for ten years. After several years of inactivity due to lack of orders from Washington, the surveying district of Utah was consolidated with that of Colorado, and the records of the Utah office were transferred to the Denver-based surveyor general of Colorado during 1862.

30 Senate Documents, 35th Cong., 1st sess., no. 11, Serial Set #919, p. 93.
31 Colonel Stambaugh, in a report dated September 10, 1860, accused Hendricks of disregarding the laws governing the surveys and his deputies of "delinquency in perpetuating the corner boundaries posts of the requisite dimensions." U.S., Congress, House, House Documents, 37th Cong., 2d sess., 1861 - 62, vol. 1, Serial Set #1117, p. 473. Utah Governors Brigham Young and Charles Durkee (1865 - 69) are also quoted as having questioned the accuracy of these surveys. Neff, History of Utah, 679 - 80, 684.
32 Senate Documents, 35th Cong., 2d sess, 1858 - 59, no. 1, Serial Set #974, p. 132.
In his report to the General Land Office for 1864, John Pierce, surveyor general of Colorado and Utah, recommended no extension of the national land survey in Utah, since those already completed more than adequately fulfilled the present needs of the people. He saw things differently by the autumn of 1865. Reporting from Denver on August 15, Pierce urged the commencement of surveys in Utah once again.

The time has now arrived when a respectable portion of the people of Utah are desirous of obtaining title to the land from the government, and the number of these is rapidly increasing. There can be no doubt that the true policy of the government in regard to Utah is to encourage the emigration to that Territory of a population less hostile to the United States than the present. To do this, Gentile emigration must have the chance of acquiring title to the land, and must be protected in that title.33

Pierce reiterated his appeal for the beginning of the resurvey in Utah the following year and asked that Congress appropriate $10,000 so resurveying could begin. His pleas went unheeded, and in 1867 W. H. Lessig, surveyor general for Colorado and Utah, asked for $5,000 for the lines to be “retraced and to enable the surveyor general to superintend it in person.” Again in his report for 1868, Lessig reminded Commissioner Wilson of the failure of Congress to appropriate money for the resurveys in Utah and stressed their importance in enhancing the permanent settlement of the territory. Evidently Lessig had not been made aware of the creation of a land district for Utah Territory earlier in the year.

CLAIM-JUMPING

During the autumn of 1866 there was a rash of claim-jumping in Salt Lake City. The city’s public squares had to be fenced to prevent squatters from settling on them. The militia’s parade ground, the city race course, and some private claims in the western area of the city were temporarily seized by claim-jumpers. Such actions aroused the established settlers. On one occasion a group of them went to the race course on the west side of the Jordan River, collected some of the squatters there, threw them into the water, tore

33House Documents, 39th Cong., 1st sess., 1856-66, no. 1, Serial Set #1248, p. 103.
down the intruder’s buildings, and heaved the boards into the river after them.\footnote{Brigham H. Roberts, \textit{Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints}, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City, 1930), 5:201-2.}

Such incidents prompted Brigham Young to state explicitly that although the established community would not tolerate any claim-jumping, it would welcome any newcomer who was willing to claim open land and make it productive.

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, 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 labour to make these improvements, to wrest our homesteads out of our hands. There is land enough in the country; go to and improve it, as we have improved our possessions; build cities, as we have done, and thus strive to reclaim the country from its wild state.\footnote{Brigham Young, \textit{Journal of Discourses}, 26 vols. (Liverpool, 1854 - 86), 11:260.}

Although the facts of the case are still not clear today, one murder in Salt Lake City has been attributed to the uneasiness of the community during these autumn months of 1866. Within its northern corporate boundary, the city possessed a tract of approximately eighty acres of land containing warm springs. Buildings were constructed over the springs, and for sixteen or seventeen years the city maintained the area as a public bathing resort. It was on this property that Dr. J. King Robinson chose to stake his claim and to erect a small shack. The city council ordered the marshal to destroy the structure and eject the intruder. The order was fulfilled, and on appeal before the chief justice of the territory, John Titus, Robinson’s case failed. On the night of October 22, 1866, Robinson was attacked in the street near his home and severely beaten by seven unidentified individuals. Death came as a result of this beating.\footnote{Roberts, \textit{Comprehensive History of the Church}, 5:202 - 3.}

The claim-jumping controversy continued on into the winter months of 1866-67. By December 23 Brigham Young’s remarks on the subject were becoming more aggressive.

\footnote{Such a control measure is strikingly similar to the methods used to preserve land claims within the Johnson County Claim Association of Iowa. At least one such trespasser found his house torn to the ground within fifteen minutes after he refused to relinquish his claim to the association. Benjamin F. Stambaugh, \textit{Constitution and Records of the Claim Association of Johnson County, Iowa} (Iowa City, 1894), xv.}
If they jump my claims here, I shall be very apt to give them a pre-emption right that will last them to the last resurrection. I hope no man will ever venture so far as to tempt me to do such a thing. The Latter-day Saints will never again pull up stakes and give their possessions to their enemies. You think that you can get the Government to help you to do this. It will never be done worlds without end.  

The encroachments of the so-called harpies seem to have been short-lived and quite unproductive.

**Integration into the National Land System**

On January 24, 1867, Sen. William Morris Stewart of Nevada introduced in the Senate "An Act for the Relief of the Inhabitants of Cities and Towns upon the Public Lands." Approved by Congress on March 2, the law provided that since townsites on public lands were not subject to the agricultural preemption laws, the authorities of incorporated towns entering claims for lands within their jurisdiction at the proper land office and paying the minimum price could obtain title to these lands "in trust for the several use and benefit of the occupants thereof, according to their respective interests." If the town was not incorporated, the judge of the county court had to enter the claim in behalf of the unincorporated town. He received title to these lands in trust for the use and benefit of the occupants. The disposal of the acquired title was to be conducted according to the regulations prescribed by the legislature of the governing state or territory.  

Inasmuch as the national land system still had not been extended to Utah Territory, its inhabitants could not avail themselves of this act until July 1868 when Congress adopted "An Act to create the Office of Surveyor-General in the Territory of Utah, and establish a Land Office in said Territory, and extend the Homestead and Pre-emption Laws over the same." This act authorized the president with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint a surveyor general for the territory whose annual salary could be $3,000, "and whose power, authority, and duties" would be equal to those enjoyed by the surveyor general of Oregon. The public lands of the United States within the territory were declared to constitute a new land
district called the Utah district, and the “pre-emption, homestead, and other laws of the United States applicable to the disposal of the public lands” were extended to the new area.40

While this bill was introduced in Congress by Delegate William H. Hooper of Utah, strong support for its acceptance was voiced by George W. Julian, chairman of the House Committee on the Public Lands, and Joseph S. Wilson, commissioner of the General Land Office. At the time of the bill’s third reading in the House, June 3, 1868, Julian expressed his desire for its passage and referred to a letter of March 20 which he had received from Wilson who mentioned that almost one hundred thousand people already were living in the territory where only 2,517,912 acres of a total 56,355,635 had been surveyed.

The Central Pacific railroad will pass over the country, and the work may take fifteen thousand employees in that region. The influx of such a column of operatives must be felt in the social condition of Utah, and many that may go there in the road service and by general immigration will doubtless remain. . . .

It is the opinion of this office that our laws in respect to the disposal of the public lands should be promptly extended over that Territory and a land office established.41

Following the passage of federal land legislation for Utah, the territorial government approved on February 17, 1869, “An Act prescribing Rules and Regulations for the execution of the Trust arising under an Act of Congress entitled ‘an Act for the Relief of the Inhabitants of Cities and Towns upon the Public Lands,’ approved March 2, 1867.”42 The new territorial law provided that once the corporate authorities of any city or probate judge of any county had received title to a parcel of land in behalf of the claimants situated there, they were “directed and required to dispose of and convey the title to such land, or to the several blocks, lots, parcels or shares thereof, to the persons entitled thereto.” The actual transfer of title was to be made by means of “deeds of conveyance.”

Within thirty days of entering any lands at the United States Land Office, the corporate authorities or judge were to give public notice of the action in at least five public places and in a newspaper with general distribution within the city. This notice was published

40Ibid., 15:91 - 92.
42Acts, Resolutions and Memorials . . . of the Territory of Utah, 4 - 6.
once each week for at least three consecutive months and contained an accurate description of the lands entered. Any individual, business entity, or other organization with a valid claim in any portion of the entered land was required to register such claim with the clerk of the probate court of the county in which the land was located within six months of the first publication of the notice. This deadline could be extended to one year if sufficient cause were shown for not having filed during the first required period.

If at the end of the six-month period there were adverse claimants to any parcel of land, the probate court served notice on them, and the case was brought before the court. The decision could be appealed to the district court. If there were no adverse claimants, a summons was served on the party making the claim, ordering him or his agent to show evidence of such claim. Upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence, judgment was entered in behalf of the claimant. When the land claimed lay within the corporate boundaries of a city, the authorities were notified of the court’s findings, and title was granted by the city.

Before title was received, the claimant paid $1.25 an acre plus a proportionate amount of the costs involved for acquiring such title from the land office. Parcels of land not claimed after the six-month period were held by the judge or corporate authorities and used for public purposes or held for future sale at not less than $5.00 an acre. Daniel H. Wells, mayor of Salt Lake City, exercised this option in 1871 when he

made application through the United States Land Office in Salt Lake City for between five and six thousand acres of land covered by the city, which on payment to the Government of $1.25 per acre would be issued to the Mayor. Accordingly on June 11, 1872, the patent was received from Washington by Mayor Wells. This disposed of some irritating and unjust claims that had been made against the land. The municipal authorities were now able to give deeds for lots in the city, thus settling the serious question of the validity of titles.43

The incorporated area of Salt Lake City presented a multifaceted problem to those attempting to superimpose the national land system of townships and sections upon a plan of plats, blocks, and lots. The Townsite Act of March 2, 1867, had fixed the number of acres to be embraced by any town in terms of its population.

43Bryan S. Hinckley, Daniel Hamner Wells and Events of His Time (Salt Lake City, 1942), 160.
... and where the inhabitants are in number one hundred and less than two hundred, shall embrace not exceeding three hundred and twenty acres; and in cases where the inhabitants of such town are more than two hundred and less than one thousand, shall embrace not exceeding six hundred and forty acres; and where the number of inhabitants is one thousand and over one thousand, shall embrace not exceeding twelve hundred and eighty acres: Provided, That for each additional one thousand inhabitants, not exceeding five thousand in all, a further grant of three hundred and twenty acres shall be allowed. . . .

Therefore, an urban population of up to five thousand persons might secure a town site of 2,560 acres. But in 1869, Salt Lake City's population was approximately twelve thousand — 12,859 in 1870 — and its incorporated limits encompassed much more than the 2,560 acres allowed towns of five thousand or more. On February 13, 1869, the governor and legislature adopted a memorial asking Congress for relief by amending the Townsite Act to authorize in all cases where the population shall exceed five thousand, the entry of twenty-five hundred and sixty acres for each five thousand inhabitants, or so much thereof as may be necessary. Your Memorialists beg leave to represent that Salt Lake City, in its surveyed and occupied lots, embraces about three times the amount of land permitted to be entered by the provisions of the aforesaid Act, and to limit the entry of town site lands would work a severe hardship upon a large portion of the occupants.

Finally, on November 21, 1871, some 5,730 acres were entered on the townsite docket of the General Land Office for Salt Lake City, and the patent for the land was sent to Mayor Wells.

A second problem — how to superimpose the national land system over land platted in Salt Lake City long before the federal surveys — was solved by compromise. Within the plats already surveyed and apportioned, land was described in terms of lot, block, and plat. This system is still used in Salt Lake County today. Outside of these plats the national land system was imposed, and the lands were described in terms of township and section.

Town dwellers and residents of areas where judges applied for title from the land office had the option of obtaining their land title from one of these two sources, but others had to apply directly to the

---

44 Statutes at Large, 14:541.
45 Acts, Resolutions and Memorials ... of the Territory of Utah, 23.
land office for their title. Ethan Pettit, a settler in Salt Lake Valley who resided outside of the corporate limits of a city, recorded that on Saturday, April 24, 1869, he went to Salt Lake City and the land office to enter "150 and 70 hundredth acres of land" as his preemption. Four days later, he went again to the city as a witness for Levi Reed and George Baldwin "concerning their land claims."47

Through such means 148,402.91 acres had been disposed of in Utah Territory by June 30, 1869, a period just short of four months after the opening of the land office in Salt Lake City. Of this total, 51,683.26 acres had been sold at a price of not less than $1.25 an acre, and 96,764.65 acres had been disposed of under the terms of the Homestead acts of May 20, 1862, and June 21, 1866.48

Approval of these applications for title began appearing on the records of the United States Land Office in 1870. Henceforth, settlers of Utah Territory could obtain title to their lands. With this privilege came the inherent prerogatives and protection that such a title holder possessed under the auspices of the United States government. It had been more than twenty-two years since the first settlers arrived in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, but at long last governmental protection of their land claims was a reality.

47Ethan Pettit Diary, positive print, Western Americana, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
John R. Young, son of Lorenzo Dow Young, played a controversial role in the Kanab United Order. Utah State Historical Society collections, gift of Salt Lake Tribune.

Kanab United Order: The President's Nephew and the Bishop

BY P.T. REILLY
Completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 facilitated infiltration of the Mormon lebensraum by outsiders, a group of opportunists indifferent to the aspirations of the dwellers in the Great Basin Kingdom. Gentile prospectors already had swarmed over Utah’s mountains, making strikes and staking claims. Now there were other newcomers. Merchants, backed by eastern capital, set up businesses stocked with cheap, new goods which the deprived Saints were eager to purchase. Plagued by a chronic shortage of ready cash, Mormon businessmen were unable to compete; their offerings were older, more costly, and in short supply, enabling the incoming merchants to seize economic leadership in a relatively brief period. Even Utah’s financial institutions were vulnerable, and by 1873 six of her seven banks were controlled by non-Mormons. Exploitation of the Great Basin’s natural resources further tended to disturb the orderly balance of the agrarian economy.

The Saints had thrived in isolation until 1857, but their second decade in Utah had brought a portent of impending change. The drift presaged a restructuring of the church-oriented society unless the trend was arrested.

Church leaders were displeased with the intrusion of non-Mormons and were disturbed by their rapidly expanding economic power. They considered a secondary role in their hard-won Rocky Mountain stronghold to be intolerable, and stringent efforts were made to regain supremacy. They urged boycotts of imported merchandise, and they promoted home manufactures with a strong “trade Mormon” policy. Moral sanction was brought against the use of “Gentile commodities” and luxury items, but the struggle seemed to be a losing game and the trends continued.

While Mormon leaders pondered their next move, a national calamity occurred — the Panic of 1873. As the money squeeze spread westward from eastern banking and commercial centers, credit was terminated, mines and businesses closed, and unemployment became widespread. But the depression gave President Brigham Young an opportunity for which he was not unprepared. It allowed him to move smoothly into a major change of social idealism which many individuals would have resisted in a normal economic period. At the same time, he could regroup his people and insulate them from the tastes some had acquired from “Babylon.”

Mr. Reilly of Sun City, Arizona, has contributed a number of articles and reviews to the Quarterly on the Colorado River and southern Utah topics.
From the early days of the church there had been a constant effort to unite the members in Mormon brotherhood. Joseph Smith had promoted this concept with his United Order in Jackson County, Missouri, and Kirtland, Ohio, but the endeavors came to unfortunate ends through financial failure. Cooperative action nevertheless remained a strength, and the willingness of the Saints to unite their labors for the common good had been manifest from their day of arrival in Salt Lake Valley. Afterwards their communal tendencies were reexpressed through consecration and stewardship. The cooperative movement, launched in the 1860s, came next and was the most advanced expression of the communal concept in Utah Territory to that time.

The Brigham City Cooperative, carefully nurtured by Apostle Lorenzo Snow, was an outstanding example of communal accomplishment because the members dedicated their efforts to involvement and cooperation. Although the panic made most of Utah a depressed area, Brigham City continued to hum and remained an economic white spot in a prostrated husbandry. Its prosperity and growth were not lost on Utah's citizenry, least of all her leaders.

When President Young arrived in St. George early in December 1873, he undoubtedly had formulated the steps of his plan by which the United Order of Enoch would be revived from the limbo of the 1830s disaster and reestablished to answer his present need.

St. George was selected as the place most apt to respond affirmatively to a major economic and social change. For one thing, the bulk of the people were poor; few had accumulated more than a bare living in Dixie, and most had expended their resources in survival. Certainly there were no wealthy individuals who would oppose him out of fear of sharing what they had worked to acquire. Dixie's resources were few and far removed, and living was difficult. The Saints knew well the value of unity; they had survived by it.

The town — and all of Utah's Dixie for that matter — had been artificially vitalized by a series of public works which started with the ground-breaking for the St. George Tabernacle in June 1863. Pump-priming continued with a scheme to bring saltwater freight up the Colorado River to a warehouse at the head of navigation, which resulted in Call's Landing being established early in 1865. From here the freight was hauled by wagon through St. George and other hard-pressed Dixie towns to Salt Lake City. Building the St. George Courthouse, which was started in the fall of 1867, was an
interim means of keeping labor crews busy until a larger project could be launched. Ground for Utah's first temple was broken December 9, 1871, and twenty days later the last stone in the tabernacle was laid. Brigham Young had kept St. George going economically; now the town could become the bellwether for his United Order.  

First he presented his plan to the local leaders and secured their support, then he plunged into a campaign of selling his idea to the people with a series of discourses on the general theme of unity. His opinions were reinforced with accompanying sermons by the members of his entourage. Even with the heavy verbalizing about "unity," "cooperation," and a "more perfect society," the president occasionally had to cudgel his flock with guile and threaten the possibly recalcitrant with heavenly displeasure.  

Brigham Young presented his plan for the United Order in public meeting February 15, 1874. After a prolonged buildup, and feeling that the people had reached the mood of acceptance, he called on those willing to enter into such an organization to raise their hands. Although he had convinced the majority, the vote was not unanimous. Annoyed, he asked for those not willing to enter the Order to raise their hands. None went up. There was veiled opposition from a number of rugged individualists, but no one was willing to be so counted. He then called for all to come forward to enter their names on the roll of the Order, and closed the meeting with these words:

If we are disposed to enter the Order of Enoch, now is the accepted time and blessed are the Latter-day Saints. But if we are not disposed to enter the Order, the curse of God will come upon this people; I cannot help it. I will not curse them. But the time has come for this work to be commenced.  

The entire citizenry, about three hundred in number, entered their names on the United Order roll.  

From this time on the movement in Dixie snowballed. The first three weeks in March saw the Order established in every sizeable settlement in southern Utah. As might be expected, the first organi-
zation was on an ecclesiastical basis; the legal incorporation (under the recent favorable revision of the Incorporation Act by the territorial legislature) would come several months later. Apostle Erastus Snow said, “We begin with the Gospel, and now we will continue by organizing under the Law.” The Saints once more had put God before government.

The president’s remarks of February 15 were carried to every Mormon hamlet. John Henry Standifird recorded their reception in remote Panguitch:

Sunday 15th [March 1874]. . . At Ward meeting bro. J. L. Haywood related some interesting news concerning the organization of the “Order of Enoch” in St. George. President Young says the time has fully come for us to enter into that order of things. The people in the South are taking hold of it.

Nearly a month later Standifird revealed another element of Brigham’s persuasion when he wrote:

Sunday 12th [April 1874]. . . In the evening attended the meeting of the Elders Quorum. The principles of the “United Order” was explained by bro. Elmer as he heard Prest. Brigham speak on the subject last week several times. The Lord is preparing the way that the Saints may redeem Zion by purchase if they will harken, otherwise, I fear it will have to be redeemed by blood.

With the rigors of winter alleviated by the warm Dixie sun, President Young prepared to return to Salt Lake City. He intended to organize the Order personally in those towns through which his route would take him. On March 8 the president supposedly delegated his nephew John R. Young to organize the people in the eastward settlements of Kanab, Long Valley, and Pahreah.

Armed with a letter of authorization from Brigham Young and George A. Smith, John R. Young departed that same day and arrived in Kanab on the eleventh. The next day, March 12, 1874, the people responded by giving unanimous approval to entry into the United Order.

4Journal of John Henry Standifird, typescript, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo.
5Ibid. The redemption of Zion referred to Mormon reoccopation of Jackson County, Missouri. Many people in southern Utah had been among those driven from their homes during the 1833 persecution, and the subject was understandably sensitive.
6“Journal History, Kanab Stake, Book A,” March 8, 1874, original, Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
It is not known whether the president's nephew honestly misunderstood his instructions or whether he deliberately read meaning into them which was not there, but he certainly made a tactical error in allowing the prestige of his surname to undercut the local bishop. In the ensuing election of officers for the Order, John R. Young permitted himself to be elected president. Bishop Levi Stewart and Thomas Robertson were named vice-presidents, James Lewis, secretary, and John Rider, treasurer. Young was then authorized to draw up articles and bylaws.

Bishop Stewart and John R. Young organized the settlement of Johnson on March 14, and the following day repeated the operation at Pahreah. A census taken at the time revealed 261 members in Kanab, 39 in Johnson, and 67 in Pahreah for a grand total of 367 prospective communal souls.

While the settlers reflected on the step they had taken, John R. Young traveled to Long Valley and on March 20 installed the Order at Mount Carmel. At this time James Leithead was bishop of both Long Valley wards. Two days later Young organized the bishop's own village of Glendale.

A non-Mormon, unversed in the hegemony of the Saints, would have difficulty in understanding the structure of an 1874 Mormon town. Unlike the strict separation of church and state in municipalities in the East, secular activities in Utah were directed by the ecclesiastical leaders. The General Authorities of the church appointed the local bishop, and he was the people's link with God through his prophet—at this time President Brigham Young. Every village had either a bishop or presiding elder, and in 1874 the vast majority of the citizens were church members who had been "called" to their place of residence. Their spiritual, temporal, legal, and social leader was their bishop. Furthermore, he allotted land parcels, and when necessary dispensed justice through "bishop's courts." But usually his advice settled disputes without resorting to court action. The system was very efficient, inexpensive, and responsive to the needs of the people.

In the span between agreement to enter into a United Order and its legal incorporation, Kanab's communal pot bubbled. John R.
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7Ibid.
8Elsie Chamberlain Carroll, ed., The History of Kane County (Salt Lake City, 1960), 58. The "Journal History, Kanab Stake," credits 299 names on the Kanab roll.
9Lowry Nelson, The Mormon Village: A Pattern and Technique of Land Settlement (Salt Lake City, 1952), 55-64.
Young's exact original presentation of the United Order idea has not been preserved, but the men soon displayed considerable confusion regarding the details of the plan. The principal argument waxed upon the relationship between property and labor. The sides were drawn with the "haves" in one faction and the "have nots" in the other. Everyone had property, since it was allotted by the bishop, although some parcels were much more choice than others. The main wealth, however, was in modicums of cash, livestock, wagons, and articles of utility. Possession of these items was in wide disparity.

Bishop Levi Stewart was far and away the wealthiest man in Kanab, while in Mount Carmel Henry B. M. Jolley enjoyed a similar status. Stewart's holding was largely in cattle; Jolley's was more diversified, and in addition he was surrounded by a host of well-to-do relatives. With Bishop Leithead living in Glendale, Jolley was the most influential man in Mount Carmel. Yet neither Leithead nor Jolley was elected president of the Glendale Order in Long Valley; instead the office went to Israel Hoyt.

Undoubtedly John R. Young's willful action in contending with Bishop Stewart for the presidency of the United Order at Kanab and his failure to support Bishop Leithead in Long Valley injected confusion into both communities. The established order of things had been upset, with the Mormon life pattern thrown out of focus and the people uncertain as to whether the community leader was the bishop or the president of the Order.

Church authorities had appointed the bishop and only they could revoke this appointment. Yet, some of the people, swayed by the magic of his name, had elected Young president to lead them in the new society. Had they interposed with a divine selection? Could they operate under an unprecedented dual leadership? These were worrisome questions.

As the people debated the problem, a smoldering dispute with the Navajos temporarily diverted their attention. Native anger stemmed from the killing of three of their young men in south-central Utah and at the time threatened the existence of the newly
established way station at Moenkopi. A small group of missionaries was isolated there and could not withstand a heavy assault.

Late in April John R. Young gathered twenty-two men and led a relief party across the Colorado River. The rescue was effected without bloodshed and the mission temporarily abandoned. On May 21 the last of the refugees reached Kanab, and the citizens once again turned to their organizational questions. One of the thwarted colonizers, William H. Solomon, wrote, "When I returned to Kanab I found the ward trying to carry out the principles of the United Order under John R. Young. We immediately fell into line and became members of the order."10

Property evaluation, delayed by the Indian difficulty, began immediately. The appraisers, Edward Pugh, David K. Udall, John Rider, and Charles H. Oliphant, based their estimates on a list of tithing prices as determined at Salt Lake City on January 1, 1873. Livestock, of course, was the principal item of wealth, and for United Order purposes a book was maintained to describe individual horses and cattle.

Since all finances, including tithing, temple donations, school expenses, and county and territorial taxes were to be handled through the Order, other property was described in a separate book.11 Even non-Mormons were listed here since they were required to pay taxes. For example, in 1874 pioneer cattleman John G. Kitchen ran 60 head of cattle valued at $1,200.00 on which he paid a territorial tax of $3.00. But in the following year his little herd had increased to 85 head appraised at $2,125.00. That year his territorial tax was $5.30, while his first county tax was a whopping $15.95.12

In other tables of the Order's record books, items appraised for one purpose or another included land claims, cattle, horses, mules, sheep and goats, swine, wagons, clocks and watches, merchandise, stock in trade, money, property not estimated, and the number of acres of land under irrigation. The low economic status of some of the people is indicated by the fact that they were without wagons and owned fewer than a half-dozen head of cattle and horses combined.

Livestock appraisals were listed as of June 1, 1874. Bishop Levi Stewart led the list with six pages devoted to the description of his cattle. His holding of 160 head was valued at $3,569.00. His closest
rival was Taylor Crosby whose 76 head of horses and cattle and other property were valued at $1,801.75. Jacob Hamblin's 38 head of cattle and horses were valued at $949.00, John R. Young's 26 head at $582.75. Other listings were: James A. Little, 3 head at $66.00; James L. Bunting, 10 head at $216.00; and John Rider, 13 head at $316.00. But many of the men had only an animal or two.13

Tuba, the friendly Hopi, had been too discreet to remain to face the Navajos when the Saints pulled out of Moenkopi on May 5 and had accompanied the rescue team back to Kanab.14 Besides being the first of his people to accept baptism, he now joined the United Order. His holdings were listed as a light sorrel mare, six years old, at $45.00, and a pale red yearling colt, $16.00.15 At that, Tuba was wealthier than some of his white brothers.

While several small businesses were transferred to Order ownership immediately, others were entered during ensuing months. At one time or another the following concerns appeared on the books: Kanab Lumber Co., the Sawmill Co., the Tannery and Manufacturing Co., the Brickyard, the Co-op Sheep Herd, the Sink Valley Ranch, and dairies at Cave Lakes, Swallow Park, and Buttermilk (near the Sevier Divide).

Almost immediately the participants began arguing over Young's preliminary draft of the constitution and bylaws. Free enterprise, managed though it was, was not dying easily. Young
reasoned that the surest way to silence the critics was to have the rules come from headquarters, so at the first opportunity he departed for Salt Lake City.

Young did not return until August 16, at which time he brought the official documents with him. Two evenings later the leading citizens assembled at the bishop's house to hear them read. W. H. Solomon described the occasion:

Aug. 18 [1874] ... This evening the Const. and by laws of the United Order were read at the Bishops and before the directors and several of the brethren, I among the rest. We were all invited to have our say on the subject. A few thought it meant cooperation and property representation but the majority was in for equality and individual representation or the United Order. Meeting adjourned until Thurs. evening. 16

Resistance to John R. Young had stiffened during his absence. Significantly, the people could not come to a decision on their degree of participation and rebelled against his presentation. The revolt was not confined to Kanab but was as strong, if not stronger, at Mount Carmel. There the dissidents generally bypassed Young and took their questions directly to the higher authority.

The Mount Carmel Order received a major setback in midsummer when treasurer Henry B. M. Jolley announced his withdrawal, and the news was transmitted over the Deseret Telegraph. A new officer was appointed on August 2, but the damage had been done. 17 President Brigham Young did not see his nephew as a factor in the dissention but rather blamed Bishop Leithead for a lack of firmness. He then sent Howard Orson Spencer south in September to replace Leithead and preside over the United Order.

Brigham Young was a distracted man at this time. Owing to the infirmities of old age he had resigned several minor official positions and on April 6, 1873, had selected five additional counselors, among them two of his sons. The flow of routine business through his office was increasing at a fast rate, and the case of his troublesome wife Ann Eliza Young caused him personal annoyance and robbed him of valuable time. In addition, the harassment of anti-Mormon Gov. George L. Woods and Judge James B. McKean increased his burden. If the president gave only cursory thought to the problem of

17 Carroll, History of Kane County, 315 - 16.
the Orders at Kanab and Mount Carmel, who could criticize him? He had to delegate such matters, and his nephew was aggressive and trustworthy.

Partly because of his health, but mainly to be out of town when Ann Eliza delivered her antipolygamy lecture in November, Brigham and his entourage left Salt Lake City early this year, on October 29. He arrived in St. George on November 11 and went into semi-isolation.

While President Young was on the road, the southern conference was held at St. George on November 6, 7, and 8. John R. Young's position was not strengthened when Levi Stewart and Howard O. Spencer were sustained as bishops of the Kanab and Long Valley wards, the latter replacing James Leithead.18

In Kanab none dared bypass the nephew openly or go over his head. Nevertheless, open resistance was there and somehow Brigham learned of it. Whether the opposition got through to headquarters or the president of the Order acquainted his uncle with his problems is not known, but President Young sent a letter to the Kanab brethren telling them to unite the positions of president and bishop in one man — no doubt intending that Bishop Stewart be elected president. This was the same solution he had employed at Mount Carmel, but inadvertently the instruction was phrased so that it had two interpretations.

William H. Solomon's account of succeeding events appears to be objective:

... President Brigham Young sent a letter of instructions for the people to elect a President for the order and said let him be Bishop. Levi Stewart was then Bp. of the Ward; As a member of the Ward, I did not consider that we had any authority to change his position and as John R. Young's authority as President of the United Order did not appear to be fully sustained in my mind, I voted for Bro. Stewart to be President and of course Bp. which was sustained by the majority. J.R. Young having previously promised to sustain whoever was elected but failing in his promise, in a few hours another party was organized with him at their head as President of the Order. Thus there was again a division of the people, there being two meetings held the Sabbath day representing two parties, one under the direction of Bp. Stewart, and one under the direction of J. R. Young. Being satisfied that the Bp. was the right authority, I rendered myself subject to his direction.19

Either Brigham Young's letter was ambiguous or its semantics deliberately misinterpreted; the hard fact remained that Kanab was more than ever a polarized community. The struggle between Levi Stewart and John R. Young found at least three-fourths of the heads of families lined up behind the bishop, while only fifteen out of approximately seventy-five supported Brigham's nephew.

John R. Young's version of the showdown is as interesting for what it evades as for what it tells. It bears out that a few of the ward members were piqued at the bishop and it gives the names of his followers, but, significantly, it fails to record a vote count.

To the Presidency at St. George

Dear Brethren:

We wish to lay before you the results of our meeting in this place in regard to the reestablishment of the United Order. On Sunday, Dec. 13th, the meeting was addressed by Bishop Spencer and Bro. Heaton of Long Valley upon the principles of the Order. The instructions given by the Presidency to the brethren at Kanab were read by Bro. John R. Young and notice given for the people to assemble on Monday at 10 o'clock for further instruction. The people assembled and were addressed by Bros. John R. Young, Spencer, and Heaton, and instructions of the president again read. The afternoon was set apart for an Order meeting for the people to gather and vote for whom they wished to be President of the United Order. There was a general gathering of the people large and small. Some of the brethren supposed it was a convention, and there was manifest a disturbing element in the meeting. Bro. Levi Stewart was put in nomination and quite a vote was taken for him. The contrary vote being called, there was quite a vote of opposition to him, many not voting, waiting for another nomination, which was not made and the meeting adjourned. On the 15th the brethren, whose names appear below, assembled at Bro. Oliphant's to give expression to their feelings in regard to entering into the Order in the Spirit thereof; Not feeling willing to sustain Bishop Levi Stewart as their President and make choice of the man whom they felt had been sent to lead in the United Order by the Presidency, we unanimously feel to sustain Bro. John R. Young as President of the Order at this place, our wives and children coinciding with us in the move to carry out the instructions given by the Presidency last spring in uniting us as a family. Cultivating that unity and peace necessary for progress in the Work of God.
We are anxious for your advice and counsel, approbation or
disapprobation in regard to our movement on the matter but we could
not feel to unite in the Presidency of Levi Stewart in the United Order
but feel desirous of carrying out the instructions of the Presidency
under the man we feel who has the Spirit of the Order.

We have consulted with Bro. Young and find him willing to act as
our President with your approval and blessing. We wait your answer
with instructions directing our further movements.

J. C. Brown  Wm. A. Black  Jas. H. Lewis
Chas. H. Oliphant  Z. K. Judd  James A. Little
Jehiel McConnell  Jas. L. Bunting  Thos. Dobson
A. A. Dewitt  Thomas Robertson  George Watson
Lorenzo Watson  Ira Hatch  Brigham Y. Baird

This letter was undoubtedly initiated by John R. Young and was
a bold power play for support. He knew the condition of Brigham
Young and was aware that his retinue shielded him from many
details. And he banked heavily on the fact that the St. George stake
president was none other than his own cousin and bosom friend,
John W. Young (who had been named to this position after the
death of John R.'s brother Joseph W. Young). Subsequent events
indicate that Brigham Young never saw the letter signed by the
fifteen supporters of his nephew.

Eventful 1874 came to an end, and on January 5, 1875, the
bishop set up his United Order organization. With himself as presi­
dent, Levi Stewart appointed J. H. Standifird and Taylor Crosby
first and second vice-presidents and F. M. Farnsworth secretary.
Standifird, Crosby, and F. M. Hamblin constituted the executive
committee.

While the dual drivers of the United Order wagon were ma­
neuvering at Kanab, Howard O. Spencer was having his share of
trouble at Mount Carmel. Here the people were divided between the
individualists of an acquisitive society and those communally
minded souls reaching for a Mormon utopia. The first group simply
would not accept the United Order as presented by John R. Young.
Bishop Spencer, seeing the basic differences between them were
irreconcilable, advised those of one mind to establish a new town.
Accordingly, the advocates of the Order began moving up the valley
on February 20, 1875, and soon established Orderville. Bishop

---

20Minute Book of Kanab United Order, pp. 82 - 84, original, LDS Archives.
21Standifird Journal, January 5, 1875.
Spencer's Solomon-like decision not only satisfied the Jolleyites at Mount Carmel but allowed the opposing side a freedom of choice which effected the formation of the most outstanding United Order to be spawned by the movement.

In the absence of Howard Spencer's wise leadership at Kanab, events there continued toward impasse. Bishop Stewart controlled the disposition of land, and he refused to allot a parcel on which the rival group could erect a meetinghouse. Nevertheless, Young persisted in maintaining his nominal organization and on the first of March enfolded his faction of the Order in the garment of legality by appearing at Toquerville (then the seat of Kane County) and organizing formally through the probate court. He then wrote Brigham Young of his action.22

Knowing that time was running out, Young was moved to desperation and sent his uncle another letter in which he pointed the finger directly at his antagonist. He did not sign this letter but the writing is unmistakably his. He slanted his case and distorted the situation in several particulars. At least one-fourth of the twenty families he claimed in support were the plural wives and children of his constituents, and he denied the existence of the bishop's Order. Of course his main point was to bring up Stewart's refusal to grant him land.

Prest Brigham Young
Dear Brother;

The United Order of Kanab is now fully organized and consists of 20 families of this settlement. There are quite a number who have not felt to join us in this organization. It is now over two months since the division of the people and still there is no other organization but our own. Our Bishop, Brother Levi Stewart has not joined us but constitutes one of the outside element.

The interests of the United Order will of necessity sometimes clash with what suppose to be their interests. How far it is the privilege of the Order to act independently for its own interests under our circumstances is a question which now presents itself for our consideration. Since the division of the People we have held an Order meeting on two Evenings each Week when it did not conflict with the Ward meetings but have as usual attended the ward meetings on the Sabbath. Some of the preaching in the Ward Meetings has been rather calculated to irritate than otherwise.

We no longer feel the Spirit of brotherhood in them which alone can make an attendance on them Pleasant and desirable. In their

Kanab, Mar. 1st, 1875

22John R. Young Letterbook, LDS Archives.
Meetings the Sacrament has not been Administered for over three Months, the propriety of this we do not question but it is our privilege to observe this ordinance in our Order when there is Union and harmony.

At this writing we are united in our desires to carry out your Counsels, last spring with regards to collecting together. It is not our privilege to select a piece of unoccupied ground where we may carry out this Counsel.

We think about a year has elapsed since the teachers have labored among the People. It is the privilege of the Order to appoint teachers to labor with its own members. Our present position is without precedent in our past experience. Your advice on these points and any others on which you might feel that advice would be beneficial, would be thankfully received.

Your Brethren in the Gospel.

Upon reading his nephew's complaints, President Young immediately got to the roots of the situation, and his reply must have scorched the paper. Regrettably it has not been preserved, but the now abject nephew wrote the following letter of blame-shifting and apology, the entire exchange taking place in little more time than was required for the round trip between Kanab and Salt Lake City.

Ibid.
President B. Young,
Dear Brother,

By request of John W. Young, acting President of the Southern Stake of Zion I went to Kanab and undertook to direct the labors of the Brethren in the United Order, with the understanding that as soon as John W. could visit us he would arrange so that I could have the liberty to act according to my own judgment in directing the labors of the Brethren, and I certainly believed that you know and approve of John W.'s calling me to Kanab. I have remained and labored in that ward because I felt it my duty to sustain and honor John W. Young in the position that he held.

I may have had more zeal than wisdom and ever wishing to improve in the future by experience of the past, I shall be more cautious hereafter in responding to calls of the Brethren who Preside over me in a Local Capacity.

And I now respectfully submit to you that upon my return home I shall decline Presiding over the Brethren Working in the Order and refrain from taking part in any Responsible Position Unless I am counseled to by the Presidency of the Church to do otherwise.

The enclosed letter was written and read at a general meeting of the Order, and I would be pleased to take your answer to the Brethren.

I pray for Peace, Power and Wisdom to be given you. I am very truly Your Brother in the Gospel Covenant.

John R. Young

While John R. was in suspense as to the disposition of his situation, his faction was jolted by James Bunting's resignation from the board of directors and the Order. This candid man said he desired to concentrate his labors and property at the tannery. Bunting was an outspoken individualist, forceful and unpredictable. Some criticism was directed his way, but he was respected by his peers and his withdrawal was a blow to the organization's prestige.

To break the stalemate, Bishop Stewart sent his resignation to Brigham Young; but no action was taken for some time, and he continued with his duties. Finally, on August 8, a telegram brought the word that L. John Nuttall of Provo had been appointed bishop to replace Levi Stewart.25 Late in the month President Young wrote his nephew that the new bishop, in an effort to unite the community, also would assume the presidency of the United Order.
Elder John R Young  
Kanab  
Dear Brother  

Elder L. John Nuttall has been ordained a Bishop under the hands of myself and President Wells and set apart to relieve Bp Levi Stewart at Kanab and will take charge of the general interests of the people of that settlement.  

With the view to unite the hearts and feelings of the brethren and consolidate and strengthen the interests of the people we deem it advisable for you to resign the charges committed to your care into the hands of Bp Nuttall that there may be one directing hand in all the affairs and business of the Saints. We hope you will aid him by such information as he may need from time to time Transfer to him all books papers property &c belonging to your stewardship and assist him from time to time as opportunity may offer and you may be able as a fellow laborer in the Church and Kingdom of God.  

Any appointment that Bp Nuttall and the people may call you to fill in the United Order We wish you to accept and fulfill to the utmost of your ability and to the best interests of the Church and all concerned.  

Your kind attention to the foregoing will be of material aid to Bishop Nuttall and will oblige  

Your brother in the Gospel  
Brigham Young  
Daniel H Wells  
of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints²⁶

Kanab was filled with distinguished visitors when the new leadership was presented on September 17. Daniel Wells represented the First Presidency; Apostles Lorenzo Snow, Erastus Snow, and Franklin D. Richards headed a host of other dignitaries which included “Traveling Bishop” Amos Milton Musser, Robert T. Burton, Joseph C. Taylor, and of course Leonard John Nuttall. The brethren met at the home of Charles Oliphant, and John R. Young presided when the meeting opened at noon.  

After some preliminary business, chairman Young got to the main purpose which was a surprise to no one. He read the letter from Brigham Young, then tendered his resignation from both the presidency of the Order and the board of directors. The first was accepted, but he was held on as a director to facilitate the transfer of business.²⁷ As soon as the visitors were out of town Nuttall plunged into the job of unifying the community. The rift in the ward had

²⁶Minute Book of Kanab United Order, 116 - 17.  
²⁷Ibid.
been deep; without compromise, reconciliation of the divided brethren was impossible.

Nuttall showed his ability when he set up the new organization on January 3, 1876. Former adversaries were teamed, necessitating cooperation. Ex-bishop Stewart was made first vice-president, and Thomas Robertson — who had supported Young and been his vice-president — was now second vice-president. Another of Young's men, the talented James H. Lewis retained his job of secretary. Abel A. Dewitt and Joseph G. Brown, other supporters of Young, were made directors, Brown replacing Young who had declined. Stewart's old organization was represented by directors John Standifird and Taylor Crosby, while John Rider was made treasurer. When the meeting broke up that afternoon, fifty-eight heads of families enrolled in Kanab's lone United Order.

Even with his auspicious reorganization Bishop Nuttall had not enrolled all the people into the fold. And the fifty-eight on the roll had nearly that many ideas regarding division of labor and degree of private ownership. Passing travelers observed the rejection of Order principles and noted that the brethren of the Kanab Order were not as united as they should be and that many had withdrawn.

New officers were elected a year later, with different men replacing some of those from the days of the rival organizations. Among those dropped was Levi Stewart. (His one-time antagonist John R. Young had moved to Orderville over a year before.) But the new officers helped little. Allen Frost noted the steady disintegration when he wrote on March 8, "several citizens of Kanab are getting ready to move over into Arizona. A noticeable feature of the move is, that most that are moving did not see fit to be in the United Order up to date...." A few months later he wrote, "A strong feeling of dissatisfaction is showing itself in many members of the U.O. which is a sweet morsel to the opposition party. There seems to be a crisis drawing near...." By this time Kanab's version of the Order bore little resemblance to that at Orderville but more closely resembled a loosely knit group of cooperatives with an overtone of stewardship.

A valiant effort was made to arrest the deterioration of morale. On April 18 Apostles John Taylor, Orson Pratt, Lorenzo Snow, and
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28 Ibid., pp. 123 - 24. See also Standifird Journal, January 3, 1876.
29 Standifird Journal, January 6, 1877.
30 "Diary of Allen Frost," March 8 and August 24, 1877.
Erastus Snow conducted a two-day meeting which culminated when Kanab Stake was organized and L. John Nuttall added stake president to his other titles. Orderville, now expanding at a fast rate, contributed Howard O. Spencer as Nuttall’s first counselor and Thomas Chamberlain to the high council. But these two men — representatives of a successful communal organization — made little impression on the proponents of private ownership. Offsetting the Orderville influence were Henry B. M. Jolley of Mount Carmel (where the Order never got started), James Leithead of Glendale (where it lasted only a year), and Sextus Johnson of Johnson and Allen Smithson of Pahreah (where the Order made no significant impression.)

The apostles had not favored those who were successful with the Order when it came to organizing the stake. Clearly, the handwriting was on the wall, for in June President Nuttall, James Lewis, and Allen Frost began overhauling the Order’s accounts. Then to alleviate one of their labor problems the board agreed in midsummer to turn their cattle and surplus stock into the Winsor Co-op herd.\(^{31}\) Transactions between private parties were the rule now rather than the exception, and in September David K. Udall exchanged part of his townsit property and twenty-five acres of pasture for $600.\(^{32}\) There was an unmistakable drift toward private enterprise.

Kanab’s United Order did not come to a sudden dramatic end; it died gradually, from atrophy. Brigham Young’s death on August 29, 1877, speeded the disintegration, and the opening of public lands in the area a year later finished the process. Too, John Taylor, who succeeded Brigham Young as church president, viewed the United Order as a social utopia presently beyond the reach of the people. By the end of 1878 he had replaced many Orders with Zion’s Central Board of Trade — a distinct step toward a modified system of cooperatives.\(^{33}\)

But the people were not satisfied with stewardship or having land vested in a trustee. Two of Kanab’s independent souls, Edwin Ford and Samuel Haycock, spoke up in public meeting to say that people wanted land in their own names, that many felt that way but would not come forward. President Nuttall, aware of the general sentiment, commended the men for expressing their feelings.\(^{34}\)

\(^{32}\)Ibid., September 23, 1877.
\(^{33}\)Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, 342 - 44.
\(^{34}\)“Journal of L. John Nuttall,” July 23, 1878.
Ironically, Brigham Young's solution of the Kanab problem carried within it seeds for its own failure. The talented Nuttall was destined not to remain in southern Utah administering the affairs of the independent pioneers but to return to Salt Lake City to assist the new church leader. President John Taylor, his father-in-law, called him to the capital that fall to help unsnarl the tangle of church property from the Brigham Young estate, then kept him on as his private secretary.

Before going north Nuttall had visited Johnson and Pahreah, apparently taking a good look at the qualifications of William D. Johnson and Allen Smithson. On December 9, 1877, while the stake president was in Salt Lake City, Johnson became Kanab's third bishop. Unfortunately, Bishop Johnson was not the "strong man" type who could best deal with the unconstrained townsmen. Physically frail, he was a school teacher who operated a store in the settlement named for his family. He had worked on the Powell survey until the rigors of the job forced him to return home. Kanab needed a man with the strength of a Lot Smith; it received a mild-mannered frontier school teacher. In his own words Johnson said, "I was called to be Bishop here as you know, very young and inexperienced. . . ."36

Nuttall did not return to Kanab until June 2, 1878. The following spring he again was called to Salt Lake City, remaining until the early fall of 1883. Johnson's letters to the stake president continually asked advice regarding his inherited troubles — squabbles over water and land, labor equalization, and other problems. At times the harassed bishop became desperate. "I am so in need of your counsel and advice in relation to matters here at home and can hear nothing from you that I do not know what to do."

Another time he lamented, "Particular pains is taken to chastise me in public . . .," and he expressed willingness for release or "a mission to Arizona, Mexico or any other place."38

Kanab's decade of social turmoil could be said to have ended when it became definite that President Nuttall could not be spared from his duties in Salt Lake City. On June 8, 1884, two capable residents were named to provide the full-time leadership which the
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36Johnson to Nuttall, August 23, 1882, Nuttall Letter Box 3, LDS Archives.
37Ibid., October 25, 1882.
38Ibid., September 13, 1882.
town long had needed. Edwin D. Woolley was appointed stake president, and Richard S. Robinson was made bishop.

Despite the ephemeral communal success at Orderville, the people of Kanab undoubtedly represented the vast cross section of Mormon Utah. They were willing to depart from the traditional American concept of the separation of church and state, but they expected the Kingdom of God to be based on free enterprise.

Howard O. Spencer had recognized the diverse outlooks of the Mount Carmel people, respected their individuality by upholding freedom of choice, and had built a strong organization at Orderville by separating the polarized factions. More importantly, he had worked within the pattern of the church-oriented society.

In sharp contrast, John R. Young failed where Spencer had succeeded because he lacked the latter's respect for the individual. He disregarded freedom of choice and stubbornly believed that the prestige of his name would bend the elders to his will. His readiness to subvert the bishop suggests a degree of selfishness that was beyond toleration in the Kingdom the Saints were striving to build. His legacy in Kanab, after nearly a century, finds the third generation of the men he sought to manipulate still mimicking his high-pitched nasal voice. Young subsequently rendered good service to his church and government, and he acknowledged his error at Kanab when he wrote his Memoirs — years afterward.

Levi Stewart, a casualty of a social experiment and another man's ambition, found his years at Kanab both tragic and frustrating. Called from a comfortable home in Big Cottonwood in the spring of 1870, he had cheerfully gone south and arrived at Jacob Hamblin's Paiute farm in June. On September 10 Brigham Young had selected the Kanab townsite and ordained Stewart the settlement's first bishop. On December 14 a disastrous fire in Kanab's log fort claimed Stewart's wife Margery and five of his children. Three years of hardship followed in which the bishop and his persevering flock had scratched a living from the harsh land. The running controversy with John R. Young had lasted a year and a half, followed by another year of secondary duty as vice-president to his successor. Then on June 14, 1878, as Levi Stewart was traveling through Johnson Canyon enroute to Salt Lake City, he died of an apparent heart attack. President Nuttall dedicated his grave as the first in Kanab's new cemetery. Thus Levi Stewart was provided perpetuity from Kanab's turbulent past to the present.
Memories of a Uintah Basin Farm

BY LOREEN P. WAHLQUIST
The Uintah Basin, in the northeast corner of Utah, was one of the last areas of the state to be made available for extensive farming and livestock grazing. In 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt allocated over a million acres of the former Uintah Indian Reservation for homesteading by whites. Small farming communities sprang up instantly as hundreds of families staked out their claims. The promise of fertile fields and the prospect that a railroad line to Salt Lake City was “a certainty” led to Utah’s last great agricultural land rush.

The long anticipated rail line was never built, and soil that turned alkaline dashed the hopes of prosperity that many had envisioned. Over the years water became critically scarce, and the uncompromising drought of the Depression era forced thousands of settlers to leave. Those who stayed stiffened their resolve and applied even greater muscle and ingenuity; but nature remained intractable, and debts continued to mount. Fatigue, discouragement, and persistent privation were staples of the harvest.

The letter that follows, originally written in the 1940s for a family scrapbook, chronicles a portion of the story. The author, Loreen Pack Wahlquist, and her husband Charles Frederick (Fred) Wahlquist, were married August 26, 1925. In the spring of 1928 they bought a farm in the Randlett area where they stayed until after World War II. At first reluctant to have this personal account published, they were finally persuaded by relatives that their story, being not unlike that of other Basin residents, is an important contribution to the history of agriculture in Utah.

Dear Gwen:

How in the world do you expect me to write such a history as you have requested? Why, it would take me from now ’till Christmas to answer all your questions. I’m not sure our history is worth remembering — it has been too hard a struggle! The only worthwhile thing we have accomplished during our eighteen years of married life is to get us seven fine sons. If we can watch them grown up to fine men that we can be proud of, perhaps our failure to build up the beautiful place we wanted won’t seem so important.

Here are a few facts concerning the arrivals of our boys.

Charles was born twenty minutes to 5:00, September 11, 1926. Fred arrived at 5:20 on the same date.

Loreen and Fred Wahlquist now reside in Toquerville, Utah, where they still engage in farming. The letter was written to Loreen’s sister, Mrs. Gwen Benson, and was made available for publication with her consent by her nephew, Dr. Reed Wahlquist, present principal of Cottonwood High School in Salt Lake City. Dr. Wahlquist also penned the introduction and assisted with the editing.
(Yes, I remember the remark Fred made when he discovered he had
given me lysol. I was choking and strangling so that mother said "Fred, are
you sure you gave her the right stuff?" Fred answered, "Yes, I'm sure, I got
it right out of this bottle." He picked up the bottle, looked at it, and said
"My God! I've given her lysol!" Roy Benson remarked afterward that I was
pretty tough when 17 pounds of baby and a teaspoonful of lysol couldn't
kill me.)

Bryan was born at Ioka at 8:00 a.m., September 24, 1928. He weighed
ten pounds. .

Wayne was born at 5:00 a.m., November 9, 1931, in our little one-
room log cabin where we first built it up by the road. Maud came and
stayed with us several days. We had Dr. Miles and Mrs. Burgi, a very
experienced and successful midwife. I think each one resented the other,
and as a result there was a terrific feeling of contention and almost battle in
everything they did. However, after eleven most agonizing hours our
12-pound boy finally made his appearance. .

Glen was born at 1:00 a.m., January 21, 1935, in the new room we had
added onto our log cabin after we moved it back here in the field. The
ground had frozen before we got the dirt on the roof and all our heat
seemed to escape out the top. It was a terrifically cold night and the wind
was howling. They pulled my bed right over by the stove and tacked quilts
up around it to try and keep me warm. I shivered 'till I was almost
exhausted. We were unable to get anyone to come and stay who could take
care of me and the baby so several of the neighbor ladies took turns coming
in once a day to look after us. We got a girl from another community to stay
and do the housework. She was a high school graduate but she didn't know
what to do except what someone told her. One night when there was no
bread for supper we had Charles (who was eight) go make some biscuits
because she didn't know how. She was quite thrilled over her first batch of
bread, her first pie, etc. .

Earl was born at 4:00 a.m., June 6, 1938, in the same room where Glen
was born, only this time it wasn't cold. .

Brent, our seventh and last son was born at 8:00 p.m., March 28, 1942,
at Deone's in Roosevelt. .

I wish we had done as well with our place as we have with our boys.
Our place isn't built up much better now than it was when we had been
here only a year. Fred has always spent so much time in some public work
that there has never been time for the fixing up around home that makes
such a difference.

When we first came down here they held church in an old school
building at Randlett. Fred was ordained Bishop of the ward November 4,
1928, and was told to straighten out the rowdy bunch of boys and build a
church house. It was quite a job, as I have never seen a bunch of boys with
less respect for anything or anybody. Fred chose Roy Taylor and Frank
Jarman as counselors. The next few years were quite unpleasant. The new
bishopric met with some fierce opposition from the parents when they
tried to control their boys. It got so I couldn't even go to Relief Society
without hearing some dig at our “meddling bishop.” It didn’t seem to bother Fred at all, but it made me furious. I completely lost all interest in the place and looked forward to the time when they would release him from being Bishop and we could move away. In time, however, the boys stopped most of their pranks, the contention died down, and those same people are very dear friends now.

The next big struggle Fred had as Bishop was to build our church house. During the winter of 1929 the bunch of problem boys accidentally burned the old schoolhouse, for which I was very grateful — I didn’t like going clear to Randlett for everything. For a while we held church in a little one-room school building on the bench three miles east of here while they were working on our new chapel. It was December 8, 1928, that Fred and two other men left for the mountains to get out our church lumber. Some other fellow who was at the saw mill looked at Fred’s big grub box and remarked “Why didn’t you use that lumber and make a church house?” They were gone ten days that trip. It was quite a strenuous ten days for me. I milked nine cows, had twice that many to feed, and had to drive them half a mile to water and chop holes in the ice. The twins were three years old and Bryan was one, so they weren’t much help. After Christmas they worked in the mountains again but we loaned all but one of our cows to Henry Wall. He took care of them for the milk. We didn’t have many people, so it required an excessive amount of time for those who did work. The fall of 1931 Fred put practically his full time over on the chapel.
We hired Ezra Boun to plow a ten-acre piece of ground and we paid him in bottled fruit and vegetables. I have always had to work outside a great deal because Fred was away from home so much and we have never had the necessary money to hire help. From 1929 to 1942 Fred spent from two to four months of each year working on the church house. During the last stretch of finishing up Fred worked almost every day for six months. Part of the time we divided the women into groups of three or four and took turns serving hot lunches to those who were working. During the winter of 1941 - 42 the women helped a great deal with the cleaning and painting. At last it was finished and was dedicated May 30, 1942, by Nicholas G. Smith.

We have also had quite a hopeless struggle financially. We bought this place for $2,800.00 and within a few years we couldn't have sold it for a tenth of that. It seemed that we did everything just wrong. We bought this place just before the drought when people still thought this was a fine country, and we bought that bunch of cows from the folks for a high price just before the depression started. The first year our cows did fine and we had high hopes for the future. Then prices started a steady decline. The drought hit us exceptionally hard here and we were unable to raise enough hay and grain for our stock. Some years our grain burned completely and there was no harvest. During the year 1931 we had a chance to sell our five best cows for $70.00 each. The spring before we had lost five cows from eating grasshopper poison and to part with five more of the best cows would leave us with scarcely any cream check but still with a debt of over $3,500.00, so we turned it down. It was a big mistake, as prices dropped so low we got practically no returns from the cows and we couldn't sell them at any price. Three years later we sold all but a few of them to the government for sixteen dollars a head because we had no feed for them. The price of butter fat got as low as eleven cents a pound and eggs eight cents a dozen, and no one wanted them even at that price.

Our biggest problem has always been water — I mean the lack of it. We have had to pay high assessments and much of the time our ditches have been dry. We have had so few people that it has been a real struggle to maintain our long canals. The summer of 1935 the Indian Department stopped furnishing us garden water so Fred and Frank Jarman leased a piece of Indian land three miles away. For the next two summers we raised our gardens there, traveling back and forth in a rickety old iron-tired wagon. We would take our barrels along and haul water home to help some of our trees and shrubs to live. . . .

The year 1934 was such an extreme drought all over the country that there was no feed for stock. The federal government came to the rescue in a fashion and bought up the cows people couldn't feed for from $12.00 to $20.00 a head. They paid $4.00 a head for sucking calves, then killed them and let people take them home to eat if they wanted to. Mr. Jordan (the banker) had told us to sell the cows and they would allow us two dollars for one on the note. We sold all but a few of our fine milk cows for $16.00 a head and turned the money over to the bank but it still left us owing them
$900. That fall we paid the rest off from our alfalfa seed on the same basis — they allowed us two dollars for one. Our alfalfa had been so dry that it had made only about a six-inch growth so we let it go to seed. We got 25 bags of seed and sold it for $627. The day Fred sold the seed he came home broke but our few remaining cows were really ours, our doctor bills and several other small bills were paid. It was a glorious day even though we hadn’t bought anything and didn’t have a nickel left. That left us with a debt of $1,900 on the place and the water.

During the year 19— we got a F.E.R.A. project to build us a schoolhouse. They hired some brick moulders and made the brick here. When they got through, Fred and several of the men who had been working there made some brick for themselves. We sold ours but we didn’t get over wanting some to build with and also some more to sell. The desire finally led us to buy the brick press and get ourselves once more terribly deep in debt. Our crops had failed so many times that we weren’t making any progress and that seemed a way out. Fred and Blake Peay went into the brick business as partners. Fred didn’t know anything about brick making and Blake didn’t know very much so they had lots to learn and made lots of mistakes. We sold quite a lot of brick but not enough to pay back the cash we had put into it. Fred and the boys worked up there for two summers with no wages at all. I didn’t work at the brickyard but I did run their errands and feed the gang. That first summer I sent lunch for 13 and often had as many as 18 for supper. I baked 35 biscuits and 8 loaves of bread every day. Occasionally I would run short and have to make baking powder biscuits. We had lots of fun during those two summers even though it was hard work and it kept taking more and more of our livestock to keep it going. We found it very interesting and we had high hopes for the future but the war came along so we couldn’t get gas or coal so we had to quit. We still haven’t lost faith in it, and some day when we can get gas and coal again we will profit by our past experience and make it pay us back for all the disappointments.

Another venture we went into was our molasses making. Some of the neighbors who had come from southern Utah had a cane mill and after working with them a year or two, we decided to get an outfit of our own; that is, us and Lorin Harris. We built the furnace and set up the outfit at Harris’. During the falls of 1939 - 1940 and ’41 we made the molasses down there. I always had the cooking to do and it was pretty hard for me to get down there by daylight in the morning and work until after dark at night, especially when I had a bottle-fed baby. The fall of 1942 we set up the outfit here at home. This fall — 1943 — we bought Harris’ share in the outfit for 50 gal. of molasses — the value of what they had put into it.

We decided to try and fix up the cane mill to run with a gas motor instead of a horse. After Fred and two hired men had worked on it for three days, they gave it up and decided to use horses. It would run fine with the motor while it was empty but soon as it was loaded, it would break the cogs.

This fall, 1943, our molasses making has been a real job. We cooked over 700 gal. In order to get through before it got too cold, we had to run
night and day and it takes quite a crew to keep it going. For more than two weeks, Fred and I never got more than four hours sleep out of the twenty-four and often we got less. By the time we finished, we both were about ready to collapse. Our molasses hasn't been any great asset financially either but it is fascinating work and we really enjoy eating it. We use the skimmings and make our own vinegar.

For the most part we have skimped along on what we made and sometimes we had pretty slim rations. For about a year and a half during 1931 - 32 our income ranged from four to six dollars a month. The case worker finally convinced us that we had better accept a relief order so Fred could get in on some of the F.E.R.A. and W.P.A. work. One cold December day we hitched the horses onto our old rickity white-top buggy, took our three boys and our $8.00 relief order and drove 12 miles to Sing's store to buy some underwear for the boys and some overshoes for Fred. We got the things picked out, then Fred swallowed his pride and handed the clerk the order. He looked at it and said, 'Oh, on the county?' That was too much for Fred and he said, "Here, hand me that thing." He took it, walked over to the stove and threw it in and we headed for home. The next few days I performed what had seemed the impossible on some old discarded underwear; Fred put a mob of tire patches on his old overshoes and our crisis was passed once more. However, Fred still couldn't get any work so the case worker finally got a small order of goods and brought them to us so Fred could be on the "honor" roll and could get some much needed work.

"The log cabin we lived in before we built our brick shop home."
During the summer of 1935 Fred got a chance to work on the highway between Vernal and Roosevelt. He was to get $10 a day for himself and 4 horses and that sounded like riches to us. We didn't get it all as we had to hire some of the horses. We have put in a lot of pretty hard licks, but that was by far the most strenuous summer we have ever experienced. I worked out in the field all the daylight hours, irrigating, preparing ground and planting, then I had chores to do. I would come in about 10 o'clock at night and start in on my day's dishes and separator, mixing bread and doing a little cooking for the next day. The twins were eight years old and they did some chores but they hadn't yet learned to milk the cows so that was my job. Fred put in his eight hours up on the road, took care of his four horses, then many of the nights he rode the pony the six miles home to help a few hours with the work here. He would snooze a few hours then ride back to work. Several times we put in nearly an all-night shift and then he rode back to work after one or two hours of sleep. During haying time he was on night shift up there so he would come home and work at the haying during the daytime. During the stretch when he was getting off at midnight there came a real stormy stretch. One day we had a regular cloudburst, and when Fred was ready to come home a big wash they had to cross was just booming with thick muddy water. There was no bridge but the crossing was built up higher. The force of the stream pushed Fred's horse off the road and she had to swim. She was floundering around trying to get out when the cinch broke and Fred and the saddle sank clear out of sight. When he came up he made for the bank and some of the men were there to help him out. They tried to persuade him to stay at the camp that night, but he knew I would be worried so he rode home in his sopping wet clothes. It was such a black miserable night that I was horrified at the thought of his riding home through that rough country with water booming down every little gully. How I did wish that I could know that he was staying at camp that night, but oh, what a relief it was when he rode in.

I suppose anyone looking at our place would think we cared nothing about beauty; no lawns, shrubs, or many flowers, but it isn't this way because we haven't tried. My one extravagance through all these years has been buying a few things each spring from the nursery catalog. During the hot, dry summers I have watched most of it burn and die. We have planted lawns but the same thing happened to them. We have hauled barrels and barrels of water to keep some of our trees and shrubs alive. During the summers of 1935 - the Indian department stopped giving us garden water so Fred and Frank Jarman leased a piece of Indian land three miles away. For those next two summers we raised our garden up there and hauled barrels of water home to put on our trees and bushes. We would go up there and see the big stream of water just running into the wash and the trees and bushes here dying for want of water. It was pretty hard to take.

I don't know why we have stuck with such an impossible situation. Perhaps we are just too stubborn to admit that we are beaten. To live in this country one needs a strong back and a weak mind. Our minds qualify ok, but I am not so sure our backs will hang out.
We have had a hard old struggle all right, but our lives haven't been as drab as this letter may indicate. Perhaps it is sorta like Brother Knight says, "The Lord tempers the wind to the shorn lamb." We have had some satisfactions from our work and we have enjoyed to the fullest lots of parties and dances.

I told you we had managed without accepting much help. I meant from charity organizations. We have had a great deal of help from our relatives. Up until about two years ago I made all my dresses (except summer cottons), and practically all of the boys' coats, jackets, trousers, and some of their caps and mittens from old clothes given to us. Our folks from both sides have helped us out a great deal with generous Christmas presents and contributions at the time of each new arrival.

During the spring of 1929 I had an experience with our cows that left me almost a nervous wreck for the rest of the summer. It was the time I had to stick one. I was unusually scared about bloated cows anyway since helping Mother that time she had to stick one, and for no reason at all I was also nervous about being alone at night. That night Fred had gone the six miles to Randlett to Mutual. It was a dreary, black night with a terrific wind blowing. I was trying to concentrate on some sewing but wasn't succeeding very well as I was too nervous. For quite a little while I had been conscious of an unusual noise but I kept telling myself it was just the wind and I tried not to hear it. All of a sudden it dawned on me that it was the groans of a bloated cow about ready to drop. For just a few seconds my courage stood in the balance, then I grabbed my scissors and raced for the corral. I was nearly there before I realized that it was so black I couldn't even see the cows. I dashed back and finally succeeded in making my shaking hands get the lantern lighted, fearing every second that I would be too late. I had no trouble in locating my cow. My first glimpse of her reminded me of the animals we used to make by putting match sticks into potatoes. Her legs were spraddled out, her neck stretched forward and down and her tongue hanging out of the side of her mouth. I quickly located the proper spot and jabbed with my scissors but it made no slightest impression. I fairly flew back to the house and grabbed both butcher knives. I used the one with the longest blade and jabbed with all my strength. It sank in clear to the handle and the stuff flew halfway across the corral. I guess I hit just right because the hole stayed open and she was soon breathing normally. My troubles weren't over, however, as there were groans coming from all over the corral. Our bull had got pretty mean and I was scared stiff of him, which didn't help my peace of mind. I finally succeeded in getting gags into the mouths of two more of the worst ones. At last grunts all ceased. I went to the house and also went all to pieces.

One summer that was quite trying at times for all concerned was the summer Peay's stayed with us. Fred had arranged the deal for them to buy back their old place. The house on it had burned down several years before so we told them to come here until they could get a cabin to live in. They arrived here March 15, 1938, with all their belongings in their car and 35c in their pockets. We had just three rooms but we had a big 14' x 16' tent
where we slept all the kids. Our income was very small and it was a real
struggle to find enough food to feed fourteen people three times a day.
Sometimes I felt that I just couldn't face another day of it. I guess I served
some pretty skimpy meals but we all managed to live through it without
any ruined health or any arguments or disputes of any kind. Having them
here made it possible for us to get away and take that trip to Idaho and on
up through Yellowstone Park. We managed to have lots of fun that
summer even if we didn't any of us have any money and were so thick in
our little tucked-up house that we nearly tromped on each other. During
October Peays got their cabin fixed and moved into it.

Through those discouraging years we did manage to make a few
worthwhile purchases and improvements. The first one was the fall of
1930. Mother and Dad drove out here after us and took me and my three
boys to Idaho for six-weeks visit. When Fred came after us he came in our
first glassed-in car. A Model T Ford that he bought on the way to Idaho. As
we were driving home it started to rain and how marvelous it seemed to us
to just turn a handle and have the windows go up, instead of getting the
boys out of the back seat so we could tip it up and get the window curtains
and then stand out in the rain while snapping them on as we had always
done before.

The next important thing we did was to get us a cistern. We got it
finished in November 1935. Before that we had hauled water in barrels
from any place we could find it and during the winters we melted ice or
snow.

We had resolved not to go into debt for anything we could get along
without. Fred had suggested a number of times that we send for a gasoline
washer but I wouldn't consent; I didn't want any more debts. As a result I
had washed by hand for twelve years and developed an absolute horror of
wash day. Getting the water was a real trial. In the summer when there was
water in the ditch, we would dip up barrels of water and stir alum in it to
make the mud settle, but most of the time our ditches were dry so we
hailed water from any place we could find it. In the winter time we melted
snow or ice. One day I went in to sort the clothes ready to wash; but as I
looked at that awful pile of dirty clothes, I felt such a repulsion and hatred
for them that I kicked them viciously back into their corner. I went out and
told Fred I just had to have a washer or I was ready to burn that pile of
clothes. We got the catalog and made out an order for a gasoline washer to
be paid for at the rate of $5.00 a month. It was shipped to us on June 24,
1937. The next November we got our first little radio and added it on to
the account.

One day in August 1939, Fred and I were traveling along the highway
and stopped at Jim Eskleson's at Gusher to have a tire fixed. While we were
there he asked Fred if he knew of anyone who might be interested in
buying a Delco light plant. He wanted to sell his as the power line had come
through. Fred answered "Yes, we might be." I thought he was just trying to
be funny, but he kept asking questions and I kept watching him, trying to
figure him out. I couldn't believe that he was serious but as he talked on
about terms and details, I almost held my breath with anxiety. Well, to make a long story short, we made a deal to trade a fine buckskin horse (of which we were very proud), our best cow and three head of long yearlings for the Delco. We were to deliver the stock and they were to deliver and install the Delco, which they did about a week later. To press a button and have such bright lights seemed a wonderful miracle to me. I had never had electric lights before in my life.

During most of these struggling years we have enjoyed good health. We called on doctors for our new arrivals, but for everything else except for a very few occasions we got by with administrations and what we could do ourselves. . . .

Wayne was the only one of the boys that was ever very seriously sick and I guess that was my own fault. When he was four months old we took him with us to Randlett to a P.T.A. meeting. There was no place to warm his bottle and he was refusing to be good any longer without it so I tried giving it to him cold and he took it without protest. I decided that was much simpler than always building a fire to warm a bottle so from then on I gave him cold milk. I also took him to the garden nearly every day which was a quarter of a mile from the house and I would put him in the dry ditch in the shade of some big thistles which was all the shade there was, and I would leave him there while I planted garden. He always ate good but he got so he fusses a good part of the time. He got steadily worse until he cried practically all the time and after each feeding he would really scream. For six weeks he never slept more than an hour at a time and both Fred and I were just about to the collapsing point. When your income is only about $4.00 a month and it takes about $1.25 to make a trip to town, you don't take trips and seek the help of a doctor unnecessarily. When we did finally take him, Dr. Miles treated him for sinus trouble, had me warm his milk, and had us get him a prescription which cost us half a month's income. He gradually improved and after a few more weeks he was a good natured baby again.

We had one very near tragic accident with Wayne. We were going to plant some grain by broadcasting it as we didn't have a drill. I always drove the team up and down the field while Fred sat in the back of the wagon and scattered the grain. He sat Wayne upon the seat and I started around the wagon to get in on the other side. Fred was holding the lines but the horses were rather flighty and took a quick step forward. Wayne lost his balance and fell out the other side of the wagon with the top of his head right in line with the front wheel. Fred jerked the horses to stop them and then they backed. I got there just in time to see the front wheel hit Wayne's head but instead of running over it, it pushed his head backward and just scraped the skin off his forehead. As we picked him up and looked at that poor bloody face, we felt such a deep sense of gratitude that it was only some skin instead of the whole top of his head.

We had a few other accidents or at least scares with our boys.

When Glen was three years he had gone with his Dad to get a load of straw. About a quarter of a mile from home, Fred tied the lines and
stepped around to the back of the wagon to put up the gate. Just as he went to climb back on, the horses gave a jump and headed for the corral on a run. As they hit the corral fence, part of the straw toppled and slid off, the fence gave away, and the horses and wagon headed for the next fence. They had lost some speed so the next fence held the wagon but the horses jumped it and fell in a tangled mess on the other side. It seemed only a few seconds after the horses fell until Fred was there and there came Glen crawling out of the pile of straw not even frightened. The horses were in such a mess we could scarcely tell which legs belong to which horse. Fred had to cut the harnesses in several places in order to get the horses up.

A short time after that Charles was out mowing hay with the same team when suddenly they jumped and ran with the mower. Fred was on his way out to the field to change off with Charles when he saw the horses start to run. Instead of running to the side to get out of their path, he turned and raced for the same gate the horses were headed for. Before they overtook him the double-tree broke leaving Charles and the mower; then Fred dashed through the gate and out of the path of the horses. Byron Boyd in telling about it afterward said, “I don’t know if that team was gaining on Fred or not, he was sure traveling.”

About a year before the team ran away with the mower, Fred Jr. had an accident while riding our pony we called “Creamy.” She had a beautiful buckskin colt a few months old (our prize buckskin that we later traded on the Delco), and he was following along as Fred started off on his errand. He got just to the gate a quarter of a mile away when we heard a terrible scream. We ran out and saw Fred headed for home as fast as that pony could run. He was so covered with blood he looked like he had been butchered. We grabbed the reins and grabbed him off the horse but before he could tell us what had happened, the colt himself showed us. As soon as he caught up he reared up on his hind feet and began to strike at his mother with his front feet. He had hit Fred in the face and there is still a scar on his lip where the colt’s hoof struck him.

We have had lots of discouragements but we kept up our hope and courage pretty well until the summer and fall before Brent was born. Perhaps things just seemed worse to me because I was so sick. Both our old cars went to pieces, one right after the other; my washer broke and I had to go back to washing by hand; then the Delco quit us and we were without lights or radio. During the second crop haying Fred got kicked and was laid up for six weeks with a crippled leg. We couldn’t get help and some of the hay lay out in the field until Fred could haul it in himself. The boys had nothing but rags to start school in and we had no money to buy new ones. Almost every day one of them would say, “Mother, what can I wear? This has got a big hole in it.” I fixed and patched until I was ready to scream at the sight of it. The bank was after us to pay up the nine hundred dollars we had borrowed to run the brick business; we got a reminder of the rest we owed on the press; and the Federal Land Bank was threatening to start foreclosure proceedings if we didn’t pay up. It seemed like every place we went someone was after us for some money we owed them, mostly from
working on the brick yard. There were very few here who had worked as hard as we had and yet it looked as though we were going to lose everything.

I completely lost all interest, hope, or faith in everything. There seemed to be no feeling left in my heart but bitterness and hatred. That was the year Maurice and Rachel came out to have Thanksgiving with the Bensons at Ioka. We joined them up there and had a fine time, but it couldn't dispel my gloom. I don't know what Rachel reported when she got back to Idaho — I only know the results. A few weeks later here came a parcel with more new clothes than we had ever owned before in our lives. That parcel worked wonders at cheering me up. To have the boys get ready to go someplace without the usual patching and fixing and to know that they were presentable anywhere was wonderful!

One day we went to Vernal to inform all our creditors we couldn't pay up and they could do what they pleased. We accidentally met a fellow from the Federal Land Bank and told him our story and after some discussion we signed up new papers on the place, with nothing to pay for almost a year. While we were on our way to the bank to tell them we couldn't pay up, we met Mr. Hopkins, the Farm Loan man. He had known the difficulty we were in and told us he had some money for us if we could come in and sign the papers. We got enough to pay the bank and most of our smaller bills. Since then we have worn our debts down some and feel that we will work out of the hole.

I don't know if you can get anything from the jumbled up letter or not. I wrote down incidents as I remembered them, but when I got through I realized I had much more detail than you would want so I'll send only part of it. I think I'll keep it all, though, so you might return these sheets to me sometime. These incidents are interesting to us but would be to no one else. Fred said I should call it "My Book of Horrors".

If you can't use any of this don't let it worry you. I know there isn't much time left. I haven't the negatives of those pictures of our home in Ioka. I prize them highly so don't lose them.

Dearest Love,
Loreen

Loreen Pack Wahlquist from a family photograph taken in 1937.
Most of our early pioneers came from the shops and factories of foreign lands. The Americans among them were but little better prepared for pioneering. All of them knew little or nothing about sheep, and no one was available to advise them of the range conditions that their animals must face. There were problems of climate, of forage, and of Indian hazards that were different from anywhere else in the world. So, in trying to build up their cherished flocks and...
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herds, they did many things that seem humorous to the experienced growers of today.

Sheep were first brought to the Cedar City area in November 1862 by the Willden family, who later moved to Beaver. They had ten head. As fast as others could get hold of them, every family acquired one or more to produce the wool that was needed to spin the family clothing. They were valued as high as thirty dollars a head. To avoid loss they were kept in a pen at home and fed by hand like pigs.

As the years went by, the sheep increased until the families were supplied with the wool they needed. The animals by now were becoming troublesome to care for, and ways were sought to get them away from home where they could pick their own living. At first they were driven out in the morning and brought back at night. Then neighbors put their flocks together and took turns in herding them. Finally a community herd developed and they were brought home only once a year to be shorn. The next step was a co-op herd in which sheep were turned in for capital stock. A wool dividend each year supplied the housewife with the wool she needed. These herds grew into strong business concerns which paid dividends each year that ranged from twenty-five to sixty percent. Sheep stock became the best stock in the country to own. Down into the eighties the people in southern Utah were still spinning and weaving their own clothing, so dividends of wool as well as of meat were regularly declared in order that these commodities might be supplied.

In 1876 the company began to purchase land for winter and summer ranges. Their price was $100 for 160 acres of patented land. They paid William Sheperson $300 for his entry covering Antelope Springs, and they gave Joseph Smith $600 for his water rights at Iron Springs. These were special ranches that controlled large, open ranges. They bought 160 acres of land at Iron Springs from Thomas Bladen for $100 and another 160 acres from Charles Ahlstrom at Spanish Hollow, on the mountain, at the same price.

Then a time came when the sheep produced a surplus of both meat and wool above that needed locally, and outside markets were sought to consume it. In 1879 the co-op herd in Cedar City exceeded five thousand head, and the management felt that the ranges were being overstocked. So they rented a herd to the United Order at Orderville, "because," the minutes record, "they still have a little
range left.” This herd was turned over to John R. Young at Navajo Lake on August 21, 1879.

To find a market for the surplus meat the manager, Francis Webster, went to Pioche, Nevada, which then was a bustling mining camp. He made contracts with a Dutch butcher named Loomis and with Gus Adelman and W. H. Mathews to handle from fifty to seventy-five head each week during the summer months. The price was two dollars per head, delivered in Pioche, and the pelts were to be given back to the seller. So each week a little bunch of sheep was driven to Nevada, and a supply wagon went along to carry food and bedding for the herders and to bring back the pelts from the last delivery. The pelts were valued at ten and one-half cents each, then the company paid seven cents each to shear them, and the shorn pelts were sold to the co-op tannery at twelve cents each. The tanner converted the hides into leather which in turn was made into fine shoes for women and children in the shoe shop which was operated as a branch of the Cedar Cooperative Mercantile and Manufacturing Company, commonly known as the Co-op Store. In 1880 the company sold 942 pounds of shorn pelt wool to the Provo Woolen Mills at twenty-three and one-half cents per pound delivered in Provo.

To supply fresh meat to the local people during the summer, the sheep company drove twenty-five or thirty head of fat old ewes and wethers to town every week. Charles Ahlstrom killed them every Friday evening at the old slaughterhouse below town. Early Saturday morning, before the flies became too active, the people rushed to the butcher shop on Main Street to buy a leg (hind quarter) or wing (front quarter) of mutton. It was never cut up smaller than that. Plucks (the heart, liver, and lungs) were given away at the slaughterhouse to the kids who swarmed there like flies on killing days.

The company paid Ahlstrom five cents per head for killing and selling these sheep, and in the summer of 1881 he butchere 335 head. Thus his summer’s work as community butcher netted Charles Ahlstrom the princely income of $16.75. At this same time sheepherders were paid $1.33 per day.

The Co-op Sheep Company of Cedar City, which at that time was the only users of the open range, had built its herds up to five thousand head and feared that the ranges were becoming overstocked. Today these same ranges are carrying a hundred thousand
head, and not many years ago the number was around three hundred thousand. After that herd had been rented to the Order­ville people, local sheepmen still had fears that their relief was only temporary. The sheep still went on producing a new crop of lambs every year. They would soon be up to five thousand head again, and there were no more United Orders who had a little range left. The company, in one of its meetings, gave serious consideration to this impending problem. One member observed that the practice of allowing herdsmen to give orphaned lambs away was tending at the rate of several hundred head a year to hasten the day of their range doom. Another member sagely observed that nature provided controls for a proper ratio of increase through a certain percent of ewes abandoning their lambs to die, and when those lambs were saved by artificial means it upset nature’s own way of maintaining a balance. The question was asked, “Who authorized herdsmen to give pet lambs away?” No such authority had ever been given. The logical conclusion then was that if the herders had no right to give the lambs away, they still belonged to the company and it could do with them what it pleased. It was decided that they must be killed. William Tucker was employed to go from house to house and ranch to ranch and do what nature in the first place intended should be done, kill all dogie lambs.

The order stirred up a veritable furor in town, for almost everyone was raising a pet lamb or two. At the first place Tucker visited, the woman of the house met him at the door with a pan of scalding water in her menacing hands and dared him to touch one of her pets. Tucker reconsidered his commission and resigned. The board decided not to appoint a successor and thus the pet lambs were saved and nature’s law set aside.

Sheep were first taken to the mountain in 1870, where the grass was a waving meadow as high as a sheep’s back. Two men were sent with the herd and they had strict instructions to keep them out of the timber. The fear was that bear or other wild animals would get them there or that they might stray away and get lost. One hot summer day the sheep were determined to get into the shade. Here they would have lain quietly until evening when they could have been driven at will. The herders dogged them and fought them back until they were exhausted. Still the sheep persisted. At last the herd scattered and ran in all directions for the timber. One of the men hastened to town to report the disaster. The company president
called the directors and they took a posse of stockholders and hurried to the mountain. Riding and yelling through the forest like madmen they rounded up the wayward woolies and forced them back to the naked, sunburned hillside. Then with many admonitions to the careless herdsmen they returned to town feeling that they had done a good and heroic day's work. Today, we know that the sheep had more range sense than the men.

In one of the early years of the Cooperative Sheep Company there came a very severe winter. The herd was quartered at Iron Springs, a range that had been reserved for them because there was water there. The animals were kept there the year around. They ranged out two or three miles each day and were brought back to the creek every night for water. One day the weather turned bilious, and the herder saw signs of a heavy storm gathering. He moved the sheep two miles south up into the hills and cedars where he would have wood and where there was good sagebrush for the sheep to browse upon if the snow fell deep. That night two feet of snow fell, and the herd was completely snowed in. The herder was very thankful that he had taken the precaution to move to such a favorable place. But in town the old country man who was the company
manager fussed and fumed. On the third day he could stand it no longer, so he hired a dozen men and two teams and wagons and went to the Iron Springs to see how the sheep had fared and to render such assistance as might be needed. Arriving at the springs they found no trace of camp, herder, or sheep, and the manager was greatly alarmed. They yelled and fired their guns but got no answer. Soon they saw smoke up in the hills and hurried to the scene. They found sheep and herder contentedly at rest. The manager was thoroughly vexed for he thought the herder should be out shoveling a trail down to the springs. “What on earth are you doing here?” he demanded. The answer was not quieting. “Just sitting,” was the laconic reply. “How long is it since these sheep were watered?” asked the manager. “Three days,” answered the herder. “I had no way of getting them down to the springs and they don’t seem to be suffering for water anyhow.” “You stupid man,” fumed the manager, “where were your senses to be caught two or three miles away from the creek in such a storm? Do you think you could go three days without water?” “Yes,” answered the herder, “three months if I was up to my neck in snow.” “Tut, tut,” was the manager’s angry retort.

The order was given for the sheep to be driven down to the water at once. The wagons and four horses were to break the trail, then the men were to follow behind and tramp it smooth. The manager, two men, and the herder with the dogs would follow and drive the sheep down the trail. A suggestion that some cedar trees dragged behind the wagon would make a better trail than the men could tramp was dismissed as a lazy man’s idea. They pushed and dogged and did everything possible to move the sheep, but the stupid things seemed to have no desire to be saved from death by thirst. Foot by foot and rod by rod they were forced down the trail and at last the herd was at the water, but not a single sheep would even smell it. Their only manifest desire was to go back up that trail to the brush and the sheltering hills they had been forced to leave. The manager said it was just cussed, stubborn sheep nature and he would hold them there until they drank if it took a month. He would be as stubborn as they. The wagons and the camps were made across the trail and everyone settled down to await the outcome. Two days later no one had seen a sheep take a drink, and the manager decided to return to town. He took with him the men he had brought but left no instructions with the leader. As soon as the trail was cleared the sheep struck out up to the hills. There had been no feed at the creek
and no brush for browse, so the herd looked very gaunt and used up. Many of the old and weak ones never got over the jamming they had taken, and the mud that followed the melting of the deep snow was too much for their strength. The losses that spring were frightfully high. It took all of that experience and loss to teach a hard-headed Englishman that sheep need no water when they have snow to lick. But the lesson was worth all that it cost, for the knowledge gained in that costly experience opened a vast expanse of virgin desert country to winter grazing which before had been untouched.

There was not an oldtimer in these parts whose memory would not do a turnover at the mere mention of the old Rock House. For him no other description or location or identification need be spoken. Just to say “Old Rock House” to an early day sheepman, shearer, or cattleman would light his eyes with a spark of devilment and he would probably say, “I'll tell you something that happened there once.” That old place figured in enough outlandish pranks to fill a book.

It was built in the early days of the Cedar Sheep Co-op Company and was intended for a shearing pen. It was a long, narrow building with a dirt floor and stood on the banks of the creek at Iron Springs. It was connected by a chute with the big open sheep corral that ran down into the creek. Enough sheep could be put into the Rock House for a half-day’s shearing run. The shorn sheep were turned out at noon and the house filled again for the afternoon run. Along the south wall there was a row of small, high windows through which the tied fleeces were thrown into the wool sacks that hung on frames under the windows on the outside of the building.

Shearing at Iron Springs in the early days was one of the big events in which almost everybody took a hand. The men camped in tents and wagon boxes along the creek, while the women at home cooked their food supplies and sent them out once a week on the mess wagon. Some women sent lots of pies, cakes, and pastries, but the man who received them almost had to stand guard with a shotgun if he got a taste. On one pretext or another he would be enticed away from his camp and return to find all his dainties consumed.

In those days men rolled their quilts out on the wagon cover and slept on the ground. Any attempt to attain comfort was sissified and woe be to the tenderfoot who tried it. Comfort was strictly against camp etiquette. One spring a fellow came to work at the shearing
pen with a feather bed. He was teased so much about it that he moved his camp a quarter-mile away off in the cedars. One day while Tobe was industriously shearing sheep some of the roughnecks sneaked out to his camp and lifted his feather bed out on top of an anthill. That night Tobe got little rest, but the next day he got lots of advice about the desirability of moving back with the crowd where his buddies could help keep an eye on things. Once when it was raining too much to shear sheep some of the boys went out and brought in a band of wild desert horses and turned them into the sheep corral. They had a lot of fun riding them bareback as long as they would buck. That night after the camp was sound asleep some of the crowd lassoed a wild horse and took him up to Tobe's camp in the cedars. They tied one end of a long rope to the horse's tail and the other end to the corner of the feather bed and then turned the horse loose. The sleeper stayed with his toboggan sled for only a rod or two, yelling "whoa, whoa" as loud as he could. He rolled out but the horse and tick went off down the desert. Next morning the brush and cedar trees for a mile or more down the country looked like they had feathered out during the night. All the next day every man in camp was cussing the low-down devils that would do such a thing to Tobe — the guilty ones doing more talking than anyone else. They took up a collection that more than repaid his losses and offered to go out and bring in that wild horse and present him, rope and all, to the injured man. Needless to say, Tobe did not come back with a feather bed.

To breed up the quality of their sheep, the company brought in a few head of purebred merinos. They were run on the best ranges and given every advantage that they might increase more rapidly. Everyone thought they were wonderful sheep until shearing time came. The natives had light, fluffy fleeces and sheared only three or four pounds each. Shearers were paid five cents per head and with the crude appointments they had, men sheared only from fifty to seventy head per day. The merinos were wrinkly bodied, tight, greasy-wooled fellows that almost defied the shear blades. The coming in of the merino herd was always occasion for groans and profanity on the part of the crew.

It was the manager's custom to call the men together for prayers every night and morning. And always a blessing was invoked upon "our flocks and herds." There was a newcomer from England in the crew one spring, and he could not get the knack of using the shears.
He snipped and snipped all day. If he was lucky enough to get a good run of bare-bellied natives he sometimes got up to fifteen or twenty head in a hard day. When the merinos came in his count dropped to a third of that number. After wrestling with the merinos one hard, hot day the manager called upon Dick to lead in prayer. He made a good and fervent start but when he came to the blessing of the flocks and herds he truly told the Lord how he felt about the matter. He said, "Lord bless all our flocks and 'erds, but this 'ere bloody, greasy 'erd we don't care whether Thee blesses 'um or not." It was a long time before proper reverence and decorum could be restored at prayer time.

Shearing and wool handling methods in that pioneer day were crude and time-consuming compared with today. Shearers were paid five cents per head as against fifty or more cents apiece now. The fleece, too, is different, as the average then weighed only about four pounds as compared with the eight or nine pound ones today. The shearer of that day ran out into the big corral, caught a sheep, and dragged it into the old Rock House for shearing. When that was done he deftly twisted locks of wool into a string to tie the fleece up, then threw it outside through one of the high windows in the side wall. All this completed, the shearer walked over to a cardboard tacked on the wall, checked down a tally mark under his name and then returned to the big corral for another sheep.

Jim Corlett's job was to haul the wool to town and take food and supplies back to the men at the shearing corral. His was the mess wagon. For the hauling job he built a big, tight rack on his wagon, and into it he pitched those fleeces with a pitchfork. Driving his four-horse outfit along under the high windows of the Rock House, he gathered the week's clip of wool off the ground and hauled it to town. Here he unloaded it a fleece at a time through a small window into the basement of the Tithing Office. By this time most of those twisted wool strings had come loose, and the fleeces had lost their identity in a stack of tangled wool.

In those days the housewives carded and spun the wool, and wove the cloth and knitted the stockings for the needs of their families. So the first market to be supplied was the townspeople. The sheep company declared a wool dividend every year, and the women brought their sacks to the Tithing Office to receive it. The women came generally because they knew wool better than the men, and they wanted to select their own for they would have to work it up.
the family needed more than twenty, thirty, or fifty pounds of dividend wool that was theirs, or if they were not stockholders, they bought it from the company or from a shareholder who had more wool than he needed. After the town was supplied, the balance was sacked up and hauled to Provo or Salt Lake and traded to ZCMI for groceries and hardware. These goods were brought home to Cedar City and sold over the counters of the Co-op Store. ZCMI found a market for most of that wool among the women of Salt Lake City who still were carding and spinning and weaving their own cloth.

The sacking of that surplus wool that was to be hauled to the north was done on the floor of the Tithing Office cellar, and it was a backbreaking job. A few fleeces were put into a wool bag, such as we still use, then a man lay down on his back inside the sack and pulling the bag with his hands he crowded the wool tight with his feet. Then he put more wool in and repeated the pressing until the bag was as full as he could cram it. Those bags weighed a third less than the same size bags do today.

Billie Harris has been given the credit for the idea of sacking frames under those high windows at the shearing pen. He suggested that instead of the wool dropping onto the ground, it could drop into an open sack and a man standing up inside could tramp more wool into a bag than he could put into it lying down on his back on the floor. The old country manager did not like the idea. He denounced it as a lazy man's way and said that if the wool were packed any tighter than they were doing it that it would rot or heat and burn itself up. However, the method was tried on a few sacks that were to be shipped right out, while enough loose wool was put in the Tithing Office cellar, as before, to supply the town. The change proved to be a big improvement. It saved work and it saved wool and it saved

Sheep grazing on their winter range in the western Utah desert. Utah State Historical Society collections.
bags, for a third more wool could be put into them. Neither did the wool heat or rot. That simple little change in handling effected a great economy both in labor and in shearing expenses. It is still the wool-sacking method used today.

The small boys of the town went also to the shearing pen to gather the tag locks. This wool had no value to the owner and anyone was welcome to it. The housewives learned that after washing through many waters the tag locks made the finest grade of mattresses or wool ticks. The wool was not kinked and the mattresses were warm, soft, and fluffy. Tag lock wool when clipped into short lengths possessed some quality absent in the regular wool that prevented matting.

In the early days, when wool was the consideration of first importance, wethers were kept until they were six or eight years old. They produced heavier fleeces and were generally fat in the fall when buyers came around to pick them up. During the eighties and early nineties buyers came in and bought them in the spring. Then during the long summer months these herds were trailed in easy stages each day to Omaha, Lincoln, or Kansas City where they arrived in good condition in October. There was open range all the way to these markets, which they reached just at the right time to go into the farm feedlots. Among those who had the experience of trailing these herds to the eastern markets were Alfred Smith, Alfred Froyd, Richard H. Palmer, and John J. G. Webster.

As we look back we find many amusing things in the early history of the sheep industry in southern Utah. We laugh at the practices of the pioneer sheepmen and their ignorance of the nature and habits of the animals they prized so highly. But when the backgrounds of those men are considered, the wonder is not that they made mistakes but rather that they had any sheep left. It was a trial and error business. Nearly all of those men had come from the old country. They had been coal miners, factory workers, clerks, and shopkeepers and their total livestock experience consisted in having driven a yoke of cattle across the plains. They knew nothing of the nature of sheep nor could they be expected to know. It was in the hands of the next generation, the sons of the pioneers, that the industry really began to thrive. These boys had grown up with the sheep on the ranges and learned firsthand something of the nature and habits of their charges.
The Watermaster's Stick

by Lavell Johnson
The watermaster's stick is the most important piece of equipment he carries, even outranking such time-honored essentials as pliers and pocketknife. One side of the stick is marked with the usual twelve inches per foot and fractions thereof; the other side divides the foot into tenths and hundredths. When asked why, the watermaster will probably not smile outright, but he may allow the corners of his mouth to lift and his eyes to twinkle when he answers, "I measure the saints with one edge and the sinners with the other." In the vast semiarid regions of the West there may be almost as much truth as metaphor in that answer.

The watermaster will explain that the water tables in his reference charts are designed to be read in tenths or hundredths of feet in order to arrive at the number of cubic feet per second passing through the measuring devices. One cubic foot of water per second running for twelve hours amounts to an acre-foot, or the amount of water required to cover an acre of land one foot deep — approximately 326,000 gallons.

Contrary to Theodore Roosevelt's advice about speaking softly and carrying a big stick, a watermaster must splash loudly to announce he is around and on the job, and he must carry his stick to maintain the delicate balance between a smoothly running canal system and chaos. He is the referee, official scorer, and timekeeper in the most serious of all games: personal livelihood.

Without a system of irrigation there never would have been an agricultural base in Utah; without it there would not be one now. Regardless of a farmer's capital, ingenuity, or other resources, his one indispensable ingredient for success will be an adequate source of irrigation water. In its absence, all else will be of no avail. Naturally, the tolerance for error or misunderstanding in the daily management of this system is very low. A breakdown is almost certain to result in bad feeling, threats, or even violence. The watermaster is responsible for ensuring this does not happen, that everyone gets his allotted share but that no one encroaches on the rights of others. Add to his other duties, then, those of whipping boy, sentinel, diplomat, and guardian of the community peace.

The following incidents and observations are particular as to time and place. Their setting is a western Utah community during
recent years. Yet they are typical enough of Utah in general that they could just as well have come from nearly any farming community during this or a previous era.

It was mid-July, when crops could make Jack-and-the-beanstalk growth in the long hours of sunlight if they were irrigated or be stunted in the day’s heat if left dry, that a stockholder requested two streams of water at the same time for two different farms. Both streams would come from the same company and the same canal. Apparently the farmer hoped to do the two irrigating jobs simultaneously in order to save his own time and, perhaps, reduce wear and tear on his pickup. When the watermaster turned the two streams through the headgates, the farmer was unhappy that one stream was a foot and a half under the size of the other stream. The watermaster suggested cutting the bigger stream a foot and a half to make both streams even, but the farmer complained loudly, “I ordered two streams the same size and that is what we pay you that big, outrageous salary for. Now, you make that little stream as big as the other stream and right now!”

The watermaster put on a convincing act, traveling back and forth between the two headgates, reading measurements, making minute adjustments on both gates, and frequently consulting his little black book’s charts. In the course of these dramas he discretely adjusted the headgates so that three-fourths of a foot was diverted from the larger stream into the smaller, making them equal in size. The farmer, none the wiser, was satisfied. The watermaster, too, was pleased. He had given the farmer his entitled share, but not a drop more, and had avoided an argument.

This incident is not an isolated example of the picayune haggling for an imagined or contrived benefit. Consider the case of a small cluster of farms taking water from a huge plastic-lined canal. Pooling knowledge gained from experience, these farmers had organized watering procedures among themselves without benefit of advice from the watermasters. All insisted that the reservoir-like canal be filled almost to bursting before one of them would allow his own headgate to be opened. Then they would jockey their orders, each hoping to be the last one on that lateral to irrigate. The object was, of course, to receive one or two extra acre-feet of water at no charge for “draining the canal.”

An especially brazen practice involves having the watermaster back up the water in the canal to get it measured through the
headgate outlet on the highest terrace. Then, usually in the night, the same stream (plus water backed up in the canal) is released onto the farmer's very lowest terrace or level, and all the other farmers taking water from that canal are left high and dry. By releasing such a large amount of water so suddenly, the culprit gets his low-lying ground thoroughly soaked long before daylight. By the time the watermaster makes his dawn checkup, the water is back on the high ground where it started the day before. A high watermark is plainly visible on the ditch leading to the lowest part of the farm, and water still stands on the night-irrigated acres. All this is only circumstantial evidence, however, as there have been no eyewitnesses who could or would testify in court. The victimized fellow-irrigators can vent their displeasure on the watermaster, or they may choose to do the same thing themselves on another dark night.

Sooner or later all watermasters learn tricks with their measuring sticks, and native intelligence dictates what to do to make sharp practices stick out. Certainly by the end of the irrigation season a watermaster knows what has been taking place, and he has probably already made an adjustment or two in his book.

Most large, modern irrigation systems are well equipped at strategic stations with automatic measuring and recording clocks. Experienced watermasters will point with pride to the almost straight, unwavering tracings of the recording pen — proof positive that water in the big canals runs steady and without visible fluctuations. These water recorders often create interesting situations.

One farmer whose land was watered directly from one of the main canals — and was close to the recording gauge — was thought to be tapping a little more water in the after-midnight hours than he was charged with in the daytime measurings. One night, when the watermaster had to make a change of streams about four-thirty in the morning at a headgate close by, he thought he caught the reflection of a flashlight which was soon no longer visible. After completing the change and returning to his pickup truck, he lowered his light briefly to the suspect's ditch, and, sure enough, it was almost overflowing. Next day, with the help of a few others who "just happened to stop by" as the watermaster was inspecting the recording made by the pen, the headgate-changer was also called in to look over the tracing. The watermaster asked, "Did you lift your headgate about four o'clock this morning?" "Gosh, no." "Well, this big wiggle on the tracing shows someone did and right close to the
clock.” The offender, confronted with the bluff, crumpled and said with awe in his voice, “Now, how the hell did that thing know that I done it at four o’clock?”

The watermaster’s challenge is to see that the water going through headgates on canals, laterals, or single outlets does not vary in volume once headgate readings and measurements are taken. Usually more than one irrigator will be taking water from the same lateral and at the same time during periods of heavy demand. When users finish, the watermaster closes their headgates and opens up those of the farmers next on the waiting list for that lateral. Whether this transfer of water is upstream or downstream makes no difference. The watermaster must anticipate the changes by making them gradually so as to compensate for the temporary variation in volume. Carefully done, these changeovers will be recorded as only

*Old-style wooden headgate was lifted to allow canal water to flow into irrigation ditch, Utah State Historical Society collections, gift of Arthur L. Crawford.*
momentary fluctuations on any measuring device. Watermasters must develop this knack through experience — all of which might not be necessarily pleasant.

In some areas the watermaster has as many as one hundred or more outlets to deliver water through and perhaps twenty or twenty-five streams to manage at one time. At peak irrigation periods, he may run two hundred acre-feet of water through those outlets in a day.

As each stream is turned to a new user, the watermaster must record all of the figures or measurements that show on the Parshall flume staff gauges or those his measuring stick determines on old-fashioned headgates. He enters the same data on specially printed forms which must be turned into the company office every few days to forestall a pileup of big overdrafts.

The watermaster goes through much the same procedure every time a stockholder finishes watering to provide incontestable proof of when a user took a stream, how long he kept it, what the stream was measured at in the morning checkup rounds, and what time it was by the twenty-four hour clock when he gave the stream up. Overdrafts of water are literally water under the bridge and cannot be repossessed in any manner. Overdrafting farmers might be required to rent water from neighbors who happen to have a few water credits to spare in order to cover the amount of overdraft. The key man in this situation is the watermaster with the figures his measuring stick reveals and the promptness with which he gets records and measurements into the secretary at the company office.

On one occasion a water company's board of directors voted to hold up the watermaster's salary until all of his customers squared up their overdrafts. The watermaster soon learned to watch like a hawk to see that when a farmer ordered a stream of water, he did not overdraw the amount of his water credits. A water user could draw out all of the water for which he had water credits on the books, but if he wanted to keep on watering beyond that point he had to purchase or rent additional water credits. He could not even have water turned to him in the first place unless he had water credits on the company books. This “water-on-call” system is like having so much money in a bank and writing checks against the amount on deposit.

Water users' credits are estimates of the water to be available for each share of stock in the water right of the company. Some companies have reservoir storage so that a reasonably firm estimate of
the water available for use during the current season can be made. Even those without storage rights can predict streamflow rights based on rainfall or snowfall records. Thus, an allocation estimate can be made. In most cases there is cooperation among the companies for the good of all. In some cases, high flows of water might be shared by giving a portion of the water to the storage reservoir in order that such stored water can be used later on in the season.

Originally begun by promoters or speculators, the land and water companies guessed at the amount of water needed to irrigate one acre of the new land and called that amount one share. In most early contracts, the one-share-to-the-acre water right was tied to the land. But before long it became apparent that one share per acre was not enough water to raise all types of crops, especially in dry years. The best farmers at present are likely to own two shares of water stock for each tillable acre of land so that they can plant whatever crops they choose and have ample water credits in reserve.

In dry years, the watermaster’s measurements are of special importance to stockholders — especially to those who are short on ownership of water stock. It was at such a time just recently that one watermaster returned home and found on the memo pad next to the telephone the message that a certain user would like the water turned out of the canal for a while. Investigating further, he learned that a party had been swimming in the big pond of the canal and had been tubing where the fall-away from the Parshall flume created swift waters. A diamond wedding ring had slipped from one young lady’s finger and had disappeared in the current. The watermaster immediately telephoned his fellow watermaster farther out on the canal and got permission to shut the big headgates for a while to drain the canal and look for the ring. Neighbors came flocking to join in the effort.

After closing the big gates, the watermaster began his search. He had gone but a few feet along the concrete side of the ditch when he caught sight of the diamond ring down in a crack with the sediment swirling around it in the shallow water. He slid down the concrete structure and retrieved the ring with ease. One of the searchers cried, “Old Hebe’s found it,” and the happy word was passed along to the advanced hunters. The chances of finding a ring lost in swift water in concrete ditches were about as slim as finding the proverbial needle in a haystack, but the experienced watermaster had known exactly where to look. The young lady was the first to
come running. She threw her arms around the watermaster and planted a hearty, grateful kiss on his grinning face. This was only part of his reward. The rest was in opening the gates and knowing that the flow of precious water had not been interrupted long enough to make any difference.

Irrigation water flows through gates and a Parshall flume as it enters a stretch of cement-lined canal on the Delta canal system near Sutherland. Photograph courtesy of Mary Lyman Henrie.

CREDULITY AND LAND PURCHASES.

That land agents exaggerate woefully in their efforts to induce settlers and speculators to make purchases, no well informed person will deny. In the “back to the soil” movement now running wild over the country thousands upon thousands are being led to purchase land, laboring under the impression that the work of planting, cultivating, and harvesting of money-yielding crops from the land when they move upon it will prove more pleasurable and no more laborious than the exertion necessary in playing tennis or golf. In fact, in this land matter history is simply repeating itself. . . . (The Deseret Farmer, September 16, 1911.)
BOOK REVIEWS


No matter how quaintly Hebraic in terminology, the word “Zion” to any rock-ribbed member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints means the “gathering place” or any “place,” regardless of how ephemerally bounded, where Mormons abide. In the early, more hectic days of the church, the Lord named Missouri as the “place.” But after the Missourians drastically changed the Lord’s plans, the Great Basin area became the Latter-day Zion with Utah as geographical center. Later prophets have attempted to give the holy name to all of America, but unsuccessfully. Zion still fans out from Utah, in rapidly fading circles, with Salt Lake City as the spiritual center. It is where the Saints reside (or it was, at least up to the last two decades).

In order for any non-Mormon to begin to understand this book, and especially to fathom J. Golden Kimball, it is necessary to comprehend not only the peculiar Mormon concept of Zion but to visualize the system by which Saints are admonished, counseled, taught, and preached into the pattern of salvation and the more coveted reward of celestial glory after death takes its inexorable due. The church uses many devices to steer its Saints into the probability of salvation and exaltation. None is more heeded nor more useful than the counseling and exhortation of the “Authorities.”

The General Authorities graduate downward from the president — universally accepted as prophet, seer, and revelator to the church — his twelve apostles (with their apostolic assistants) — the seven presidents of the Seventies — the stake presidents — and down to the local ward bishops. Any member, of course, no matter how obscure, can be called to speak or function, but the Authorities are the preachers. In tabernacle conferences, in stake conferences, in ward conferences, they thunder The Word. To a dedicated Latter-day Saint, they speak with the passion, wonder, and full guidance of Jehovah. When one of the Authorities preaches, whether in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, or some ward house in Zion’s outer bounds, every ear is attuned.

For forty-six years, as one of the seven presidents of the Seventies, J. Golden Kimball served as a General Authority to the church. At the time of his death, in 1938, J. Golden Kimball was probably the world’s best known contemporary Mormon. This reviewer, having been born into the church, and enough of a rock-ribbed member to heed and respect the General Authorities as they thundered The Word from Zion’s pulpits, would have walked ten miles to hear J. Golden Kimball tear into sin, the Gentiles, and/or the treacherous blandishments of the world.

Golden, an all-but-forgotten son of Apostle Heber C. Kimball, added little grace to any pulpit. He was six feet three inches in height, skinny and
slender enough to blow away in a breeze. His balding, egglike head bobbed on a neck reed thrust up from narrow shoulders. He possessed a voice that whined like a power saw going through soft pine but with an occasional jarring dissonance when it tore into the more knotty problems of life. I, or any other Mormon I know of, never went to hear J. Golden Kimball preach because of polish, eloquence, or even with the expectation of being transfixed with revelatory glory. We went because he was one of us—with every spiritual scar and defect. And, because in salty, earthy language he told it like it was.

J. Golden Kimball did not earn his right to admonish the Saints through theological or academic training. His schooling was of the sparsest sort. He had earned his living as cowboy, teamster, and mule-skinner. In his ordination into the General Authorities he carried with him the wit and humor of saddle days and the vernacular he had used on the mules. For decades he was a thorn under the saddle blanket of Mormon officialdom and often embarrassed his fellow dignitaries by cutting loose with words that could be fully comprehensible and startling to both mules and men.

The swearing prophet has been dead more than three decades, but in Zion he is still revered and remembered. First of all, he was an honest man without pretense or guile. Those of his audience recognized in him a fellow Saint who had as much trouble as they in walking the straight and narrow. He readily confessed and acknowledged the insuperable demands of remaining pure in heart. He cussed in public like all the other Saints cussed in private. And, instead of posing as an example of pulpit perfection, he was content to stumble along with lesser folks.

In this ungainly, earthy, blundering human, the Saints saw themselves. In his ministry, instead of commanding and driving, he led them and helped them along the way. He seldom failed to boff an audience with his droll wit. Every seat was filled when he spoke to the Saints. People came away strangely fed and uplifted. Mormondom loved him as no man before or since.

Time has done little to dim his memory. Throughout Mormon Zion, J. Golden Kimball has become a folk hero. Any family who knew him, or remembered him, have their own treasure-trove of Golden’s bawdy pulpit remarks and witticisms. He has been called the Will Rogers and the Mark Twain of Mormondom. He resembles neither of these men.

Thomas E. Cheney, after twenty-seven years on the English faculty at Brigham Young University, has taken upon himself the task of putting this extraordinary man and his salty sayings into a book. No one could ever be more deserving than J. Golden Kimball to such honor and preservation. He served his church humbly and with enviable results. He is still loved and remembered when others who served with him are already forgotten. He enriched Zion with stories and anecdotes that are told, retold, and embellished year by year. Assuredly this is prime biographical material. And certainly the “Golden legacy” deserves to be preserved.

The book is richly and tightly packed with J. Golden Kimball. It is a good book, and there probably will never be a better one on this subject. It must have taken endless and scholarly effort to sift the truth and veracity from the Golden apocryphal humor which lays like snow over Utah. There is no doubt that what has gone into the volume, lifted from tabernacle sermons and from personal interviews, is as much of the real Golden as one can or ever will get. But with all the skills and tireless endeavor, Dr. Cheney has
not quite succeeded in putting J. Golden Kimball between covers. Golden's bawdy humor is there enshrined, and some of the pulpit jokes are lulus — but he still remains the jocular six-foot-three ghost in Zion.

The banter of Will Rogers and Mark Twain titillate us endlessly, because they were planned and conceived to go into print. The windies and witticisms of J. Golden Kimball, especially to those who once witnessed and experienced their oral delivery, seem to be only half there when set in type. There was never a funnier or more delightful man. But without Golden’s presence to laugh at and with, his sayings become much less humorous. Without his earnest and honest presence to back them up with believability even his serious delivery sounds petulant — like recorded exhortations of a bucolic preacher with a needle stuck in the groove. The pity is that no author, or editor, can or will likely make it any different.

But despite this unavoidable loss, The Golden Legacy is still one of the most important books in the Mormon spectrum. Latter-day Saints owe a debt of gratitude to the author and to the publisher. This book is so honest and so different from the sanctified effusions which endlessly pour from the present Authorities, that every Saint should treasure to their heart everything they can of J. Golden Kimball.

I hope The Golden Legacy can somehow manage its way through the censorious “Zion curtain” so that Latter-day Saints everywhere can now endlessly savor the “mule-skinner” stories they treasure. For J. Golden Kimball was one leader who led like the Master himself. He was one Saint whose sayings are more “faith-promoting” than anything likely to be presently found around Temple Square.

PAUL BAILEY
Westernlore Press
Los Angeles

A Mormon Mother: An Autobiography by Annie Clark Tanner. 1st ed. rev. Foreword by Obert C. Tanner. Utah, the Mormons, and the West Series, no. 1. (Salt Lake City: Tanner Trust Fund, University of Utah Library, 1973. xxxiii + 346 pp. $10.00.)

"Though painful for me to concede, the evidence is rather overwhelming that Annie Clark Tanner’s life was tragic. Granted that she herself did not consider her life as tragic and granted there were years at the beginning and at the end of her life that were not tragic, nevertheless, nearly all her mature years were a succession of tragic events."

Thus Obert C. Tanner, the youngest of Annie Clark Tanner’s ten children, introduces the autobiography of his mother. He defines the real mark of greatness in the life of a human being as the ability to emerge from such heartache and bitter disappointment with an unbroken spirit. Then he concludes that Annie “was a surpassingly great human being.”

Annie Clark Tanner, herself the product of a polygamous marriage, was raised in affluence, well educated and committed without reservation to the ideals and practices of her religious faith. At the age of nineteen she became the second of four wives and later the mother of ten children, two of whom were born on the underground, hiding from the law.

In her own words, interspersed with extracts from her diary and fam-
ily letters printed in full, she tells her story with candor and honesty. So effective is her account that we share her bitter disappointment as alone she ate her wedding supper of bread and milk and remembered the elaborate weddings of other young brides. "No one will ever congratulate me," she said to herself. We feel her insecurity as an expectant mother when federal officials increased their attempts to enforce the laws against polygamy. "I knew that in a short time I would be hiding out under an assumed name to conceal my identity. This was the practice of all those living in polygamy at that time. Their uncertain condition of living with relatives, friends, or sometimes trusted strangers, under assumed names, was known as living on 'the underground.'"

We cope with the opposing problems of adjustment after the Manifesto: children were supposed to honor a father with several wives yet at the same time reject the very doctrines which justified plural marriage. "If one doctrine can be discarded, why not all of them?" her son Myron asked. Was God really the same yesterday, today, and forever?

In 1912, when Mr. Tanner informed Annie that he would not see her again and that she must look to her brothers for help, we glimpse her nobility of character through these simple words, "I'll be equal to whatever must come." The separation was final; she must raise her children alone. Accepting his decision was not easy, but the previous years of meeting life alone had prepared her for that day.

These experiences created an evolution in her, from an obedient daughter of the church to a self-sufficient, independent woman. Reflecting later on a comment once made by her husband that "it is not capability that a man admires most in a woman," she stated, "I felt equal to my tremendous responsibility and... yet, I honestly had no apologies to make."

Annie's task was not unique. Her lot was shared by many other Mormon women who, left alone with large families, dedicated their every talent to making outstanding and productive citizens of them. This she did well. Dedication to learning, concern for the lives of others, devotion to family ties, belief in the value of hard work—these characteristics are but a part of the legacy she provided. "I might have thought mine a hard row to hoe had not the plants I cultivated responded so magnificently to the culture I gave them."

The choice of an autobiography for the first volume in the series, Utah, the Mormons, and the West, is significant. Here is a firsthand account of an aspect of Mormon history little documented and often misunderstood. Too many Mormons regarded polygamy as either too controversial or too sacred to discuss. Non-Mormons had only bitter accounts written by those who had an axe to grind against the church or its members.

The need for such candid and objective accounts of this story has long been felt. It is hoped that others will appear through which we can glimpse the reality of polygamy as it was lived and practiced by the Mormons.

Attractively printed (except for a few crooked lines of type), sufficiently illustrated, and adequately indexed, Annie Clark Tanner's autobiography is impelling reading as a primary historical source and as a human interest story.

Arlene H. Eakle
The Genealogical Institute
Salt Lake City
Ever since Maurice S. Sullivan and Dale L. Morgan published their respective works regarding the life of Jedediah Smith, scholars and buffs alike have joined forces in the search to uncover new material focusing on one of the most exciting and respected figures in the annals of the American fur trade. The most recent work to appear on the subject is a small book composed of a series of four short articles. Originally addressed to the members of the Jedediah Smith Society, and subsequently published in the Pacific Historian (1972), Garber’s research is now available to a wider audience in essentially the same format but with additional photographs and illustrations. The work is the product of the author’s investigations of the Maurice S. Sullivan Manuscript Collection at the Stuart Library of Western Americana, correspondence with Dale L. Morgan, and the examination of ancillary primary and secondary materials relative to the activities of the Smith family during the period of their Ohio residency. The author’s handling of the geography of the region associated with Smith’s early life demonstrates more than a casual acquaintance with the landscape. His graphic descriptions of the Ohio terrain do much to bring to life the township records and private business ledgers which form the nucleus of the new materials uncovered by his efforts.

Writing in a style which often rambles, the author devotes the entire first chapter to a strongly documented account of the Smith family’s arrival in Green Township, Richland County, Ohio, sometime during the fall of 1816.

The second chapter challenges Sullivan’s thesis regarding the motivating cause for Jedediah Smith’s decision to seek a life in the mountains. Garber dismisses the traditional explanation, i.e., that Smith’s interest in the West was sparked by reading the published journals of Lewis and Clark, and introduces a new theory: that it was Sergeant Smith’s appetite for adventure. Unfortunately, support for the theory rests entirely upon circumstantial evidence. The author’s thesis is based upon the fact that William Gass, an active politician and brother of Patrick, lived in the vicinity of the Smith family and that at least upon one occasion William received a visit from the old veteran, who at that time may have been introduced to the Smith family. However, no evidence has been uncovered which directly links the Smith family with either William or Patrick Gass.

The third chapter is given to the author’s views regarding literature and folklore as they relate to Johnny Appleseed, Mike Fink, and Jedediah Smith. New light is shed upon Major Tyler, a land promoter who sold tracts of land to both Johnny Appleseed and Ralph Smith, Jedediah’s brother. Garber believes that the land purchased by Ralph was obtained with money sent by Jedediah especially for that purpose. The balance of the chapter is devoted to a description of the changes which took place on the Ohio landscape subsequent to Jedediah’s departure for the mountains.

The fourth chapter is a potpourri largely devoted to events in the life of Smith, senior. However, there is an interesting item relative to the alleged lost love affair involving Jedediah and his brother Ralph’s wife, Louisa. Garber has uncovered evidence that will finally put that story to rest. Also included in this chapter are a number of illustrations, one of them a photo-
graph bearing the caption, "Jedediah
Smith inscription on Register Cliff." Unfortunately, upon closer examina­
tion the reader will be disappointed to
learn that the dim inscription can also
be read as "Jeremiah Smith," making
the find somewhat less dramatic.

The warmth and compassion with
which Garber treats his subject will be
appreciated by all who have come to
love and respect the epic adventures
of Jedediah Smith. However, the
scholars and buffs who search in this
book for knowledge regarding
Smith's activities beyond the environs
of Ohio will certainly be disappointed.

TODD I. BERENS
Instructor
Anaheim Union High School District
California

 Frontier Tales: True Stories of Real People. By JUANITA BROOKS. (Logan: Western Text
Society, 1972. 57 pp. $2.00.)

This slim little volume will make pleasant reading for anyone who
loves pioneer stories. The narratives, evidently sifted from Juanita Brooks's
own fund of Washington County history, have about them the warm aura
of a grandmother's reminiscence: pleasant, honest, unstructured, and
somewhat vague at times in their allu­
sions and references. There are
stories of enterprise and success such
as "The Buckskin Pants" in which a
young teamster on his first trip, a boy
"too old to cry and too young to fight,"
is swindled into trading his good
homespun trousers for a pair of ill­
fitting buckskins. But he makes the
buckskin into bullwhips which he sells
for a good profit, coming off finan­
cially and morally superior to his tor­
mentors. There are stories about
pioneer love ("Sam's Courtship") and
stories about the faithful family dog
("Griz"). Indeed it is the family reun­
ion familiarity of these stories that sus­
tains them. And that is at once their
strength and their weakness. For
while these pieces have a quality of
unsophisticated pleasantness, they are at the same time frustrating in
their occasional use of perplexing de­
tails, hasty summaries, and moralistic
messages which sometimes disrupt
the organic unity which characterizes
the best examples of the genre in
which Mrs. Brooks is working.

Many of these stories have an in­
terest and a significance not indicated
in their sample presentation here. Several of these pioneer tales appear
in other published versions and have
had a considerable career as part and
parcel of Utah literature. Consider,
for instance, the story of the giant
footprint. These huge tracks appear
each night at various points around
the little town of Washington, much to
the terror of the villagers. A delega­
tion is about to set out for Salt Lake
City to ask the church Authorities to
come exorcise the evil influence that is
abroad. But the hoax is uncovered,
and the footprints are found to be a
product of two huge pieces of wood
manipulated by one of the village
herd boys. This story has at least two
other published versions in Austin
and Alta Fife's Saints of Sage and Saddle
(1956), pp. 272 - 73, and in Thomas
E. Cheney's Lore of Faith and Folly
(1971), pp. 31 - 35. And anyone famil­
ar with Maureen Whipple's Giant
Joshua will recognize the the story of a
pioneer woman hiding an Indian
child from slave hunters by having
him stand on her feet under her long
skirt. Both of these incidents from
Frontier Tales are important parts of
Maureen Whipple's novel about St.
George. A few editorial comments
reminding the reader of these uses of
this material and a note regarding the
particular sources of these versions would enhance considerably the usefulness of this book. Nevertheless, one can find a pleasant hour with these stories from Washington County. The fact that they appear in other places and other versions suggests the richness of this material. The existence of this little book suggests that there may be more such stories. One hopes that these too might be edited and presented to us.

NEAL E. LAMBERT
Associate Professor
English Department
Brigham Young University


Benjamin Franklin was right (in Poor Richard’s Almanac [1758]) when he observed that “a little neglect may breed great mischief . . . for want of a nail the shoe was lost . . . .” Franklin’s comment as applied to Elizabeth Wright’s account of pioneer journalist Legh R. Freeman might be paraphrased: for want of an editor the story was lost.

Mrs. Wright’s effort was gallant, the promise bright, but her publisher’s failure to apply the discipline of an editor’s blue pencil tarnished the outcome; not the least of these deficiencies is the willful lack of an index. Even so, Mrs. Wright has from family papers and correspondence pulled together a fairly general picture of the Freeman story.

At the close of the Civil War in May of 1865, Legh Richmond Freeman, late of Morgan’s Black Horse Raiders, had served seven months in a Union prison camp. Before Thanksgiving he had gained his release by signing an oath of allegiance to the United States, turned his face west, and because of his knowledge of the Morse code was offered and accepted a commission as telegrapher at Fort Kearny, Nebraska Territory.

There he was joined by an older brother, Frederick, also an ex-soldier and also a telegrapher. Casting about for ways to improve their condition, the Freemans chose to enter the world of journalism.

They bought for fifteen dollars a small hand press and revived the post news sheet, the Kearney Herald. As “co-editors” Fred handled the business office; Legh accepted editorial responsibilities. They brought forth the first edition in November 1865, bearing within the masthead the motto which inspired the title for Mrs. Wright’s book: Independence in All Things, Neutrality in Nothing.

In the issue for January 6, 1866, Legh devoted a full page of the Herald to his interview with “Col. Bridger, the hero of Fort Bridger and Bridger’s Pass . . . .” who was living near the garrison. Annoyingly, Mrs. Wright chooses to copy but four paragraphs of the interview, leaving the rest of this tantalizing morsel for researchers to relocate.

Her determination to fill space with snatches of history from secondary sources has the unsettling effect of changing the course of thought from the mainstream of her story. Errors of fact bob up along the way. On page 69, for instance, Mrs. Wright confronts the reader with a rambling account confusing Old Fort Kearny (at Table Creek on the Missouri River) with New Fort Kearny (more than 180 miles to the west on the Platte) and Fort Phil Kearny (near Powder River in Montana). Thus Mrs. Wright is hard put to carry forward smoothly her narrative as the Freemans follow the Union Pacific “Hell on Wheels”
construction gang chewing a transcontinental railroad route westward.

With a new Washington press fitted to the bed of a heavy plains wagon behind four yoke of oxen, the brothers loaded two additional wagons with printing equipment and headed out. At railhead, the Freemans left the Kearney Herald to history and dubbed their new "newspaper on wheels" the Frontier Index.

Gone, too, from the masthead was the motto, and during the next two years the itinerant Index would carry datelines from Julesburg, Colorado; Cheyenne, Fort Sanders, and Laramie City in Dakota Territory; and Green River City and Bear River City in Wyoming.

It was at this latter terminus that Legh and the Index tangled with the ruffians and speculators from the wrong side of the track. A brief notice by the Bear River City forces for law and order appeared in the paper in this language: "The gang of garroters from the railroad towns east, who are congregated here, are ordered to vacate this city or hang within sixty hours from this noon."

Some of the spoilers and exploiters did meet Judge Lynch as promised, and, not surprisingly, the editors were accused of being in league with the local vigilantes. A drunken, angry mob of some two hundred men surged toward the Index office with a rope. Forewarned, the Freeman brothers left the neighborhood, but the newspaper was demolished. It was November 1868, just three years to the month that the Freemans had printed their first issue of the Herald.

Mrs. Wright traces Legh's subsequent career through marriage, family life, and a return to publishing with the founding in 1875 of the Ogden Freeman. Later years saw a resurrected Frontier Index at Butte, Montana, and the establishment of a number of newspapers from 1881 through 1889.

Legh R. Freeman died in Yakima, Washington, in 1915 at the age of seventy-two, his spirit and determination a credit to his profession.

Some flaws in Mrs. Wright's work can be corrected in future printings, but priority should be given glaring errors. She moves the Mormons from Ohio to Illinois without mention of the Missouri period, and Kirtland becomes Kirkland (p. 133). Later she writes, "At the time of the publication of the Ogden Freeman, Brigham Young was dead; yet, as a powerful Mormon leader, he had left a residue of church strength which carried long past his day" (p. 163). The Ogden Freeman, however, made its debut in June 1875. Brigham Young lived until August 1877.

HAROLD SCHINDLER
Salt Lake City


Nearly forty years of meticulous research have gone into preparation of these volumes. Few scholars have devoted anything like the effort of pursuit and publication of materials that Professor Drury has spent on Protestant missions in the Pacific Northwest. This account of these missions, presented as a biography of the Whitmans, derives from careful and critical use of original sources that the author has assembled after a thorough search that exposed many previously unsuspected leads. Considering the vast interest which surrounded the Whitman legend long before Profes-
sor Drury commenced his research, any prospect for turning up much in the way of new material might have seemed limited. But given enough energy and industry, an investigator of a widely known subject can seek out new documentation to provide a sound historical account of a highly controversial subject. That kind of achievement makes these volumes a worthwhile addition to an already extensive Whitman literature.

Aside from offering the author an opportunity to bring his history of the Whitman and Spalding missions up to date, these volumes deal with Whitman's importance in development of the Oregon Trail. A great controversy that arose early in the twentieth century over a claim that "Whitman saved Oregon" for the United States has obscured Whitman's part in the entire matter. Mistaken claims such as this one frequently arise in regional and local history, but the Whitman-saved-Oregon confusion was handled in an amateurish way that has obscured, rather than clarified, the Whitman story. Professor Drury has gone to great effort to straighten out this tangle. He also presents a careful analysis of the situation that led to the Whitman massacre in 1847. In the process the entire Whitman story appears in full detail. Religious controversies among the various northwestern missionaries are treated as dispassionately as possible, and altogether an important chapter in the religious history of the West receives the careful attention it deserves. The entire study is documented thoroughly, and the footnotes are on the pages where they belong. An index of 302 Whitman letters, along with other bibliographical information, completes this useful account of an important phase of western expansion.

MERLE W. WELLS
Director
Idaho State Historical Society
Boise
to in Arizona Highways — which is not surprising, since David Muench is a frequent contributor to both.

Second, there is a very excellent collection of historic black and white photos providing a vivid picture of the early days in this region. The portraits of trappers, Indians, and captains of desperate voyages are intermixed with the solid faces of early businessmen, missionaries, farmers, loggers, and railroad builders. This book makes a real contribution in presenting to the general public, in a most attractive form, a rich trove of historic pictures and drawings usually found only in libraries and museums.

Against this graphic competition, the text, though smoothly written by staff writers Bette Rhoda Anderson, Michael Ames, and Donald G. Pike, often has a difficult time holding the reader to a steady pedestrian progress through the book. The narrative, while rich in detail, is of necessity somewhat lacking in depth and analytic power. If anything, the book may try to do too much. The geology, history, politics, and industry of this vast region are so diverse that the authors have undertaken an almost impossible task in covering them all in a single brief volume, but this is the pattern of Great West series books.

The text basically is a good narrative summary of the area while not pretending to break new ground in historic or cultural analysis. The reader who is looking for fascinating pictures and a broad but relatively low-level discussion of the area will be well pleased. The specialist in geology, however, may find the opening paragraphs and later discussions of the geologic development of the area slightly generalized. The sensitive student cannot view that barefoot Makah whaler preparing for another rain-swept struggle for survival without a feeling of awe, but once again the ground plowed is rather familiar to cultural anthropologists. The discussion of explorers, missionaries, and the like is interesting and challenging — reminding us of our pioneering ancestors — but has been covered before.

In short, I would recommend this book highly for the casual reader or for the introductory scholar, which is no doubt the market that the editors of American West had targeted. Many professional historians and scientists, both the physical and social breed, may feel that the book uses the shotgun approach rather than the more penetrating rifle.

The appendix provides additional information and suggested sources for further reading.

Robert P. Collier
College of Business
Utah State University


For many years the term "historic site" brought to mind a Mount Vernon or Gettysburg. An important contribution of Water for the Southwest is to remind us that canals, tunnels, dams, wells, mills, and power plants are also legitimate historic sites. These sites illustrate how particular problems were solved to provide the Southwest with the usually scarce but essential element of water.

By way of introduction the book contains a short essay on "Early Water Supply Systems in the Southwest."
The essay discusses in chronological sequence the water supply systems of the Prehistoric Indians, the Spanish and Mexican Peoples, and the Anglo-Americans. This descriptive essay provides a good deal of information about the kinds of irrigation and water systems. However, it fails to explain such things as the process of adaptation by the Anglo-Americans of irrigation. In Utah, for example, why did the Mormons immediately upon their arrival begin the development of an irrigation system? Was it transplantation, adaptation, innovation, or revelation? The contribution of John Wesley Powell in the development of western irrigation is not mentioned.

The major section of the book is a description of approximately sixty sites in the states of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Texas surveyed by a team of Texas Tech University engineers and historians from the Departments of Civil Engineering and History. These one-page descriptions of each site include a statement of significance, a historical summary, and a short statement of the remains of each site. Each description also notes the references used with the full citation given in the bibliography.

The book contains an excellent selection of pictures, sketches, drawings, and maps. Unfortunately, only five Utah sites were surveyed as part of the project. They are the Heber Light and Power Company 1909 Hydroelectric Plant, Mount Nebo Reservoir, Strawberry Reservoir and Tunnel, the Jordan Narrows Irrigation and Hydroelectric System, and the first Mormon irrigation system in Salt Lake City.

The Utah section would have been enhanced if the authors had included the irrigation sites surveyed in 1971 and 1972 by Historic American Engineering Record Survey teams under the direction of Burtch Beall, professor of architecture at the University of Utah. The irrigation and water sites surveyed by HAER teams were the Mountain Dell Reservoir dam in Parley's Canyon, the Olmstead Power Plant in Provo Canyon, the Garland Sugar Mill with its power plant and canals, the Hurricane Canal, and also the Heber Power Plant. These surveys include measured drawings, professional photographs, and written data on each of the sites.

Water was a primary factor in the colonization of Utah, and in every valley the story of water development contains aspects both similar and unique. The Utah sites surveyed in Water for the Southwest, the sites surveyed by the Historic American Engineering Record Survey teams in 1971 and 1972, the work of Dr. Charles Peterson in Utah's agricultural history as displayed in his recent Statehood Day address in Logan, and the recently completed thesis by Craig Fuller on the development of irrigation in Wasatch County indicate that an excellent beginning of the study of water in Utah has been made. However, there are other areas that need to be investigated and many sites documented. For a start, future HAER Surveys might consider the Bear River Canal, the Sanpete County diversion tunnels, the early irrigation attempts at Bluff, the Ontario Mine Drain Tunnel, irrigation canals constructed on the Uintah Indian Reservation in the 1880s, the pre-Reclamation Service developments on the Strawberry, the adaptation of natural lakes in the Uintas as regulatory lakes for irrigation purposes, the Newton Dam and Reservoir in Cache County, other power plants operated by water, grist mills, and a Mormon farm irrigation project.

A. KENT POWELL
Preservation Historian
Utah State Historical Society

First published in 1954 and reissued as a second edition in 1962, this popular and trustworthy text has again been revised to reflect the many legislative and administrative changes of the past decade. In this edition the material has been thoroughly reorganized, as well as updated, and statistical data have been reduced to a minimum. The book continues to offer much important historical background to the existing structure, operations, functions, and finances of the various departments, commissions, and agencies of Utah's state and local governments. Worthy enough as an encyclopedia of current facts, it is especially valuable as a reminder of the evolutionary dynamic behind the state's governmental institutions.

The Cowboy in American Prints. Edited by JOHN MEIGS. (Chicago: The Swallow Press, 1972. viii + 184 pp. $15.00.) More than one hundred woodcuts, engravings, lithographs, and pen drawings of the cowboy by American artists from the 1850s to the present.

Deseret News 1974 Church Almanac. By DESERET NEWS. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1974. 225 pp. $1.95.) This almanac contains historical data, brief biographical sketches, statistics, and other information on the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, including a review of 1973 church activities.

High Country: The Rocky Mountain West. By VIRGINIA WEISELJOHNSON. (New York: Walker and Co., 1972. x + 201 pp. $6.95.) A personal account of this vast, eight-state region, including history and geography mingled with myth and anecdote.

The History of the Tenth Cavalry, 1866-1921. Edited by E.L.N. GLASS. Introduction by JOHN M. CARROLL. (Fort Collins, Colo.: The Old Army Press, 1972. x + 145 pp. $7.00.) Major Glass's 1921 compilation of this Black cavalry unit has been reprinted with a brief introduction.

Utah Criminal Code Outline. Edited by LOREN DALE MARTIN. (Bountiful: Author [573 Pheasant Cr., Bountiful, Utah 84010], 1973. xxiv + 238 pp.)
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The Utah State Historical Society library has acquired twenty hours of oral history interviews with residents of Spring City. Other recent accessions of interest to local historians are microfilm copies of the *Springville Herald* (1924-68), the *Springville Independent* (1895-1914), and the minutes of the Strawberry Highline Canal Company. During National Historic Preservation Week in May, residents of Willard cooperated with a Society photocopying project and brought valuable historic photographs of the area to a booth where they were copied and immediately returned to the owners. Some forty pictures of Willard were acquired for the Society files in this manner.

Dates have been set for a number of local and national meetings of interest to amateur and professional historians. Included on the calendar are the annual meetings of the Utah State Historical Society, September 7, Salt Lake City; Oral History Association, September 12-15, Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming; American Association for State and Local History, September 25-28, Austin, Texas; and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, October 2-6, Portland, Oregon.

The Southwest Labor History Conference will be held on April 24-26, 1975, at the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, under the auspices of the Pacific Center for Western Historical Studies. The sessions will be divided into two general areas: Southwest labor history and national and international history. Scholars and trade unionists are invited to submit session proposals in areas including press, labor and politics, labor and race, women and labor, agricultural labor, Chicano labor, labor and socialism, labor in Mexico, international labor, and comparative trade union movements. Address all program inquiries to: Professor Sally M. Miller, Department of History, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California 95204.
The Utah State Historical Society was organized in 1897 by public-spirited Utahns to collect, preserve, and publish Utah and related history. Today, under state sponsorship, the Society fulfills its obligations by publishing the Utah Historical Quarterly and other historical materials; locating, documenting, and preserving historic and prehistoric buildings and sites; and maintaining a specialized research library. Donations and gifts to the Society's programs or its library are encouraged, for only through such means can it live up to its responsibility of preserving the record of Utah's past.
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Membership in the Utah State Historical Society is open to all individuals and institutions interested in Utah history. Membership applications and change of address notices should be sent to the membership secretary. Annual dues are: Institutions, $7.00; individuals, $5.00; students, $3.00. Life memberships, $100.00. Tax-deductible donations for special projects of the Society may be made on the following membership basis: sustaining, $250.00; patron, $500.00; benefactor, $1,000.00. Your interest and support are most welcome.