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In This Issue

From the time of permanent white settlement in the Great Basin until the 1950s, agriculture was the dominant enterprise in shaping Utah’s economy, values, landscape, and identity. Early agricultural needs and practices dictated water law, land ownership procedures and philosophies, settlement patterns, and much else. Farming also held profound social and religious implications for many early settlers who sought to make the desert blossom as a rose and in whose legacy most contemporary Utahns still take great pride.

Due in part to natural phenomena and in part to cultural considerations, Utah agriculture was different at the outset and has retained some unique qualities to this very day. The articles in this issue highlight many of those differences. The first, for example, analyzes the introduction of cattle and sheep to the territory and notes several subtle but lasting effects of those early migration patterns. The second article features a look at fox and mink farming and demonstrates, among other things, that the Utah tradition of innovation and experimentation in agriculture has lasted to the present day.

Cache Valley is the setting for our final two articles. One focuses on the pioneering period and illustrates the importance of persistence and optimism in the creation of a strong commercial base for the area’s agriculture. The other proceeds from that point and offers a specific look at the valley’s sugar beet industry. Complementary analyses, they go far in illuminating those essential economic, technological, and sociological factors that define the historical traditions of a region and state.
Grazing in Utah: A Historical Perspective

BY CHARLES S. PETERSON

The history of grazing in Utah is recognizably different from other regions and has left lasting social and natural imprints. Factors that influenced this at the outset included broad geographic influences and the timing and character of settlement. Although Utah is in some ways a transitional region between the Northwest and the Southwest, it was isolated by the great canyons of the Colorado from Hispanic influences, and cattle and sheep did not penetrate into Utah during the Spanish era. Later, when Texas longhorns and Spanish merinos were

Dr. Peterson is a Fellow of the Utah State Historical Society. A version of this paper was presented at the 38th annual meeting of the Society for Range Management.
trailed north, the physical barriers forced cattle and sheep drives to flank Utah and diverted the movement of ranching customs that extended from Texas to other regions of the West.¹

By contrast, States-bred animals and husbandry practices from the Midwest and Northeast had an important effect upon early Utah. Utah lay across the main road of the great central overland migration. The earliest Mormon pioneers brought States cattle and sheep with them in their exodus from the Midwest. Furthermore, it was only a short time until the Mormon core area (the settled valleys along the Wasatch Front) became part of the overland road, and new infusions of States livestock were dropped off by gold rushers and immigrants.² Thus, Utah became an outpost of the Midwest and Northeast more than of the Southwest as far as bloodlines and its first stockgrowing culture went. This set it apart from those parts of the West where stockgrowing cultures were the heritage of what historians Walter Prescott Webb and Ernest Staples Osgood have called “the Texas Invasion.”³

Eastern influences notwithstanding, land utilization and management practices evolved rapidly. Construction time and material for fencing were lacking, and town herd grounds and community herding practices quickly became common. At first, range land was abundant and little effort was made to establish claims to it, but this period passed


quickly. In 1853 Col. Edward Steptoe, who had been dispatched to Utah, took action to establish military grazing reserves. Thus challenged, Mormons tried to improve their claims upon certain prime grazing areas, including range Steptoe wanted. Although totally without jurisdiction over the public domain, the territorial legislature granted vast herd grounds to prominent Mormon leaders and groups. Most of these grants were never translated into actual titles, but at least two were proved up on. Brigham Young was allotted the whole of Cache Valley (some sixty miles long and fifteen wide), and Heber C. Kimball, his counselor, much of Parley’s Park, east of Salt Lake City. Later, after the United States Land Office had opened in Utah, Young acquired title to almost 10,000 acres at his Elk Horn Ranch in the south bottoms of Cache Valley and the names Kimball Ranch and Kimball Junction still attest to Kimball’s lasting influence in Parley’s Park.

Mormon herds multiplied quickly and new infusions continued, and before 1860 Utah had become a grazing country of some importance. Men with imagination and drive, like Salt Lake City’s William Jennings, profited mightily. More typical was Alexander Toponce, a small-time but freewheeling merchant/freighter. Setting out from Salt Lake City in the fall of 1867, he collected debts owed him and traded for 6,000 “cattle, big and little,” which he drove to the Comstock mines in Nevada and sold for $300,000. Similarly, a cattle buyer named Ben Heywood gathered herds of as many as 10,000 “north of the lake” and trailed “them slowly across the country” to Omaha in days prior to the railroad.

Utah was in no sense a ranch country in the prerailroad era, however. Indeed, its first livestock era was well established before ranches spread to most of the West. In the sense we have come to know them, there were no ranches in Utah in 1870. Far from being an offshoot of the Spanish ranching culture, Utah’s grazing practices and institutions were shaped by the Mormon penchant for cooperation and group life.

---


Ronald O. Barney discusses Young’s Cache Valley grant and the procedure by which he gained title to it in “Mormon-U.S. Government Interaction over Land Policies,” typescript in writer’s possession.

Most Saints lived in towns from which they worked small general farms. Almost all kept a few head of cattle and sheep. When these were not fed on the farm, they were grazed in town pools or co-op herds. The disparity between farm stock and range stock was blurred, a point underscored by the fact that Utah’s first use of mountain ranges was by community sheep herds and by summer dairies staffed by women or entire families. Although cooperation was common in the cattle industry throughout the West, Mormon pools differed in the great number of farm-based owners and the small number of animals owned by each person.\(^7\)

The livestock pools were not notable for the number of animals assembled. Yet, on occasion, when natural and social circumstances were right, large herds were brought together. For example, at Brigham City, where abundant range lay west towards Nevada, the co-op sheep herd numbered 50,000 head by 1880. An important part of the town’s annual cycle was an autumn inventory of what may have been hundreds of small flocks. Mountain dairies could also take on considerable size, with some running as many as 250 cows and one on the divide between Salt Lake and Cache valleys collecting 750 head from farmers in both valleys and employing twenty-five milkmaids.\(^8\)

By the late 1870s a distinctive Mormon village livestock system had developed throughout the central mountain valleys of Utah.

Elsewhere buffalo were killed and Indians subdued in the years after the Civil War, opening ranges for longhorns driven from Texas and a ranching culture based on Hispanic traditions. As noted earlier, this so-called Texas Invasion initially had little impact on Utah’s grazing, but after 1880 both internal and external conditions functioned to superimpose ranching patterns upon the well-established customs of the village-based grazing system.\(^9\)

To some degree this change was reflected in growing livestock numbers. The upswing began first in cattle, which in 1885 numbered about 200,000. This number increased to 356,600 in 1895. Thereafter, with great pressure from sheep and with adverse weather and market conditions, cattle numbers barely held their own until 1905. Appar-


MOVEMENT OF UTAH SHEEP AND CATTLE

Cartography by Steven R. Thomas, University of Utah, DIGIT Lab
ently encouraged by Forest Service policy that partially offset the advantages sheep had gained, cattle increased to about 412,334 in 1910 and by the end of the World War I reached a high of 505,578.¹⁰

After slow beginnings prior to 1880, sheep numbers increased explosively. By 1885 the territory supported one million head and by 1890 about 1,500,000. By the turn of the century the tally had skyrocketed to 3,818,000. In the decade that followed, with drought, slow markets, and Forest Service policy prompting the trend, numbers declined almost as rapidly to about 2,740,000, after which sheep populations held steady at about 2.5 million for more than fifteen years.¹¹

¹⁰ These data are compiled from the agricultural censuses for 1890, 1900, 1909 and 1910, 1920, and 1925.

¹¹ Most census counts include only shearable sheep and therefore discount the year’s lambs. The census of 1900, however, reported all sheep. Figures presented there indicated the lamb crop amounted
To understand better what these figures meant we may examine the cattle industry. First, it should be noted that the number of people involved in village-based ranging operations greatly increased. For a brief period prosperity prevailed. Families got rich, towns grew, and the country filled up. Located strategically, Nephi styled itself a “Little Chicago,” Spanish Fork flourished as a cow town, and Mount Pleasant began to see itself as “the Queen City.” The pressure of the filling country made itself felt, and the last remote spots of Great Basin Utah were grabbed up. Conditions were complicated in 1879-80 with a feed-short winter of unprecedented severity.\(^{12}\)

In the years after 1875 Indian and geographic barriers collapsed and livestock literally streamed from the overcrowded Great Basin settlements. In effect the Great Basin played the same role in stocking the Colorado Plateau parts of Utah that Texas did in stocking the ranges of Wyoming and Montana. This was especially true in southeastern Utah. First came the Green brothers who trailed into the Moab area in 1875 where they were killed by Indians. Then came town builders like the Taylors of Moab and aggressive loners like the McCartys, Coloradans like “Spud” Hudson of the Monticello area, and finally big stockmen like Preston Nutter from the Arizona Strip. Buying cattle for less than $10 a head in the overstocked Mormon settlements, they headed east and south, fattening cattle on virgin ranges and selling for fantastic profits in the burgeoning mining country of Colorado.\(^{13}\)

It is difficult to know how many cattle were trailed from the Great Basin into eastern Utah, but it is certain they numbered in the hundreds of thousands. In the process, the Old Spanish Trail and other routes across the Wasatch Plateau and the canyonlands became ave-

---


13Charles S. Peterson, Look to the Mountains: Southeastern Utah and the LaSal National Forest (Provo, Ut.: Brigham Young University, 1975), pp. 89-106.
nues of the cattle trade similar in romance to the Chisholm Trail. Indeed, the Texas trails paled by comparison as far as drought, sparse feed, and canyon barriers were concerned. The Colorado River crossing was doubtless among the most formidable obstacles. Costs in terms of discomfort and time were high, and men always worked against the pressure of other herds, short feed, and wandering stock. Lehi Jones’s crossing at Hite Crossing in December 1887 gives a good feel for the experience:

We were there for five days. . . . In the morning there was much ice on the river. . . . We would strip down and get onto our horses and take a bunch and crowd them into the water. . . . The men were on horses in water and ice up over their waists. Three of [them] worked at a time driving and crowding the cattle, attempting to force them to swim the river. One man kept a fire going with willows and they rotated in order to keep from freezing to death. The last afternoon an old crumpled-horned cow suddenly took it into her head to cross the
river, and a number of animals followed her. She had a large calf with her, so the men tied the calf on the opposite side of the river and forced the cow back again. Each time she crossed to get her calf, many cattle followed.\textsuperscript{14}

Others found suitable range in the canyon country short of the river. This first wave of settlement was a "men only" proposition—actually a population of boys. While their fathers returned to the settlements, the boys stayed on, an untamed and independent crew of perhaps a hundred, some of whom got back to civilization no oftener than once in three years.\textsuperscript{15}

Shedding a fair light on this cowboy epoch is the experience of the Bennion family between 1875 and 1878. Upon migrating to Utah they established themselves "over Jordan" on the west side of Salt Lake Valley. As their families grew and ranges filled up, they moved progressively westward until by the late 1860s they ranged cattle, some their own, many cooperatively owned, over an immense territory extending from Salt Lake City west to Fish Springs near the Nevada border, to Fillmore on the south and the Wasatch Plateau on the east. With feed supplies failing, they gathered more than 2,000 cattle in 1875 and drove them over the Wasatch Plateau into the canyonlands west of the Colorado River. There they left them in charge of two teenage boys, Israel Bennion and Tom Simpers. In the summer they ran on the east slopes of the Wasatch Plateau. Winter quarters were located on Ferron Creek from which stock ranged south and east to the Green River.\textsuperscript{16}

In many respects life for the boys was idyllic. Fish Lake and adjacent streams were full of fish. In the fall they scooped thousands of trout from the creeks, built willow drying racks, and smoked fish and venison. With supplies packed from Salina they headed for winter grazing grounds. No more than forty air miles, the trip crossed an "upside-down nightmare of sandstone" that required far better cowboying than the two lads could give.\textsuperscript{17}

Once on Ferron Creek they quickly became acquainted with others who had also assembled there. Cattle were left pretty much on

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.
their own and the cowboys devoted the winter to “just plain having fun.” They often gathered at one camp for a week or more before moving to the next and another extended visit. For boys like Israel Bennion, whose every waking moment had been “devoted to the work and responsibility of an adult,” it was a kind of freedom and undisciplined camaraderie that goes far to explain cowboying’s appeal.\footnote{18}{Ibid.}

For three years the wilderness of Castle Valley was life for young Bennion and Simpers. Toward the end their hair had grown to a length of two feet and was braided, if cared for at all, and when cut was handled by the simple expedient of laying the braid over a log and hacking it off with a knife. But it couldn’t last long. For one thing the management of the two boys was woefully inept. They branded some 700 calves each year, but when they collected their stock late in 1878 they tallied only 1,700 head, indicating that each year they had lost upwards of 700 animals. Also the livestock frontier was changing, and as they crossed the rim of the Basin to get supplies in the fall of 1878 they met a party of settlers. Pausing to get their first scissored haircuts in more than three years, the boys and the Bennion stock soon left Castle Valley. The Bennions lost heavily on the enterprise, but for others canyonlands grazing was a success and the livestock business became a major element in the region’s early heritage.\footnote{19}{Ibid.}

Before turning our attention from the movement of cattle from the Utah core, reference should be made to the role of Utah cows in Arizona’s early development. Beginning with the Mormon migration to the Little Colorado in 1876 large numbers of cattle were trailed south over what came to be known as the Honeymoon Trail. Utah cows became the prime currency with which a dozen town sites were bought from previous claimants. Although many Arizona Mormons engaged in livestock enterprises, most were village based and relatively small. At Fort Moroni, on the south slopes of the San Francisco Mountains, however, John W. Young ran what historian Earle Forrest has termed Arizona’s first giant cattle ranch, which he stocked with 30,000 cattle, the foundations of which were trailed south from Great Basin Utah. Although polygamy and other troubles had forced Young out of the San Francisco Mountains area by 1885, he continued to have interests in various Grand Canyon and Kaibab cattle companies.\footnote{20}{Earle R. Forrest, Arizona’s Dark and Bloody Ground (Caldwell, Ida.: Caxton Printers Ltd., 1952), p. 326; and Charles S. Peterson, Take Up Your Mission: Mormon Colonizing along the Little Colorado River, 1870-1900 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1973), p. 166.}
Meantime, in the early 1880s the Texas Invasion finally breeched the canyonlands and social barriers that for a decade and more had kept the larger livestock frontier at bay. Major points of access were the corners of the territory. In the northeast a defiant half-outlaw, small-rancher spin-off of Wyoming’s corporate ranches penetrated Utah through Brown’s Hole and the Uinta Basin, making a congenial milieu for the rise of Utah’s Butch Cassidy and the Wild Bunch lore.\(^\text{21}\) Into the northwest came Charles Crocker, Jr. Occupying Central Pacific Railroad grant lands, his 35,000 cattle were the easternmost wing of the California expansion that brought the herds of the giant Miller Lux outfit into northeastern Nevada and southwestern Idaho.\(^\text{22}\) Far to the south, Arizona interests expanded as John W. Young retracted, ultimately taking over most of the Grand Canyon and Kaibab country and extending into the Arizona Strip, crowding Mormon interests before them.\(^\text{23}\) But perhaps the classic example of the Texas Invasion’s impact was in southeastern Utah.

Virtually unknown until the great surveys of the 1870s called attention to it, southeastern Utah was penetrated first by miners, then by small ranchers drifting ahead of the larger frontier, and finally by large ranching companies. To hold the country for the Mormons, the Hole-in-the-Rockers dug in at Bluff on the San Juan River after 1880. They built diversion dams and waterwheels, shoveled sand from washed-in ditches, worked in Colorado for subsistence, quarreled among themselves, and watched the river carry off their tiny farms. But in the beginning they ran few livestock. Between 1882 and 1887 the big cattle outfits and bitter competition came to San Juan’s ranges. Preston Nutter rode into the country north of the Colorado River. The Pittsburgh Company bought out the small ranchers at La Sal. The Carlisles, Englishmen with connections in New Mexico, Kansas, and Texas, did the same on the north Blues. Farther south the LC Company from the Texas panhandle established itself, while another Texas outfit, the ELK, moved into the canyons west of Bluff.\(^\text{24}\)


\(^{23}\) Some feel for this process is found in Jones, Lehi Willard Jones, pp. 115-20, 140, and 175; and Rowland W. Rider, Sixshooters and Sagebrush: Cowboy Stories of the Southwest (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1979).

\(^{24}\) For detailed treatment of the San Juan case see Peterson, “San Juan in Controversy,” and Look to the Mountains, pp. 79-106.
The Bluff Mormons shifted their emphasis after 1885 from farming to cooperative livestock management. Organizing a livestock pool, they met the big outfits head on, adopting competitive tactics that soon earned them the name of Bluff Tigers. In the long run, drought, poor markets, and overstocking worked to the advantage of the Bluff pool, and by 1918 it, or Mormon successor outfits, had taken over most of the big ranches in southeastern Utah.25

In important aspects the clash was economic. But it was also cultural, and a give and take of ranching customs took place that ultimately left a livestock industry that bore the identifying marks of both the “native” Utah and the Texas cultures. Some sense of this exchange may be had by looking briefly at the chief mythic figure of the grazing industry—the cowboy.26

Town dwellers by preference and church calling, the Bluff stockmen did not regard themselves as cowboys. They managed stock cooperatively to support community life. Herders were hired and line riders assigned cooperatively, but few lived with cattle year round or gave themselves to the outfit with the complete loyalty of old-line Texans. As a type, cowboys were feared by San Juan Mormons, who avoided them socially and denounced their life-style and values. Indeed, so sharp a line was drawn that a “Mormon cowboy” was almost unheard of. For example, Albert Scorup, who had lived in caves for months at a time punching cows in the roughest canyons in America, was greeted at Bluff in 1891 by a dozen or more cowboy-shy girls who had come to see

Al Scorup, “the Mormon Cowboy,” near age eighty. USHS collections.

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
this loner who styled himself as "the Mormon Cowboy." Although other San Juan Mormons were often desperate for work, there is no evidence they punched cows or worked for the big outfits which consistently hired long riders from Texas.\(^\text{27}\)

Not surprisingly, Mormon standoffishness and the aggressive tactics of the Bluff pool produced a reaction. At the cowboy level the response was direct and personal. Young and full of life, cowboys invaded the Mormon towns socially. As a local folksong put it, they drank at Monticello’s Blue Goose Saloon, traded with Mons’s store (the town’s only mercantile institution), and “danced at night with the Mormon girls.”\(^\text{28}\) Occasionally there was gunplay. Much of it was drunken but dangerous fun; however, on at least one occasion they shot up a school and on another killed two people at a dance. More important was the fact that a dozen or so outside cowboys married Mormon girls. Frequently these men stayed in the country where they became the relaxed channels through which Texas and Mormon customs evolved.\(^\text{29}\)

With the breakup of the big outfits, San Juan’s grazing institutions continued to change. Village life remained important. Regional and educational centers were in Utah. Stalwarts of the Hole-in-the-Rock group gave themselves to livestock as well as to church and family. Like their stockworking counterparts from the general frontier, they adapted ranching ways that originated in Texas to local conditions and values. The product was a set of practices unique in many ways to southeastern Utah that still needs to be examined in detail.\(^\text{30}\)

A closer look at the human and institutional development of grazing’s development in Utah may be had by examining the growth of the sheep industry after 1890. Although there was considerable interstate movement, the sheep industry, like the cattle industry, was in many respects a local or internal development. To understand growth patterns it is especially useful to examine the eleven central and northern Utah counties in which the Wasatch and Cache national forests were organized after 1902. In 1890 some 718,618 sheep, or 47 percent of the territory’s total, were owned in that region. A decade later the number had risen to 2,126,545, or nearly 56 percent. In the quarter-century


\(^{28}\) Fred W. Keller, “Blue Mountain,” copy in writer’s possession.

\(^{29}\) Peterson, “San Juan: A Hundred Years of Cattle, Sheep, and Dry Farms,” p. 178.

that followed, the trend in declining sheep numbers in the Wasatch-Cache counties ran far ahead of the state as a whole. By 1925, for example, when the state's total was 2,355,038 sheep, the eleven counties accounted for only 786,518, or 34 percent. Fluctuation was most dramatic in Salt Lake County, which rose from 124,471 head in 1890 to 558,243 in 1900, when it was second only to Sanpete County with 600,000 sheep. During the next quarter-century sheep numbers in Salt Lake County fell to 158,871, or to less than 7 percent of a state total that itself had fallen by 1.5 million head.  

A significant point is that in 1900 sheep were crowding cattle from many Utah ranges. The state's location at the "crossroads of the

"West" had some bearing on this, and hundreds of thousands of sheep trailed to and from neighboring states. Another factor contributing to the pressure sheep put on Utah's ranges lay in the fact that desert ranges were more abundant than mountain. In an era when range rights were held only by customary usage, this led to maximum stocking on the winter ranges and heavy overstocking on high altitude summer ranges and a grazing situation in which it seemed that livestock often lived on nothing but "fresh air and mountain scenery." Under these conditions of declining resources, sheep competed somewhat more efficiently than cattle.

By now long past their pioneer period, certain Wasatch Front farming towns played an important role in the rapid growth of the sheep industry. With more young people than farm opportunities would accommodate and with favorable access to range, they became sheep towns serving, in effect, as the hinges upon which the summer winter rhythms turned as sheep trailed from desert to mountain and back.

An occupational profile of Draper, in the south end of Salt Lake Valley for 1900, helps to illustrate this point. Of the town's 257 employed people, 39 were sheepmen and shepherders. Of these, 17 were young men who lived in their father's homes and worked for wages as herders. Some of the 20 who listed themselves as stockgrowers owned farm property, but more did not. The sheep owners who had no farm property were all relatively young, suggesting that they had worked up from herders to become owners and that they were almost certainly dependent upon the public domain for grazing land. Other Wasatch Front towns where this same process was underway included Spanish Fork, American Fork, Lehi, Riverton, Woods Cross (the home of the Deseret Land and Livestock Company), Layton, Brigham City, Hyrum, Franklin, and Preston.

Typical of those who became sheepmen was Andrew Peterson of

---

32 U.S., Department of Agriculture, Sheep Migration in the Intermountain Area, by H. R. Hockmuth, E. R. Franklin, and M. Clawson, Circular No. 624 (1942); and Diary of Albert F. Potter's Wasatch Survey, July 1 to November 22, 1902, Wasatch-Cache National Forest Historical Files, Region IV Papers, RG-95, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

33 A good source for this development are the diaries of the Bennion family, which number into the thousands of pages, located in the library of the Utah State Historical Society. Especially useful are the statements of Glynn Bennion. Most of what he had to say was written in the 1930s but remains unpublished. Manuscripts entitled "Let's Stop Kidding Ourselves," "The Dude in the Ascendancy," and "You Can't Eat All the Grass," are found in the "History of Grazing," Coll. 9, Box 2. One entitled "An Autumn Idyll" is in the possession of the writer, and one was published as "A Pioneer Cattle Venture of the Bennion Family."

Lehi. His father had migrated from Sweden in the 1860s and was comfortably fixed as a farmer but had few resources to help his sons. As a consequence, Andrew ran sheep. Ranging nearby in Cedar Valley and American Fork Canyon, he took his young brothers out of school to herd for him, and for a few years did well enough. Also reflecting the importance of family in shaping livestock enterprise were Hyrum and Wilford Hatch, who, with the help of a brother who had married into the Thatcher Brothers Bank of Logan, built sheep herds of 7,000 or 8,000 by 1900. They summered in the mountains along the Utah-Idaho border and wintered on public lands near Bancroft, Idaho, or in the Cache Valley fields where sheep from as far distant as Iron County were fed hay.

Another example was E. J. Jeremy who controlled substantial land in East Canyon by the 1890s and with boys hired from Salt Lake Valley’s farming communities made properties along the Jordan River bottoms the axis for a sheep operation numbering about 10,000 head. He wintered on the West Desert, trailed his own sheep, along with upwards of 300,000 others, from the neighborhood of Vernon, sheared near Grantsville, lambed just west of the present Salt Lake City International Airport, and in a tragi-comedy of dust, grazed lawns, sheep manure, and frayed nerves strung his herds out in an all-day trek through Salt Lake City.

Jeremy, the Hatches, and Andrew Peterson, like many others, made their homes in the core communities, the hinge upon which their sheep operations swung east and west as they moved from winter to summer ranges. For some, farm pastures became a vital pivot. Others with no farm base followed the same seasonal rhythm but grazed year round on the public domain. Few lived on isolated ranches with no ties to any town.

Another point that may be illustrated by Jeremy’s operation is that his ten-day race from Skull Valley to the head of the Duchesne River was part of a keen competition. Violence rarely threatened, but camps were located early to hold grass, and shortcuts were taken or trails hewn for miles through timber to regain grazing advantages. There was a keener edge to competition in neighboring Idaho, where

---

35 Peterson’s father’s role in Lehi is referred to in Hamilton Gardner, History of Lehi (Salt Lake City, 1913), as is the development of the sheep industry, pp. 187, 199; and Diary of Albert F. Potter’s Wasatch Survey, which refers to the Hatch Brothers operation. For feeding operations see J. C. Dowdle Journal, 1844-1908, Utah State University Library, entries for 1900-1901.

36 Oral Biography of Harry Lunn, 1974, taken by Craig Fuller, pp. 31-52, 61-72, and 83-112, typescripts, Utah State University Library, and in the possession of the writer.
the powerful Kollin and Finch partnership preempted a "fine spacious range" which "range-hungry nomads" invaded in desperation. Kollin and Finch protected their interests by a simple but effective expedient. They grazed a herd of bucks in the approaches to their range, leaving herders with instructions to drive the bucks headlong into invading herds, which were almost always ewes and lambs. If the threat of mixing herds failed to turn invaders, the prospect of a lambing season badly out of kilter did.\textsuperscript{37}

Kollin and Finch also raised purebred Shropshires. Different only in their preference for Rambouillets were a number of purebred breeders in Utah. Prominent were W. S. Hansen of Collinston and John H. Seeley of Mount Pleasant, who, between them, dominated Rambouillet breeding in Utah and perhaps the United States. As a merchandising technique they developed world-famous ram sales in Salt Lake City. Seeley, particularly, came to have great influence. His neighbor, David Candland, long a key member of the State Land Board, was not loathe to influence land decisions in his favor, and Senators Reed Smoot and George Sutherland were his confidants. That Seeley also followed enlightened grazing practices is suggested by the fact that the Forest Service borrowed his "principal employee," W. C. Clos, "an encyclopedia on range management," to help formulate its grazing policy after 1905.\textsuperscript{38}

From the foregoing it is apparent that in important respects the growth of the sheep industry was a matter of internal development. It was both an economic and a social strategy through which an entire generation of Utahns found opportunity as the limits of Great Basin agriculture foreclosed on them.

Together with the growth of Utah's cattle frontier, Utah sheep also contributed to one of the worst overgrazing problems in the entire West. Future problems were hinted at already in the late 1860s when Apostle Orson Hyde of Sanpete County told Mormon listeners that

\begin{quote}
I find the longer we live in these valleys that the range is becoming more and more destitute of grass; the grass is not only eaten up by the great amount of stock that feed upon it, but they tramp it out by
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{38} For a careful account of the role Hansen and Seeley played see M. G. Seeley, "A History of the Rambouillet Breed of Sheep in Utah" (Master's thesis, Utah State University, 1956); on the contributions of Clos see Paul H. Robert, \textit{Hoof Prints on Forest Ranges: The Early Years of National Forest Range Administration} (San Antonio: Naylor Company Publishers, 1966), p. 42.
the very roots; and where grass once grew luxuriantly, there is now nothing but the desert weed, and hardly a spear of grass is to be seen.^^

Near Ogden, observers blamed short grass on the "poisonous" breath of sheep, and by the late 1880s the famous or infamous Mountain Meadows had undergone a transition from a verdant meadow to a gully-cut sagebrush plateau. By the first decade of this century Manti and other Sanpete Valley towns were suffering regular floods, and mountain ranges above them were washing away. By 1930 the Wasatch Front towns themselves were under dire threat as cloudbursts hurtled unchecked down watersheds and canyons from which ground cover had been stripped. In few parts of the West were problems of erosion so severe.41

It had long been recognized that erosion was a problem of overgrazing and fragile natural conditions, but it required long-range management experience and careful analysis to understand that human and institutional adaptations peculiar to Utah made a critical difference. To illustrate, brief reference may be made to the relationship between ownership patterns and early Forest Service grazing policy. The tendency to have a large number of small owners that had characterized Utah's pioneer era persisted well into the mid-twentieth century. This can be understood by looking at the unparalleled number of grazing permits issued by the Forest Service. For example, in 1918 permits were issued for 200,000 cattle and 800,000 sheep belonging to 7,582 separate cattle grazers and to 1,406 sheepmen, making average permit allowances of 24 cattle and 570 sheep. By contrast, Arizona, with public lands similar in extent and character, had a total of 603, or less than 10 percent as many licensees.42

---


42 Data compiled by K. L. Steward, Region IV, Grazing Files, Utah State Historical Society; and in "History of Grazing," chap. 1, p. 9.
Among Utah's high permit forests was the Cache with 1,424 cattle permits and 146 for sheep in 1918. Even more striking were the 1,915 cattle permits and 629 sheep permits issued in the World War I years on the Manti Forest. A few years before, this situation had caused real consternation when the Manti supervisor repeatedly requested more permit request forms. Finally the acting commissioner of the General Land Office himself took the matter in hand, writing that something was radically wrong about the numerous requests for these blanks. For the small number of stock allowed in the reserve it is simply unprecedented, and it does not seem possible that the demand for them is legitimate. . . . You have already had 600 cattle application blanks. I venture the prediction that you will not have 200 applications. . . . But 100,000 sheep are allowed in the reserve. I venture the prediction that you will have 75 sheep applications to forward, yet you have had 325 sheep grazing application blanks.

And then clinching the whole thing the commissioner concluded:

the total number of cattle applications approved for 44 reserves in 1903 was but 4,121, covering 529,973 head. You have already been sent more than one seventh of that number with but 15,000 head of stock.

Ultimately, well over 1,000 cattle and 600 sheep permits were issued.

To complete the picture it must be understood that Utah’s farm village stockmen were a class favored by both forest policy and forest personnel. They lived on locally owned land adjacent to the forests, thus qualifying as particularly dependent upon the forests. In addition, the small number of animals they owned came in well below the maximum limit cutoff prescribed by forest policy, so virtually all qualified for permits. Many of the foresters were brothers and sons of the operators and applied even such rules as did pertain loosely. Already badly overstocked with local animals when they were designated, Utah’s national forests were even less able than forests in other states to resolve overgrazing problems.

Finally, during the New Deal years drought and hard times resulted in conditions so critical that tens of thousands of Utah farmers and stock owners defaulted on taxes, interest, and other debts. In some

---

*3 W. A. Richards, Commissioner, and J. H. Fimple to A. W. Jensen, October 27, December 10 and 29, 1903, Historical Files, Manti-LaSal National Forest.

*4 Peterson, “Small Holding Land Patterns in Utah and the Problem of Forest Watershed Management,” treats this question in depth.
areas most of the privately held land had reverted to the counties, and throughout the state, land, including grazing land, reached all-time lows in value. In this situation it was possible for the Forest Service and other agencies to acquire critical watersheds and through federal programs restore them, thus belatedly dealing with a major problem that had historical and social roots as well as natural.45

A grazing culture indigenous to the humid East and Midwest had been transplanted to one of the West's most arid and hostile environments. It was modified in response to these new conditions and for a time worked well. Then with the advent of the Texas Invasion after 1880 a more general ranging system was superimposed upon the old, resulting in added pressure to the natural resources as well as adaptations in ranching customs that are peculiarly Utahn. The core villages lent themselves to the seasonal rhythms of summer and winter grazing, allowing sheep especially to overuse ranges. Finally, it took longer for range managers to bring a grazing system based on small ownership into line with prudent resource utilization than systems used elsewhere in the West.

In sum then, Utah's is one of the oldest livestock cultures in the West. It borrowed efficiently and effectively from other stockgrowing systems and, adapting to the peculiarities of its natural resources, produced a grazing system that was notably different. The state's grazing industry used its resources heavily and at times paid dearly. Although only a small number of people are now involved in the grazing enterprise, the population at large has a surprisingly deep but unfortunately largely uninformed affinity for the traditions that livestock enterprise bequeathed the state. There is great danger of Utah's particular cultural past being consumed by the mythic memory of the larger frontier past. Thus, in terms of the lessons it teaches for quality of life as well as for what it tells us about the technicalities of resource utilization, the different past of one state is important.

Early Fur Farming in Utah

BY RICHARD E. WESTWOOD

SERIOUS ATTEMPTS TO RAISE FUR-BEARING ANIMALS in captivity in the Intermountain Area began during the early 1920s. Each beginner had dreams of earning wealth and independence. For some the dream came...
true, providing them with a profitable, life-long occupation. For others it was a disappointing failure.

The early fur farmers experimented with various kinds of animals. These included mink, fox, marten, beaver, chinchilla, fisher, skunk, muskrat, coyote, and others. All went through early phases of breeding stock promotion, some at very high prices. In the end only mink and silver fox proved to be profitable from the sale of pelts through the established auction markets. Therefore this article will deal with the fox and mink farming industry only.

EARLY FOX FARMING

In the 1890s five Canadians, Sir Charles Dalton, Robert Oulton, James Tuplin, James Gordon, and Silas Raynor, began the first commercial silver fox farming operations. Their headquarters was at Prince Edward Island, Canada. These men had a gentlemen's agreement that they would sell no breeders to outsiders and pelted all their surplus animals. Their scheme paid off. They made immense fortunes selling their rare silver fox pelts on the London market for more than $1,000 each.¹

In 1908 the combine was broken. This set off promotions for the sale of breeder animals at fantastic prices, rising from $5,000 per pair to as high as $25,000 per pair. Organizers set up corporations to build ranches and promote the sale of breeding stock. They pelted hardly any foxes, selling them all for breeding stock, even those of very low quality. As the number of silver foxes increased, competition drove prices down. Ranchers started peltng the animals they could not sell as breeders.

Heber John Sears, former head of the Department of Hygiene at the University of Utah, was probably the first person to have a commercial fox ranch in Utah. In the early 1920s he built a ranch on the north side of 48th South, just west of present-day Olympus Junior High School. Later, as this area became more populated, he moved his ranch to the foothills just below Wasatch Boulevard on Casto Lane.² He raised foxes for several years at these locations. His ranch, known as the Utah Silver Fox Farms, Inc., was an agent for Duffus Silver Fox Corporation, a national syndicate.³

³Silver Fox News 1 (September 1925).
Other ranches followed. Bruce A. Hartman and Alma W. Farnsworth became salesmen for Milligan & Morrison, another syndicate, whose headquarters was on Prince Edward Island. Hartman and Farnsworth established their Wasatch Silver Fox Ranch just east of Highland Drive, south of present-day Cottonwood Mall. They sold foxes at about $2,000 per pair, establishing small ranches of a pair or two all over northern Utah. Finally, Farnsworth established a separate farm on 27th East and about 7500 South. In 1927 Hartman formed a partnership with J. G. Cramer and built a ranch at 8400 South Redwood Road in West Jordan. They called it the Salt Lake Fur Farm.4

Other early ranchers were William B. Erekson, R. L. Ashby, Joel R. Wilcox, Vernon Jensen, George English, Paul A. Johnson, Cyril Fowles, and Fred Cooper in the Salt Lake Valley; Lawrence B. Johnson, Randolph; Joseph Hacking and Milas Colton, Vernal; Austin Pond and L. Ray Robinson, Logan; David W. Henderson and Sterling Wright, Corinne; Robert I. Burton and Albert Black, Eden; Thomas Adams, Tooele; Charles Tonks, Round Valley; Gilbert and Joseph H. Francis and John and G. Sylvester Heiner, Morgan; Carl E. Wilberg, Castle Dale; a Dr. Calderwood, Coalville; and Lester Lowe, Franklin, Idaho, just over the Utah line in Cache Valley. In 1924 William B. Erekson was raising rainbow trout on Vine Street in Murray where Mick Riley Golf Course is now. That year he penned up some red foxes in his chicken coop. When he was successful in getting them to survive and reproduce he felt confident he could raise silver foxes. In 1925 he imported his first stock of silvers from Prince Edward Island. Erekson, along with his sons Zelph, William S., Edward, and Alma, went on to establish a large and successful fox and mink farm.

There was much to learn for beginners in this business. If a fox was off feed it usually meant that the feed was bad or that the animal had picked up some disease. If a nose was swollen or eyes were without luster there was fever, which needed attention. Sometimes the fox expelled ground worms. Sometimes there was coughing.

Distemper was the disease feared most. It is the same disease carried by dogs, skunks, and raccoons. Symptoms were listlessness,

---

4 Much of the information about the early fox and mink farmers of Utah was obtained from William S. Erekson of Salt Lake City whose father was one of the pioneers of the industry. Will grew up on the fur farm in that formative period and for many years was a partner in the William B. Erekson and Sons Fur Farm.
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signs of fever, mucus around the eyes and nose, and loose, sometimes bloody stools. At first many foxes died of this sickness, as little could be done for it. Laboratories eventually developed vaccines to prevent the disease.

The year distemper hit the Erekson ranch they got in touch with Dr. Flint, a veterinarian from Salt Lake, who reportedly had some experience with the disease. He did autopsies on some foxes and made a serum from the spleens. Then he injected serum into all foxes. This treatment was partially effective. Half of their pups and many of the adults died. It was summertime and so the pelts were worthless. William S. (Will) Erekson said, “An epidemic of distemper is terrible to see on any ranch.”

In the early days most ranchers used forked sticks and cruel iron tongs to catch and hold foxes. Cyril Fowles, while working for Bruce Hartman, threw away the tongs. He simply grabbed foxes by the neck and held them by the nose with his large, strong hands. This controlled the animals without hurting them. Soon other caretakers adopted this method. They found they could catch and hold foxes just as Cyril did.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s new color phases or mutations appeared among silver fox litters on widely scattered ranches. By selective breeding and application of Mendel’s law, some of these new colors were “set” and bred with predictable results. For example, being genetically recessive, a pearl platinum female bred to a pearl platinum male will produce only pearl platinum pups. On the other hand, 50 percent of the pups from platinum foxes mated to silver foxes will be platinums, as the platinum color gene is dominant over the standard silver fox. William S. Erekson, son of pioneer fur farmer, William B. Erekson, wrote, “The fox business was most exciting. The almost immediate results of selection for certain qualities made us hopeful of the outcome of the next season’s crop of animals.”
In 1929 some foxes had small white tips on their tails. The Ereksons found that breeding related foxes having large white tips would result in progeny having good tipped brushes. Highly silvered males mated to highly silvered females generally produced well silvered pups.

In the winter of 1941-42 silver fox pelts averaged around $30 per pelt, with a high of about $75. White face silver fox pelts averaged around $60 per pelt with a high of $180. Pearl platinum fox pelts averaged around $90 per pelt with a high of $250. Platinum fox pelts averaged around $180 per pelt with a high of $275.6

Robert I. Burton started a fox farm in the 1920s. His son, Charles R. Burton, later wrote the story of their early days.7 In it he tells of the high expectations and later problems of the early day fox farmer. Robert I. Burton had poor health and his doctor suggested he take up some business that would keep him out of doors as much as possible. He and Albert Black ventured into the silver fox business. According to market reports, there was an unlimited demand for silver fox furs. The average price paid for silver fox pelts at that time was about $200. Vixens averaged three pups per litter and some produced as many as six.

Foxes could be fed old disabled horses and cows that cost very little. It seemed to Burton and Black that the cost of raising foxes would be minimal, after they met the initial cost of breeding stock, land, and pens. They bought breeding stock from a company in Wisconsin known as Fromm Brothers, at a cost of $1,800 per pair. Besides this, it cost them $200 per pair for care of the animals until their own pens were ready to receive them. This brought the cost of each fox to $1,000.

6American Fur Breeder, October 1942, p. 22.
7Charles R. Burton, "Grandpa Burton's Fox Tails and Tales: The Fox Farm Stories," MS in author's possession.
Burton and Black located their fox farm in Ogden Valley, between Eden and Liberty. On it they built a house, a garage and shop where the fox feed would be prepared, a three-story watch tower, and 150 fenced pens. Each fenced pen measured 14 feet by 36 feet and was equipped with a kennel where the foxes could sleep and find refuge when frightened. The fox yard was surrounded by a guard fence seven feet high with an overhang turned inward to prevent foxes from climbing over the fence to freedom. A portion of the fence wire extended below ground level to prevent the foxes from digging out.

Problems began cropping up early. An outbreak of distemper in the first year resulted in the death of seventeen foxes which had just cost $17,000. The deaths occurred in the summer when the pelts were worthless, so this was a huge loss.

During the first few years they saved all the animals in order to build up the numbers of breeding stock as rapidly as possible. However, there were a few casualties among the foxes during the winter months when their skins were worth saving. Pelting operations were commenced on a limited scale. Sales of these pelts, which were almost all black with very little silver showing in their hips, were very disappointing. The buyers wanted silver, and plenty of it. They also noted that some of their $1,000 animals produced no offspring, even after three or more years. The market declined to the point where a dark pelt, like most of theirs, brought about $35, while the full silvers would still bring about $200. As they got into larger-scale pelting operations they began to weed out the darkest animals as well as the nonproducers.
In a few years Burton and Black eliminated all the dark ones and their foxes were beautifully silvered. By this time, though, the financial crash of 1929 had occurred, and the price paid for fox pelts had dropped dramatically.

The farm survived the onslaught of distemper and the process of learning how and what to feed foxes. The men learned how to kill the animals humanely, to skin and flesh and dry the pelts effectively, and to deal with the other problems of fox ranching. They finally felt they had learned to do a good job of caring for and raising good silver foxes. But they only enjoyed a few years of prosperity before the bottom dropped out of the market. No one wanted to buy silver fox pelts any more.

Meetings held by representatives of feed manufacturers who visited the area were of prime importance to the ranchers. Besides the valuable information gained from the talks, the ranchers could swap ideas and experiences. There was no proven way of feeding foxes. The ranchers throughout the area had to learn through trial and error. By trading information the ranchers gradually learned better methods of feeding and caring for their foxes. The written directions for feeding foxes varied greatly. Promoters said you could feed foxes on table scraps. How many foxes could you feed on that? Progressive ranchers recommended that they vary the feed from day to day so that the fox would eventually get all the nutrients he needed. Some ranchers cooked rice and served it with milk. Others served bread and milk. A high percentage of horse meat and slaughterhouse byproducts made the best feed. But as competition for horses drove the price of horse meat up, many ranchers used it quite sparingly.

Cereal companies advertised grain products as the best mixed feed base. The Purina Company was perhaps the most active in this field. Each feed company tried to promote the use of its cereal in maximum amounts. This led to the production of compressed cubes that were supposed to contain all the needed nutrients. This feed was never as efficient or as effective in producing high quality fur animals as feeds containing fresh animal products in abundance.

William B. Erekson was particularly fortunate in having a good supply of horse meat available because of his trout hatchery. Since he used more horse meat than most in his fox ration, his production turned out better than many small ranches at the time.

Erekson said:

In spite of the setbacks the fox business was a wonderful experience. There was only one year prior to 1947 when the books failed to
show a slight profit. 1946 was the last year they paid their way. At that time we were over producing in this country and imports from the northern countries, particularly Russia, flooded the markets and a change in fashion ensued which doomed the fox business for our generation.8

Exposure to sun and weather caused the fur of foxes to fade and go off color. Lloyd Gibson, of Delta, Colorado, who worked for Bruce Hartman, proposed individual, smaller pens where foxes for show or superior pelts could be kept almost completely in the shade. This was an important finding.

By 1949 it was clear that the market was gone. Women of fashion wanted to look slim, and it was hard to look slender in a bulky fur coat of a long-haired fur like that of foxes. It took more than 25 years for it to make a come-back. Some fox farmers went out of business. Others turned to mink.

**EARLY MINK FARMING**

Mink ranching started out with a lot less publicity and fanfare than the silver fox business but has stayed around much longer. Ranch-raised mink have been the mainstay of the fur industry for many years.

There were two main sources of wild mink from which most of the early herds originated. One strain called "Yukon" came from the Yukon Valley. It was a large, heavily furred mink, a little coarse in texture. The other strain, referred to as "Eastern," originated in the area of Quebec, Canada. The Eastern was smaller in size but very full-furred and silky in texture.

In 1923 Lester Lowe of Franklin, Idaho, secured a pair of young mink from Dale Haskins of Hood River, Oregon. Haskins had trapped these animals in the wild. This first pair produced a litter of seven kits. In 1924 Lowe obtained seven additional pairs of mink from Nelson Weldron of Prince Edward Island, Canada. From these animals much of the mink industry in southern Idaho and Utah had its beginning.9 Mink ranchers in Franklin and Preston, Idaho, have long been members of the Utah Fur Breeders Association and the Utah Feed Co-operative. The Lester Lowe ranch still provides a living for his son, Bruce, who now operates it.

---

8Erekson letters.
9Information from Mrs. Lester D. Lowe in American Fur Breeder, October 1966, p. 20.
Ray Vernon of Coalville was the first man in the state of Utah to get a permit from the Fish and Game Department to raise mink. He got the idea for ranching mink in the spring of 1925 when he and his brother, Alvin, caught a male alive in the family chicken coop. Later that year they caught three females. They caged them in giant pens where they could observe their habits and see what they preferred to eat. The following spring they succeeded in raising two kits.

Ray Vernon soon after purchased breeding stock from a rancher named Gadsen of Montana. The mink from Gadsen were the small, silky Easterns. After obtaining the Gadsen mink, Vernon became very quality conscious. Mink ranching was a sideline with him while he increased the size of his herd. In 1937 he went into it full time. Since then three generations of Vernons have made their living from the
ranch. He built up a fine mink herd, and his dark mink pelts topped the Seattle Fur Exchange auction sales for thirty straight years.\footnote{10}

John Adkins of Coalville was a trapper. In 1928 a fox farmer by the name of Calderwood offered him ten dollars for a live mink if he would catch it without injuring the animal. Adkins built a box trap and caught a mink, but when he went to collect the ten dollars the man said he would only give him five. Adkins told the man that since he would not pay the ten dollars as promised he would keep the mink himself.

John Adkins caught other mink and started his Black Willow Mink ranch, also in Coalville. Adkins, too, went on to establish one of the fine quality dark mink herds, still in existence. On May 22, 1946, he established a world’s record price for dark ranch mink pelts when he sold a lot of 67 Yukon males for an average of $76 at Lampson, Frazier & Huth, Inc., in New York City.\footnote{11} In May 1966 Adkins set another record when a bundle of his Black Willow pelts sold for $1,100 each.\footnote{12}

In the fall of 1928 William B. Erekson made a trade with the Horace G. Frantz trout hatchery at Salida, Colorado. Erekson exchanged rainbow trout eggs from his hatchery at Murray for one male and three female Yukon mink. This put him and his sons in the mink business.

In the early days ranch-raised mink pelts were dark brown in color like their wild parents. Fur dealers believed that the ranched pelts were inferior in quality and paid less money for them. The buyers were probably right because the early ranchers were only guessing at the proper feeding and care of their animals. Some enterprising ranchers shot their mink in the heads before skinning them, passing them off as wild-caught furs.

**Utah Fur Breeders Association Organized**

On October 10, 1934, seventy-five fur breeders, mostly fox ranchers, met in Salt Lake City and formed the Utah Fur Breeders Association. They elected William B. Erekson of Murray, president. Bruce A. Hartman reported that 103 Utah fur farms sold over $300,000 worth of fur the previous season. Thirty-one ranchers joined as charter members.\footnote{13}
In August 1935 the Utah Fur Breeders Association held a successful two-day summer school at the Utah State Agricultural College, Logan. In his opening address, Elmer G. Peterson, president of the school, gave encouragement to the fur farmers and promised cooperation from the college. William B. Erekson, president of the association, outlined some problems of the industry. As fur farming was a new undertaking, the participants were glad to hear new ideas and to learn better methods for the care of their animals.

Representatives of the New York Auction Company, Frederick Huth, Inc., Lampson of London, Seattle Fur Exchange, and E. A. Stephens of Denver brought market reports. They also gave praise and criticism of the pelts they handled, along with appeals to ship to them. Individual brokers from the fur centers also made their appeals for a chance to handle pelts.

Other speakers covered specific problems of breeding, feeding, rearing, disease control, and other aspects of fur farming. One session was devoted to the part heredity plays in the development of fur-bearing animals, emphasizing the value of good breeding stock.
At the later summer schools the association invited representatives of the feed companies, fur auction companies, and other suppliers to make presentations of their products or services before the gatherings. People from all the Intermountain states would attend. Since that time the summer school in Utah has become an annual affair.\textsuperscript{14}

**MINK BREEDING**

In the beginning ranchers mated their mink in pairs. They soon learned to use polygamous matings; that is, one male could be used to mate about five females. This permitted greater use of outstanding herd sires and cut down on the number of males needed for breeding.

The mating season normally occurs during the first three weeks of March. If matings do not take place at that time there will not be another chance until the following year. Ranchers plan matings carefully, hoping for a desirable crop of kits. They keep breeder animals in separate pens, as they would fight and damage each other's pelts if kept together during the off season. At mating time the handler places a male and a female together in one pen. If all goes well a mating takes place. If a fight ensues the two must be separated immediately to be tried again another day, perhaps to different mates.

The gestation period of the female mink varies from 39 to 76 days, not a set amount of time as in hogs and cattle. This wide variation is due to a function called "delayed implantation" and is affected by the length of the daylight hours. Ovulation in the female mink does not take place until a mating is consummated. Then the fertilized ova ascend to the uterus where they float dormant until the hormone balance becomes just right. At that time the ova attach themselves to the walls of the uterus and begin to grow. It takes about 35 days from the time the ova attach themselves to the uterus wall until the kits are born. If lighting or other conditions are wrong the ova may float in the uterus for more than a month before attachment takes place.\textsuperscript{15} In recent years the use of artificial lighting to advance the amount of daylight has resulted in more uniform and shorter average gestation periods.

Most kits are born in late April or early May. At birth they are naked, blind, and about the size of a person's little finger. The kits

\textsuperscript{14}American Fur Breeder, October 1935, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{15}Arthur Hansson, The Physiology of Reproduction in Mink, with Special Reference to Delayed Implantation (Stockholm, Sweden, 1981), pp. 6, 21, 22.
grow rapidly and by three weeks of age have increased their birth weight ten times. Soon after this their eyes open and they begin to nibble on solid feed.

By late spring the adults have shed their thick winter fur and have grown a thinner summer coat. The lengthening hours of daylight also trigger this shedding process. When the kits are two months old they are able to be on their own and can be separated from the mother.

In late August, while the weather is still hot, mink begin to grow their winter coats. As the daylight hours shorten the optic nerve sends a message to the pituitary gland which begins preparing the way. The first outward appearance of this is a sloughing off of old fur on the end of the tail together with the growth of new fur there. Because the new fur is longer and deeper than the old fur, the mink’s tail, at an early stage, looks somewhat like that of a lion. The new fur growth works up the tail, along the back and sides and winds up at the tip of the nose. By the time cold weather has set in around the first of December the mink has a brand new coat of thick, deep fur and is ready for winter. It is then that the fur is prime and ready to pelt.

**MUTATIONS, MARKETING, AND GENETICS**

While the ranchers were raising only standard dark mink they organized into market groups to do a better job of marketing and to promote their product. The two main groups were GLMA, the Great Lakes Mink Association, and UMPA, the United Mink Producers Association.

In the 1930s mutation mink made their appearance. The first was the platinum mink, silvery grey in color and genetically different from standard dark mink. It is true breeding when platinums are mated together.

The first recorded appearance of a platinum mink occurred in Wisconsin when William Whittingham of Arpin noticed an odd-looking, grey mink kitten on his ranch in 1931. He obtained information from persons with a knowledge of genetics and began experimenting. In the third year his efforts were rewarded. He produced two platinum kittens from the original platinum female mated back to her dark son. This success was the beginning of the first strain of platinum mink.16

---

Other ranchers acquired breeding stock and began raising platinum minks. In 1935 Lester Lowe, of Franklin, Idaho, produced a grey kit from dark mink parents. He obtained some platinum mink from Wisconsin and found that the two strains would cross and breed true. That put him in on the ground floor of platinum producers. The breeders formed an association called the Platinum Silverblu Mink Breeders Association.

The ranchers introduced the new mink to the New York market in November 1942. They displayed six platinum mink, together with pelts of the same hue, in the Fromm Brothers’ showroom. Producers pelted and donated enough of these types that fall to make one coat. The association gained considerable publicity when they auctioned the coat for the benefit of the Stage Door Canteen at a gala affair held in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. They realized $18,000 for the coat at the auction when Brock Pemberton, theatrical producer, outbid I. J. Fox. Pemberton then exhibited the garment in a Saks Fifth Avenue window.

The first sale of Silverblu mink pelts was held at the New York Auction Company on January 19, 1944. Lester Lowe had 100 pelts in the sale. The OPA (Office of Price Administration) had set a wartime price limit on standard ranch mink pelts. This did not apply to the new color phase, so the sky was the limit. The 2,500 dressed skins sold for a top price of $265 each. The collection averaged $147.29 per pelt. According to Women’s Wear Daily, “The top lot purchased by I. J. Fox consisted of 65 skins, and were ranched by Larry Moore, head of the Silverblu Breeders Association.”

\[\text{\cite{National Fur News, February 1944, p. 9.}}\]
Many ranchers who had not already done so tried to obtain a start in this new mutation, even though the cost of breeding stock was high. Subsequently, other mutations appeared on various ranches. The breeders developed and promoted them in the same manner as the platinums. The ranch names of some of these were pastel, aleutian, white, black cross, bluefrost, palomino, and Moyle buff. Only a few were more than passing fancies.

Some color phases were recessive in their genetic makeup and some were dominant. By cross breeding mutants, the ranchers produced other color phases, such as sapphires and pearls. Through a complicated process of mating over two or more generations, they bred double recessive, triple recessive, and recessive-dominant combinations. Each one created a new and different color. With the advent of newer color phases, the Silverblu association changed its name to the Mutation Mink Breeders Association. Still later it changed the name to EMBA, a coined word taken from the initials MMBA. The trademark logo EMBA appeared in the group’s advertising and also on the silk labels provided for garments made from its quality graded skins. The trademark name such as Autumn Haze appeared on the garment label instead of the ranch name, pastel. In recent years the Great Lakes Mink Association, marketer of standard dark mink, and EMBA, marketer of mutation mink, have merged into a marketing association called American Legend.

**MINK SHOWS**

One of the first western shows was held at the Blackfoot, Idaho, fairgrounds about 1932 or 1933. Frank Chastek, a rancher from Oregon, judged the foxes. Billy Austin, a rural taxidermist, judged the mink.

These early shows were of great importance to an industry dependent on fashions for women. Ranchers could see what their contemporaries were exhibiting. Besides the excitement of winning a trophy or a ribbon, they could hear the comments of judges who were aware of what the market wanted to buy. The shows were most important in moving toward the production of more fashionably desirable furs.

In 1935 the Utah Fur Breeders Association put on the first live fox and mink show to be staged in Utah. Twenty-four ranches exhibited 100 foxes and 72 mink. Those who helped stage these shows were volunteers. William S. Erekson was superintendent and Vern Finlayson,
Above: Rick Westwood weighing a champion sapphire male mink. Left: Dick Westwood with a champion pale pastel mink. Courtesy of author.
an employee of Bruce Hartman, was his assistant. W. A. Young, member of the American National Fox and Fur Breeders Association of Wausau, Wisconsin, judged both foxes and mink. The Utah Fur Breeders Agricultural Cooperative still holds a live mink show each year.

In the beginning the ranchers learned by trial and error and the exchange of information. Then, as today, ranchers were glad to hear new ideas and learn of better methods of taking care of their animals. The show gave the rancher a chance for side-by-side comparisons of his best mink with those of other ranchers. It gave him the benefit of critical comments of the judges and other experts on the quality of his animals. He had a chance to see where his own stock needed improvement. There was always the benefit of listening to experts in feeding, management, and marketing through the “shop talk” that goes on with any gathering of this kind.

FEED COOPERATIVE ORGANIZED

The year 1939 was a landmark year for fur farming in Utah. By that time the ranchers were using a high percentage of horse meat in their mink and fox feed. Old horses were cheap, and the hide could be sold for the cost of the horse. The ranchers decided that if they all slaughtered horses at one place, four slaughterhouses could be closed and the overhead expenses saved. They also saw the advantages of organizing into an association, not for profit, but for each member to share in the benefits.

Investigation had shown them that other farmers, raising different “crops,” had formed cooperatives and that there were national cooperative laws used for all. Moreover, because fur farming was classed as agriculture in Utah, they could get the same services available to other agricultural groups. Five ranchers formed the Fur Breeders Agricultural Co-operative and signed the articles of incorporation on January 10, 1939. The original board of directors included the five organizers, with Joel R. Wilcox, president; Bruce A. Hartman, vice-president; Edgar B. Madsen, secretary-treasurer; Ray Vernon, director; and R. L. Ashby, director.

At the first annual membership meeting held February 8, 1939, Vernon Jensen and Alvin Vernon were added as directors. Alvin Vernon resigned in April and was replaced by G. Sylveter (Syl) Heiner of Morgan. The organization first used the feed plant of Bruce Hartman at 8400 South Redwood Road in West Jordan.

The members soon learned that they needed a manager and a
Officers and directors of the Utah Fur Breeders Cooperative meeting with bank officials in February 1941. Left to right, seated: Joel R. Wilcox, Sandy, general manager; Bruce A. Hartman, Midvale, president; C. A. Heffernan, Berkeley Bank for Cooperatives; Edgar R. Madsen, Sandy, secretary-treasurer; Paul A. Johnson, Holladay, director; George J. English, Sandy, director; standing: Ray Vernon, Coalville, director; Vernon Jensen, Murray, director; R. L. Ashby, American Fork, vice-president. Courtesy of author.

bookkeeper. They also needed a more centrally located slaughterhouse, a cooling plant to chill the meat and keep it fresh, a pasture for live horses, and trucks to deliver the feed. In order to pay for these things the first eight members put up $500 each.\(^\text{18}\) They set the joining fee for new members at $1.50 per breeder fox or mink kept.\(^\text{19}\) On December 19, 1939, they hired Joel R. Wilcox as their first general manager. They located the plant near the Jordan River on South Main Street in Midvale, its present site. After the cooperative was formed the Utah

\(^{18}\)Paul A. Johnson was listed as a director in 1941, so he was probably the eighth man to put up $500 to start the co-op.

Fur Breeders Association ceased to function, its activities taken over by the cooperative.

By the end of 1940 the co-op had grown to 58 members and by the end of 1941 to 94. During that time the co-op sold 1,753,000 pounds of mixed feed. In 1941 Bruce A. Hartman wrote:

Three men are doing the work of securing supplies and mixing feed for 48 fur farms; think of the saving in labor. A shiny new truck covers a route 127 miles long every day, leaving carefully and scientifically prepared feed for either foxes or mink.

All of the supplies can now be purchased in large quantities, yet used while fresh. This results in a real saving to many breeders aside from the undeniable fact that the animals get better care when no one has to take time out to go for feed and then mix it.

William B. Erekson and Sons did not join the co-op until late in 1942 because they had their own feed business. In that year the wartime government passed regulations rationing the use of gasoline. This impaired the Erekson's ability to gather ingredients and to distribute feed to their customers. Additionally, the Ereksons were also feeling competition from the co-op for commercial slaughterhouse products and the purchase of horses. When the Ereksons joined the co-op they advised their customers to do the same.

This was a good move for both sides because it doubled the co-op's feed volume without any increased outlay for mixing and grinding equipment. Another benefit was that when the co-op had labor difficulties or a shortage of help the Erekson boys would come to the rescue. Their hired help also worked evenings at the co-op when needed.

In 1945 the co-op started operating a branch plant at Logan. This plant cost $14,000 and delivered feed over a 70-mile route including southern Idaho. Under the efficient management of Joel R. Wilcox, the co-op put out over 3,000,000 pounds of prepared fox and mink feed in 1945. Fox feed cost the rancher $5.55 per cwt. and mink feed cost $7.00 per cwt.

The Fur Breeders Agricultural Cooperative has grown from producing 1,753,000 pounds of feed in its first three years of operation to nearly 100 million pounds in 1988. In that year it had 350 members.

---

20 Minutes of Fur Breeders Agricultural Cooperative on file in the co-op office in Midvale, Utah.
MARKETING AND PROMOTION TODAY

Most ranchers sell their mink pelts at auction through marketing associations. Graders at the auction houses in Seattle and New York City grade and sort the pelts into matched bundles. Each bundle has a serially numbered tag on it. The owner’s name, the type of mink, grade, trademark of the association, and the number of skins in the lot appear on the tag.

The auction company lists the lot numbers in a catalogue and puts the pelts on show for several days before the sale. Buyers come from all over the free world to compete in the bidding. There is a wide range in prices between low-grade pelts and those of high quality. A rancher must continually strive to maintain the highest quality in his mink herd.

In 1988 the United States produced only 4 million pelts of the 28 million free world output. Utah was the third largest producing state, behind Wisconsin and Minnesota, accounting for nearly 24 percent of the U.S. production.

The mink business has had its ups and downs. In 1954 the national average for ranched mink pelts was $26.39. Cost of production at that time was around $15 per skin. By 1970 the average price had declined to $12.60. Some ranchers went out of business. There was less fallout in Utah than other areas because Utah pelts were generally of superior quality and brought more money at auction. The more skillful breeders got higher prices and were able to continue. From that low point pelt prices gradually increased to $41.13 in 1979. The price of pelts ranged between $32 and $39 until 1988 when it again went over $40. By then the cost of production had risen to around $25, most of which was spent inside the state.

In 1988 fewer ranches produced more mink than a decade earlier. Successful ranchers expanded their operations while others dropped out. In 1988 the 350 members of the Fur Breeders Agricultural Co-op produced nearly one million pelts valued at approximately 40 million dollars. That amount of outside money brought into Utah each year by mink ranchers helps bolster the state’s economy and serves as an eloquent reminder of how far this unique industry has progressed from its modest beginnings two generations ago.

---

22 Figures from Bruce W. Smith, executive director, National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
23 Prices computed from market reports of EMBA and GLMA in author’s files.
THE early years of Cache Valley settlement were a struggle to survive. A particular farmer in Lewiston harvested a meager four bushels of wheat to the acre his first year, insufficient to feed his family. He spent the winter cutting lumber in the heavy snow in Richmond Canyon to earn supplies to provide for his family. The following years were not much better; he grew six bushels of wheat to the acre and his rye crop failed. In desperation he begged wealthy men in Richmond to buy his property. They refused, explaining that the homestead was worthless. He thought seriously of committing suicide. As he knelt to beg God to care for his family when he was gone, he felt a change of heart. Asking God to forgive his cowardice, he sensed hope and promise in the future.

He was impressed to trade a neighbor thirty bushels of rye for the same amount of wheat. Sowing the wheat on the rye stubble, then harrowing it into the soil, he reaped thirty bushels of wheat to an acre. His fortunes had changed. The sandy soil transformed miraculously into a

Dr. Arrington, Lemuel Redd Professor of Western History Emeritus, Brigham Young University, is a member of the Board of State History. Ms. Wilcox is administrative assistant to Salt Lake County Commissioner Mike Stewart. This paper was prepared under a grant from the Ronald V. Jensen Historical Farm, Utah State University, Logan. The authors are particularly grateful to Jeff Simmons and Ann Buttars of Special Collections, USU Library, and to Heidi Swinton, Salt Lake City historical consultant.
rich, productive earth, yielding grain, fruits, and vegetables. By the
1890s he was one of the most prosperous farmers in the community,
raising forty bushels of wheat to an acre. His farm was stacked with hay
and lucerne (alfalfa); his yard was full of fine cows and healthy horses;
and his orchard was loaded with excellent fruit.\textsuperscript{1}

The farmer’s experience reflects the growth of Cache Valley agri­
culture during the nineteenth century as poverty and bare subsistence
shifted to prosperous farming and related industries, all overlaid with a
religious outlook that colored and affected how the settlers reacted and
dealt with their difficulties.

**Farming Practices**

Mormon colonists who began settling Cache Valley in 1859 de­
vised their own methods for parceling out the land. Although the land
was owned by the United States government, no congressional provi-

\textsuperscript{1} Tri-Weekly Journal (Logan), September 16, 1897.
Cache County surveyor J.H. Martineau's map of Clarkston shows the typical farm and village layout of early Cache Valley settlements. Special Collections, USU.
sions for private ownership existed during the decade before the establishment of the Land Office in 1869. Under lay ecclesiastical leadership farms were allotted by drawings, and the size of farms was kept small—usually ten to twenty acres—so that no man held more land than he was able to farm himself. This practice avoided land speculation and monopoly and assured extra land for the continuing stream of new arrivals.

From 1859 to 1864 the settlers lived in fort style, with homes placed close together in rows facing each other for protection and convenience. Later, as towns were laid out, each head of a household received a small village plot of one and one-fourth acres in addition to his (or her) farm land. Settlers abandoned their fort dwellings and moved to their individual village plots. In some communities additional parcels of land were later allotted for sugar cane, broom corn, or hay. George Barber, for example, spent many days in June 1861 helping the bishop divide the hay land in Smithfield, number the plots, and write the owners’ names on the stakes.\(^2\)

In Clarkston the original farms of five to ten acres were too small. Drought and grasshoppers made it almost impossible for many to raise enough food on farms of that size. Not until twenty-acre plots were allotted for dry farming in the late 1870s did farmers begin to do well.\(^3\)

Not long after settlement some parcels of land were transferred by the original owners to others. Deaths, migrations in and out, absences for missions or work elsewhere, and sales and trades of land all transformed the land-owning picture. Some farmers pooled resources. Friends and relatives often held adjoining lots and helped each other. Neighbors often built sheds on property lines to be used by both owners until they could construct better dwellings or livestock shelters. Such cooperative ventures were not likely to be permanent or durable. Mission calls, sickness, and just plain discouragement or disillusionment often ended the efforts.

Andrew Israelsen’s experiences provide a good example. By the time he bought his one-acre Hyrum city lot in 1877 it had already changed hands four times since his father had first owned it. In 1878 he and Lars Christiansen rented three farms on which they planted and harvested grain and were responsible for all the irrigation. The next

\(^2\)George Barber, pp. 13-14, Journal, microfilm of typescript, LDS Church Archives, Salt Lake City.

year he and his brother-in-law, Chris Jensen, rented from the LDS church four hundred acres of previously unfarmed land on Spring Creek. They worked the land together until 1883 when Israelsen received a mission call. They had poor luck selling their grain and hay—few opportunities to sell hay, low prices for wheat—and it would have taken all of their produce to pay for the rent on the land. Jensen did not want to continue working the land alone, nor was he enthusiastic about John Iverson’s offer to take Israelsen’s place. But Jensen eventually agreed, just to please Israelsen.

Returning in 1885, Israelsen was dismayed that the rent on the farm had not been paid and the horses, wagon, and implements were in poor condition. He worked the land for three years until the church decided to sell the farms to raise money for the establishment of Brigham Young College. Most farmers were given first option to buy the lands they had been farming. Israelsen, with no money, no credit, and delinquent rental payments, was not able to complete a purchase.*

Farmers in Cache Valley in the first decade of settlement did well to keep themselves and their families alive. A number of factors influenced the slow pace of economic betterment. One was the nature of the settlement process; few of those moving into the valley brought any capital, except what was called “bone and sinew.” Unlike many other settlements in the West, Cache Valley communities were built almost entirely from the labor of the settlers. Moreover, the water, land, and timber resources of the valley attracted a continuous in-migration of Mormon converts from England and Scandinavia who had to be supported until they could produce their own subsistence. Problems with irrigation, inadequate farming implements, weather, grasshoppers, and marauding Indians made it difficult to produce crops and to preserve supplies sufficient for more than basic survival.

IRRIGATION

Cache Valley had abundant potential water resources, including rivers, canyon streams, and creeks, but the early settlers faced problems in channeling the water to irrigate their lands. In the first fort settlements, located near springs, the men dug canals and ditches to distribute the water. The settlers of Mendon worked cooperatively every other day, and thus finally completed a dam and a three-mile

ditch. When the dam broke the men rebuilt it. Hyrum settlers in 1860 dug a nine-mile canal to the Little Bear River. Although the men worked solidly for three weeks digging the canal by hand, the water arrived too late to save their crops and the men had to find work in Ogden or elsewhere in order to earn grain to feed their families.

Inevitably, some squabbles and disagreements arose about irrigation rights among individuals and communities. In 1867 Wellsville residents accused Hyrum and Paradise of taking more than their share from the canal. After much discussion and argument someone proposed building another canal from Blacksmith Fork where there was plenty of water; Hyrum and Wellsville jointly contracted to build this canal.

Constructing irrigation canals presented many difficulties. Primitive surveying instruments and equipment as well as inadequate tools

---

6 Ricks, History of a Valley, pp. 147-51.
made the task a back-breaking one. The lands were often poorly pre-
pared for irrigation; "porous leaky ditches" and "temporary make-
shift dams" made it difficult to control the water and cover the lands
effectively. The work was physically taxing. Without the convenience
of rubber boots, for example, many Cache Valley farmers waded bare-
foot in the water—extremely cold early in the morning in the months
of May and June.8

Occasionally farmers received unexpected help in their irrigation
efforts. At Weston in 1868 the irrigation ditch was constructed as soon
as the crops were planted. The next project was the dam, and here the
settlers acquired welcome allies:

The creek was full of beaver, as soon as the beaver understood that
there was going to be a dam built they worked with all their might in
the night to help. They would cut down willows, cut them up into
three or four foot lengths, weave them together in the water where
the dam was going to be, and plaster the whole thing up with mud,
so work never stopped until the dam was built. The Beaver run the
night shift. It took three weeks to build it at that rate.9

By 1870, despite tremendous obstacles, almost all of the easily irri-
gated parts of Cache Valley had been placed under cultivation. One
further notable development in water resources was the construction of
a reservoir by residents of Newton beginning in 1871. This appears to
have been the first storage reservoir in the Utah-Idaho area and quite
possibly the first in the nation.10

FARM IMPLEMENTS AND DRAFT ANIMALS

Working the farm lands and harvesting the crops proved difficult.
Tools and implements were simple and scarce. The settlers who
founded Mendon in 1859 "all set to work making beams for their
Ploughs, and three cornered Wooden Harrows with Wooden teeth."11
Such wooden implements were far from satisfactory. Charles Ramsden
Bailey complained about the scarcity of plows in Wellsville in 1860. His
own homemade plow performed so poorly that attempts to work the
land went very slowly. Besides being hard to work with, the plows were
always breaking.12

8 Israelsen, Utah Pioneering, pp. 28-29.
9 Lars Fredrickson, Autobiography, p. 5, microfilm of typescript, LDS Church Archives.
10 Leonard J. Arrington and Thomas C. Anderson, "The 'First' Irrigation Reservoir in the
12 Charles Ramsden Bailey, Autobiography, p. 39, microfilm of typescript, LDS Church
Archives.
Harvesting grain was done by hand with primitive cradles and scythes, humorously called “armstrong reapers.” Andrew Israelsen of Hyrum recounts the progressive improvement of harvesting devices in the valley:

Grain had to be cut with a cradle, then raked into bundles and bound with straw; later, when the mowing machine was invented, slats were fastened behind the cutter bar to hold the grain until enough for a bundle accumulated; then the slats were dropped. The grain slid off and was bound with straw. The next machine was called “self-rake.” This machine threw the grain out on the side so the team could keep going, while the men were binding the bundles. The next machine for cutting grain was called the harvester. It cut and elevated the grain as does a self-binder, but for the binding, two men stood in a box, took the grain as it fell onto a table, and each man, in his turn, would bind his bundle and throw it off. This was a great improvement, as two men could bind as much as four or five could do before. Next came the self-binder, then, much later on, the header. Next came the combine harvester, which had revolutionized farming, and taken much of the drudgery out of farm life.\textsuperscript{13}

With a son working as a “binding attachment” to the cradle, a farmer could usually harvest an acre or two of grain a day. The first mower and reaper were brought into Cache Valley in 1865, but not until the 1870s, after the coming of the railroad, were they in general use. In 1874 Goudy Hogan acquired a wealth of farm machines compared with what had been available earlier:

\begin{quote}
I bought a champion reaper and mower combined. I paid $160. And also bought a sulky rake for which I paid $50, also one machine to sow small grain called Coram Seeder, paid $80, which I could sow and harrow 10 acres per day and ride on the machine. This proved to be a perfect machine.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Threshing operations were similarly primitive for a number of years. Sometimes it would take all winter to thresh and separate the grain to make it ready for use. Charles Nibley remembered that as a young boy his first work was gleaning wheat, beginning on the first day after his arrival in Wellsville. He then was responsible for threshing the wheat:

\begin{quote}
We would take the little bundles of heads and use a washboard which we had brought with us to rub out the heads of wheat or thresh them out as we would say. Then we would put this wheat in a pile on our
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Israelsen, \textit{Utah Pioneering}, pp. 27-28.

\textsuperscript{14} Goudy E. Hogan, Diary, p. 43, microfilm of typescript, LDS Church Archives.
wagon cover and I would have to take a plate or something of that kind and throw the wheat up in the air to let the chaff and smut and straw blow away with the wind, and keep on so throwing it in the air until the wheat was as clean as we could get it, ready for the gristmill. If we bought a load of wheat, which we did once or twice, in bundles from the field, we would take and lay those bundles in our wagon cover on the ground and drive a yoke of oxen around and around over the bundles until the oxen had tramped out the wheat. This, of course, was done where there was no threshing machine, and I don’t think there was a threshing machine in all Cache Valley that fall.\textsuperscript{15}

The few threshing machines were usually owned jointly and used cooperatively. James Sherlock Cantwell’s journal, for example, indicates that for all of October 1862 he was working on the threshing machine for several people, including two days threshing his own wheat.\textsuperscript{16} Owning a part share in a threshing machine could be of additional economic advantage to a farmer besides providing a way to thresh his grain. Farmers who lost wheat crops to drought or grasshoppers could work on the threshing machines to earn bread for their

\textsuperscript{15}Charles W. Nibley, \textit{Reminiscences} (Salt Lake City, 1934), pp. 26-27.

families. Lorenzo Hill Hatch noted in 1872 that he had owned a share in a good threshing machine since 1863, "which has in addition to threshing grain, enabled me to live and to do more to develop than many of my brethren."

Farmers were plagued by poor wagons and implements and also by problems with animals. Stockyards, corrals, and sheds had to be constructed to confine and protect farm animals. Feed had to be produced or found in order to keep them alive. Before the coming of alfalfa, the wild hay used for feed might run out during a particularly long and cold winter. During one such winter, 1874, feed was scarce. In order to cope, one farmer, following the advice of Brigham Young to save chaff for an emergency, fed chaff and straw, "even the straw off my sheds" to his animals and they survived, "thin as they were."

Animals that managed to get enough to eat encountered other misfortunes. There are accounts of cattle being poisoned by parsnips and of oxen stepping on hooks and becoming lame. The loss of an animal could have a devastating effect upon a farmer's fortunes and work patterns. When one of Lorenzo Hatch's mules hung itself in the stall one night, Hatch had to make major adjustments in his routine. A son described the situation:

The morning father discovered this great loss, he as well as the entire family was sorrowful indeed. It was in the middle of the Winter, and broke up our team. So we had no way of hauling wood for the family. I remember father hitching old "Fan," the remaining mule, to the wagon to haul manure from the stables, with himself holding up one side with the neck-yoke. A stay-chain was fastened to the mule side to hold up the tongue. The future looked discouraging indeed; and as I recall these things, they rested heavily on us children.

Although the family later got a yoke of cattle to replace the mules and also a pair of small bay mares, these animals were mismated and did not work out as well as expected.

**WEATHER**

Farmers have traditionally been at the mercy of weather conditions, and this was as true in Cache Valley as elsewhere. Extreme tem-
peratures at either end of the thermometer could halt or slow down work. "Too cold to work," "excessively cold; couldn't do much work" some journal entries report, and too much heat in the summer brought similar laments. An early or a late frost could damage crops and vegetables. Heavy winters were especially devastating when farmers ran out of feed for animals or the snow and cold killed them outright. Those who had to stack their hay outside would often have it ruined by rain or snow. Some settlers have related how difficult it was to cut wet hay down with a hay knife. When there was deep snow in the winter, they would have to get on the stacks with a ladder and shovel off the snow before they could cut the hay.20

A severe drought could make the irrigation ditches ineffectual, while an abundance of moisture, rainfall or flood, could do extensive damage. The following is an account from Wellsville in the early 1860s:

It rained all winter. Lots of grain in stack spoiled. It was the most miserable winter ever spent but we was all in the same condition and we made the best of it. Floods everywhere, landslides and great destruction everywhere. It was late in the Spring of 1862 before we could put in crops, the land was so wet. But we had big crops that season. But travel was bad everywhere. The teams that went after the poor Saints had high water to contend with. However we had a good season. Everything grew and prospered. I raised a good crop but we had a terrible time to get our seed grain over to the East Field on account of Big Creek being so high. I carried a sack of wheat over on my shoulder on trestles we had made to go and come on foot. Teams once over had to stay over until we was done cropping but everything came out all right.21

Somewhat later, a hailstorm near Clarkston, Lewiston, and Fairview did much damage. The local newspaper reported that "A great deal of standing grain was threshed out upon the ground."22

GRASSHOPPERS

Cache Valley was subject to periodic invasions of grasshoppers and crickets throughout most of the first twenty years of settlement. Although the damage varied from place to place and from year to year, the years of 1860, 1862, 1865-72, 1877, and 1879 were particularly

20Ibid., p. 12.
21 Bailey, Autobiography, p. 46. We have regularized the capitalization and provided some punctuation.
22 Tri-Weekly Journal, September 7, 1897.
bad. The worst year was probably 1869 when less than half a crop was raised throughout the valley.

The arrival of a grasshopper invasion could be a frightening experience. The insects flew in like a cloud, covering and darkening the sun, then settled on the fields and devoured all the crops and vegetation in sight. In 1865 residents of Wellsville were enjoying a July 24 celebration playing cricket on the public square when the grasshoppers arrived in such thick numbers that the game had to be discontinued. Grasshoppers stripped the gardens and left everything standing "like sticks," then alighted on the fences so that by evening everything was "all one color." 23

Cooperative approaches generally proved more effective than individual efforts, both in organized attempts to destroy the grasshoppers and in recouping losses. Several communities turned acreage into cooperative wheat fields in order to try to raise at least a partial crop. The settlers of Hyrum "organized into a corporation company, a sort of united order affair. As they [grasshoppers] mowed down the wheat we planted corn, squash, and beans. This crop flourished fine." 24

Those who lost crops to grasshoppers managed to show some flexibility. One man who found his wheat field "bare as a road" emphasized the positive and looked at his still-growing potatoes and his cows. "Chee hee, now it will be potatoes and milk." 25 James Cantwell, who had no such reserve to fall back on, reported in his journal in April 1867 that the grasshoppers were destroying his wheat and that he had had to sell five head of stock. He summed up the entire months of May and June in a single entry: "All our crops are destroyed by grasshoppers. Obliged to haul lumber to buy clothes, having no grain." July happenings were summarized in much the same terms: "Grasshoppers continued to fly over us in clouds destroying fields, gardens &c doing immense damage, destroying everything in the shape of grain and vegetables, and stopping all improvements both public and private." An August entry reveals his final discouragement, yet not a complete giving-up: "Crops all gone, obliged to sow something to get bread." 26

---

26 Cantwell, Journal, p. 74.
SHARING WITH INDIANS

After the weather and insects had taken their toll of Cache Valley crops, the policy of feeding the Indians instead of fighting them depleted available food supplies even further. Individuals gave food to small family groups, and the community organized collections to provide for larger numbers of Indians. In the first few years of settlement some hostiles stole horses from Maughan’s Fort and the church farm and shot some as well. Pioneer accounts state that Indian raids on animals and property continued even while the settlers were feeding them.

The arrival of a large number of Indians in the valley usually necessitated a full-scale effort to provide food for them. In the summer of 1861 about 1,000 Indians, described as "very hungry but not unfriendly," appeared in the south end of the valley. When they came into Logan, flour was collected for them and they left. The next day they returned and received another 1,300 pounds of flour. A month or two later Indians camped near Providence and let their cattle into the grain fields where they did damage. Henry Ballard went around his ward and gathered some melons to take to them. Large amounts of tithing donations were disbursed to the Indians, and many Indians returned regularly to receive commodities from this source.

More food resources were channeled out of the valley for other purposes. In addition to the distribution of tithing food and supplies to the poor and unfortunate, the church periodically took collections for special needs, such as meat for the workers on the Salt Lake Temple. The private charity of neighbors for each other and advances given to incoming settlers also depleted stores. "We met at the Bishop’s house and took into consideration the case of Brother Wilks who was destitute of provisions. We took up donation for him which was very liberal under our circumstances," reported Henry Ballard in 1860. In another instance, when Samuel Oldham’s family moved to Paradise the bishop called the ward together and asked them to make whatever advances they could afford to the new arrivals. Oldham noted that they received generous amounts of meat, potatoes, flour, and other food, all of which was later repaid.

29 Ballard, Journal, p. 28.
HOME INDUSTRIES

With almost no capital or agricultural surplus with which to procure machinery and equipment, the settlers established few industries in the valley in the early years, and their home-based enterprises were critical in providing the necessities of life. These included making straw hats; carding wool, then spinning, dyeing, and weaving it; raising silkworms and making silk; making soap; and growing flax to make linen. Many farmers’ families pursued several of these enterprises. In other cases a skilled individual might specialize. A talented weaver, for example, might do the weaving for a whole community and receive produce, labor, or raw materials in return.

Some who were children in those early days recalled holding skeins of yarn on their arms while their mothers rolled the yarn into balls or helping to make starch and soap. One account noted the busy spinning wheels in Mendon in 1861: “After the yarn was spun, the next thing was to color it. Herbs and bark and curious mixtures were used. As time went on improvements were made until some rather creditable dress patterns were shown by the women—not broadcloth, but better than at first.”

FAMILY LABOR

In all the work done around the farm—both the farming itself and the manufacturing work—the efforts of women and children were indispensable. Every household member was economically productive.

One of the first tasks given to youngsters was caring for animals. “We knew all about feeding and milking cows, tending horses and hogs, and teaching calves to drink,” Isaac Sorensen remembered. A small boy might look after the family’s cows or horses and see that they were brought in from the range. This could often be frustrating. One settler told how he would sometimes have to hunt all day to find the horses and then have to turn them back on the range at night and go for them again the next morning.

Herding sheep was a job frequently assigned to youngsters. Two eight-year-old boys of Franklin, each with about twenty-five sheep to care for, would take them to the hills each day, mixing them as soon as

32 Ibid., p. 50.
they were turned out of the corral and then separating them again at night. This job had its difficulties as well as its rewards:

Being small, we found it difficult to get the sheep over small creeks where the water during the night had become swollen. By getting a lamb under each arm and then wading across the stream, the small herd would follow, and this being my first experience on the farm, it so impressed me that those pleasant memories still remain most vivid.34

Children also assisted in the shearing, taking the wool to the creek to wash, and helped with carding and spinning.

Milking cows was another common chore. Hezekiah Eastman Hatch learned to milk when nine or ten years old and cared for one to four cows. He became discouraged when the cows dried up as winter came on—which he explained was partly due to lack of shed room to protect the cows from the cold and partly due to his not stripping closely. Caring for the oxen was even more difficult:

In putting the yokes on the oxen, it was rather hard, for if the ox refused to put his head down, one must lift the heavy yoke high enough to put it on top of his neck and hold it there until the bow could be slipped from underneath into the yoke. When the yoke was put on the ox, you then had to drop one end of the yoke, and probably go to the other end of the corral for the near ox and drive him to where the other one was standing, unless the near ox came when you called him, saying, "Come under." If he was feeling all right, he would often do this; then again, he would pay little or no attention to a boy's calling.35

Children could also do much of the actual field work on the farm. They dug potatoes, broke up the land, planted, hoed, and pulled weeds. At harvest time they could help with binding and raking. One youth remembered how he would follow behind the man who did the cradling and rake the wheat into bundles for another man following who did the binding. A boy might become expert at hay-stacking (an "expert" being one who could put a top on the stack that would shed rain easily so that only a small part of the hay would spoil).36

Even quite young children often assumed farming work on their own. Andrew Israelsen, only about eleven years old in 1868, took it upon himself to break up some of the family's land while his father was

36 Ibid., pp. 12, 14.
away working on the railroad. He hired a nine-year-old to drive the oxen while he held the plow and succeeded in plowing nearly five acres of land. After harrowing it and preparing it for seeding, he got a friend’s father to do the sowing. Andrew’s father was pleasantly surprised upon his return home to find some fine-looking grain.\textsuperscript{37}

One of the hardest yet most essential jobs was getting wood for fuel and building out of the canyons. Hezekiah Hatch’s feelings were perhaps typical:

\begin{quote}
The hardest work I found on the farm was getting out wood. It seemed to be impossible in the Summer and Fall to haul sufficient wood to last three families during the winter, hence we had to go into the canyon, cut and pile the wood and then in the Winter on Saturdays, go up and get two loads. I had but little time for play.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

Boys who could drive a team were enlisted to haul lumber, bring a load of rock, or drive to a neighboring community to exchange produce and goods. Special tasks such as harness mending, for example, might

\textsuperscript{37}Israelsen, \textit{Utah Pioneering}, p. 24.

become the assignment of a particular child who often became quite expert.

Women and girls likewise contributed to the economic survival of Cache Valley farm families. Although they did not normally take on the heavy work in the fields, they cared for animals, produced and prepared food, and made most of the clothing for the family, including spinning and weaving. They might sell eggs or raise chickens, care for the vegetable garden, keep roomers or boarders. Some daughters taught school; others moved into the larger cities, such as Logan, to hire out for work.

An interesting sidelight, though perhaps not of major economic importance to Cache Valley agriculture, was the presence of black workers on farms. The Bankhead family, for example, kept two servants named Nate and Sam in the early 1860s, and a few black laborers contributed toward agricultural development in the valley.

TRADE AND EXCHANGE

The economy of Cache Valley functioned largely on the barter system in the early days. With little money available, wheat was the principal commodity for exchange. Wheat or flour was used in payment for work and as currency for buying tickets for entertainments. Farmers traded their produce with each other—an animal for some grain, a stove for a piece of land—or took it to other communities in order to get the things they needed. Charles Nibley remembered driving to Logan with his mother to take two or three hundred pounds of flour to trade for some calico and other needed items. When his family at last acquired some chickens and cows, butter and eggs became precious items to be traded rather than eaten by the family.39 There were instances of trading on a community basis also—for example, Hyrum trading butter and wool to Wellsville in exchange for molasses.

To get items not available locally, Cache farmers hauled their wheat all the way to the Salt Lake Valley. Sometimes one man would haul a load for several of his neighbors and try to trade for needed items. Animals might be driven to Salt Lake City and traded there for clothing, dishes, cookware, or cutlery. One early settler described the economic disadvantage of such trade:

We had to haul what wheat we had to Salt Lake and then sell it for fifty cents per bushel. Sugar we bought for 75¢ per pound. Calico

39Nibley, Reminiscences, pp. 38, 45.
was 50¢ per yard, common nails 75¢ per pound, a Spade or Shovel $5.00. These were the prices we had to pay for everything we needed and wheat at 50¢ per bushel. We had nothing else to sell and not much of that.\textsuperscript{40}

When wheat was scarce settlers traveled to Salt Lake to get it. Isaac Sorensen remembered lean years when he returned to where he used to live in Mill Creek, east of Salt Lake City, borrowed wheat, and had it ground into flour. After the next threshing he would haul the same amount back again, paying a peck per bushel for interest.\textsuperscript{41}

There were other opportunities for trade. Occasionally a peddler wagon came through the valley and residents could buy some thread or a pair of shoes or a coat. The men who went east to bring immigrants across the Plains sometimes took flour with them to trade for buffalo robes, clothing, and equipment.

The extent of trading even as early as 1862 can be seen in journal entries made by James Sherlock Cantwell:

November 7th. Travelled to Brigham City, Sold the wheat for shoes. . . .
November 11. Sold the oats to Livingston. Henry Sadler gave me 2051 lbs barley to haul to camp Douglas. . . .
November 24. My birthday. Travelled home got there about 9 o clock. . . . I found my family well, and very much needing the articles I bought by the sale of oats.
December 15. Bought a pig from Licience Laramie for 6 Bls of wheat.
Feb. 7 [1863]. I hired a team and went to Wellsville taking a load of oats to buy slates. . . .\textsuperscript{42}

The main institution for facilitating trade and exchange in Cache Valley in the 1860s was the local tithing house. Here the donations from LDS church members were received and then disbursed as needed for the care of the poor, for feeding the Indians, and for contributing to community projects. Donations not used locally were sent to the central tithing house in Logan to alleviate shortages in other communities or for projects benefiting the whole valley. Excess receipts—generally in the form of cattle, wheat, and cash—were sent on to church headquarters in Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40}Daniel Walters, quoted in Ricks, \textit{History of a Valley}, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{41}"The History of Isaac Sorensen," p. 61.
\textsuperscript{42}Cantwell, \textit{Journal}, pp. 52-61.
ECONOMIC WINDFALLS

The difficulties of scratching a living from the soil were mitigated somewhat by developments that provided economic bonuses for Cache Valley farmers. The coming of federal troops into the valley in 1862-63 and the discovery of gold and other metals in Montana and Idaho in 1861 and 1862 created two of the earliest such windfalls. The construction of transcontinental and local railroads later in the 1860s and 1870s provided a great boost to the economic prosperity of the struggling settlers.

The Third California Volunteers under the command of Col. Patrick E. Connor arrived in Cache Valley to fight the Indians during the winter of 1862-63. The soldiers busied themselves trying to recover horses stolen from immigrant trains and preventing further attacks. They provided a ready market for butter, eggs, and milk, which the farmers traded for needed items, usually blankets or clothing. From 1863 to 1865 Fort Connor was built and maintained at Soda Springs,
and some Cache Valley farmers also earned money working on the road Colonel Connor built from the valley to the fort.44

The opening up of mining in Montana and Idaho produced a more exciting stimulus to the agricultural markets of Cache Valley. On the route from Salt Lake City and Ogden and also the closest agricultural area, Cache Valley established a large volume of trade with the mining areas. Many farmers freighted supplies north to the mines or hired out to other freighters. Some traveled to the mines to sell provisions and then stayed to earn extra money. Besides freighting or selling goods to freighters, the valley's farmers also sold directly to miners passing through on their way to the mines. Such trade led eventually to the establishment of the first general stores in the valley in 1864.

Profits in the mining trade could be enormous. Farmers found they could sell their grain and dairy products for more than enough to make the trip worthwhile. A pig bought for $36 brought $600 at the mines. Flour that was once $24 per hundred pounds jumped to $125. But there were problems as well. One early settler reminisced that the trade could have been a blessing to the valley had the farmers followed the counsel of church leaders to stay home and let the miners come to the valley to buy. That way they could control prices. But so many were anxious to realize a profit that they freighted grain in great quantities and eventually overstocked the market, bringing prices down from their earlier high levels. Instead of a benefit, the venture resulted in losses for some.45

Despite the opportunity for profit, the trade with the miners received some official disapproval. In December 1863 Brigham Young sent a special message to Cache Valley to stop selling wheat to the Salmon River and Bannock city miners; rather, they should send any surplus wheat to Salt Lake City. The California Volunteers needed bread, and Brigham Young was paying $3.00 per bushel in cash for all the wheat he could get. Two months later another message came asking again for surplus wheat—this time to feed the poor of Salt Lake City—at the price of $2.00 per bushel.46

In general, trade with non-Mormons was discouraged by church authorities, but often the benefits were so impressive and made such a difference in the quality of life that such advice was difficult to enforce.

44 Ricks, History of a Valley, p. 170.
One year the farmers of Weston sold their surplus crop of oats to non-Mormon dealers at Corinne for cash. One who received forty dollars promptly spent $37.50 for a stove and $2.50 for a pair of shoes for his wife, and others did about the same.

When the bishop chided his followers for trading with Gentiles, they stoutly defended their actions. Christen Christensen said: "I can't say I feel sorry, because I feel pretty good, my wife don't have to set on her knees and cook; so she can stand straight up so I feel pretty good." Wisely, the bishop did not press the matter too far.

Railroad construction provided several possibilities for improving one's economic circumstances. The construction of the transcontinental railroad created opportunities in 1868 for employment and markets for produce. Wheat brought $4.00 or $5.00 per bushel. One farmer related that with potato prices at $1.50 to $2.00 per bushel he made good money on his four trips out to Promontory with potatoes and lumber. Besides receiving money for commodities, many farmers were hired to build grade or blast rock. Workers could earn $3.00 to $6.00 per day and a man with a team could earn $10.00. In fact, the biggest effect on Cache Valley of the transcontinental railroad, with its markets and employment, was the introduction of larger amounts of money than the valley had previously seen. "For us who had seen precious little money for nine years," reported one settler, "the jingle of coins was stimulating."

The LDS bishops of Cache Valley handled subcontracts to build individual portions of the road. Not all of them reaped a windfall, however. Lorenzo Hatch, for example, contracted to build a mile of grade for the Central Pacific Railroad. He received a small amount of money and the balance in old carts and scrapers. His son recalled:

These last I shall never forget, as we had to haul manure in the old carts; and with a big mule we had, it was all I could do to lift the shafts up to the sides of the mule where they were strapped. When loaded, the poor old mule could hardly haul the cart to the dumping place. Because of this the name of Leland Stanford never sounded good to me, as he and his associates lived in affluence, while my father found himself ruined.

Hatch's two teenage sons, with the help of a hired man, ran the farm

---

47 Ricks, *History of a Valley*, p. 65.
49 "History of Isaac Sorensen," p. 65.
that summer while their father was working on the railroad. The proceeds from their 2,000-bushel crop had to go to pay the men hired to build the mile of grade. The younger son saw this as a serious loss to the family as it prevented the older children from getting an education.⁵¹

Some ingenious trades and arrangements benefited both laborers and farmers. One farmer working on the Utah Northern Railroad needed to find someone to care for and harvest his crop. Noticing that the Perpetual Emigration Fund offered to take UNRR stock, dollar for dollar, to apply against indebtedness, he approached a neighbor who was uneasy about not repaying his PEF debt completely: "I went to him and said that if he would look after my crop while I was gone to work for the U. N. and harvest it for me, I would pay him in U. N. stock and he could get his debt paid off. We carried out this plan, and he was as happy as a robin in a cherry tree."⁵²

The construction and completion of the Utah Northern to Logan in 1873 and as far as Franklin by 1874 opened up agricultural markets for Cache Valley produce on a much wider scale. In 1872 Cache Valley

⁵¹Ibid.
shipped out more than $100,000 worth of butter and eggs and $250,000 in wheat. Some went to Montana, some to Corinne, Utah, and then on to San Francisco. Cache Valley was becoming an important exporter of grain and dairy products. The increased volume of trade between Montana and Corinne, which now went through Cache Valley instead of the alternate wagon freight route through Malad, spurred much of this growth.

An extension of the Utah Northern Railroad was constructed from 1877 through 1884 into eastern Idaho and southwestern Montana. As the terminus extended farther from Cache Valley, markets for butter, eggs, cheese, and vegetables in the boom towns along the way declined somewhat. A more important effect on Cache Valley's agricultural economy came from the employment the railroad extension provided for inhabitants, as Cache Valley residents provided almost all of the labor for the work done from 1877 to 1881.

The practice of farmers leaving their farms to work elsewhere continued in Cache Valley well into the 1880s, carrying along with it the ambivalence that had been evident in other dealings with mining and railroads. A correspondent from Wellsville reported in 1886:

The people in this little burg chiefly follow farming for a livelihood. . . . So far as I am informed the people generally intend to take the counsel of those who are watchmen on the towers of Zion, so to speak and try to make a living by staying at home, and not leave to hunt work, thus neglecting their duties at home.53

On the other hand, the following notice appeared in an adjoining column:

Last Monday a large number of men and teams came to town from Hyrum and Paradise, and the principal streets took upon themselves an unusually lively appearance. The men were bound for Fort Benton, Helena, and other points in Montana, where they will work upon a railroad which is about to be constructed this summer. We wish them success.54

COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

Cache Valley's agriculture was also affected by the cooperative movement of the LDS church which began in 1868 and extended to the 1870s and 1880s. Each community in the valley operated a cooperative

53 Utah Journal (Logan), April 7, 1886.
54 Ibid.
general store to which farmers could bring their produce and either trade for goods or receive scrip redeemable at a later time. This provided a more flexible medium for exchange than the tithing house which continued to take care of church-related donations and distributions.

Establishing cooperative agricultural enterprises similar to the cooperative herding also affected the economy. Some community co-ops established dairies in order to centralize and make more efficient the manufacture of cheese and butter. The Mendon co-op purchased an improved threshing machine in 1870 that did custom threshing in the area.

Also affecting agriculture was the more all-encompassing United Order arrangement in which entire communities would pool resources and share on the farms and in the shops. About one-third of the residents of Mendon, under the urging of visiting Apostle Erastus Snow, organized themselves into a United Order in 1874 and turned over their property to the order, some "never expecting to get it back." After organizing into units of ten, they handled their farm work cooperatively and did the plowing, sowing, reaping, mowing, and threshing in common. Each member was assigned to irrigate the land he had

Residence and stock farm of W. H. Horner, Oxford, Idaho, 1885. Special Collections, USU.
originally donated. Each received payment on the basis of hours contributed, with no adjustments according to the amount of land donated. The Mendon United Order lasted little more than a year.

"GOLDEN AGE" OF CACHE VALLEY AGRICULTURE

By about 1880 Cache Valley farmers were no longer producing mainly for family survival but were raising specialized cash crops and livestock that could be exported on a large scale. As they moved away from self-sufficiency, their income became more tied to national trends and thus more affected by national economic swings.

Several developments aided Cache Valley farmers in making this shift. One breakthrough came from using successful dry-farming technology that brought larger areas of the valley under cultivation. Early attempts at dry farming in Whitney in 1870 had not been promising, but pressure for more farm land intensified experimentation on bench-lands and other hilly or dry areas. In the late 1880s the establishment of the Utah Agricultural College Experiment Station in Logan focused efforts on growing wheat in arid lands. The increase in wheat production at the turn of the century was indeed impressive. From 235,000 bushels in 1880 the wheat production jumped to more than 1,500,000 bushels in 1910, and acreage increased correspondingly from 12,000 to 80,000—largely because of the extension of dry farming.

The construction of new highline canals also enhanced crop production, as did the enlargement of the Newton Reservoir and the addition of new artesian wells. The 1,255 farms in the valley in 1880 had 50,000 acres under irrigation. An additional 40,000 acres—almost double—were under irrigation in the next twenty years. The new canal construction was difficult because of the longer distances required and the shortage of money because of depressed farm prices in the late 1870s. Farmers organized into mutual irrigation companies to finance the canals and hired the work done.

Newspaper reports during the 1880s reflect increased production from dry farming and improved irrigation. In 1885 Kansas provided a good market for Utah wheat, and "large quantities of grain" were shipped there, and "considerable cash . . . passed into the hands of the farmers in consequence, enabling them to pay taxes without selling the family cow." Wheat and hay exports were impressive. Even in the

55 Utah Journal, October 17, 1885.
middle of winter, wheat was hauled out of Lewiston in great quantities on sleighs. In the 1890s elevator and storage companies in Cache Valley could clean and store grain, enabling farmers to hold their grain until prices were favorable.

Improvements in farm materials, equipment, and machinery also contributed to the growth and improvement of agriculture. One helpful addition was barbed wire. A farmer who homesteaded two miles west of Weston in 1878 did his fencing for the first two years with poles hauled fifty miles from Cottonwood Canyon. He found the new material well worth the expense and trouble:

In 1880 barbed wire came out, that was better we could accomplish more that way, wire was 13 cents a pound in Ogden, we had it shipped to Mendon and went there after it with teams. We borrowed the money to pay for the wire, from Nels Carlson of Clifton at 24% pr annum, while father and my brother Marcus put up the fence, I went out on the Kelton and Wood River freight road with a four yoke bull-team and two wagons trailed, made two trips and came back for harvest and had made enough money to pay Carlson back the loan.

In 1885 a newspaper report indicated that one agricultural implement dealer had received a shipment of 25,000 pounds of barbed wire and noted that "This kind of fencing material seems to hold precedence over all others in Cache Valley."

Sixty threshing machines and two hundred harvesters and reapers were operating in the valley in 1880, and the boom continued into the 1890s. Mowers and reapers made of wrought iron, malleable iron, and even steel were replacing those made of cast iron. Local dealers purchased plows made "especially for the Utah trade," and a Richmond man invented a new plow that underwent several trials and demonstrations. Local dealers began to carry parts for the machines they sold, making it easier to get replacements. As always, new contrivances and improved models appeared on the market. One interesting device was a trucklike apparatus made for the purpose of conveying the large Osborne Twine Binder from one place to another. The binder could be lifted onto this device and then taken over ditches, through gates, and past other obstacles that previously had made some areas inaccessible to the binding machine.

56 Logan Journal, January 18, 1890.
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Technological progress paid off for the farmers. The Weston homesteader referred to earlier became in thirty years one of the most prosperous farmers in town. Early in the twentieth century he owned half a share of the first steam thresher in Weston; had his own pumping plant with two wells, a lawn-sprinkling system, and an elevated tank for the water system; enjoyed both hot and cold water in the house and a water trough for stock; owned his own electric lighting plant and a gasoline engine; and even had a power-run machine shop that enabled him to repair farm implements any time he wished.  

Another important shift in Cache Valley agriculture toward the end of the nineteenth century was the planting of row and orchard crops, which increased production because of better water supplies. Although fruit had been grown as early as 1865 (500 apple trees were planted in Hyrum), the largest growth came in the 1890s. The value of orchard products in the valley—mostly apples, peaches, pears, and cherries—shot up from $3,204 in 1890 to $65,432 in 1910. In 1890 the Logan Journal predicted that within a year the valley would be shipping a carload of small fruits each day. Even on a smaller scale, fruit growers were watching out for their interests and profits. A "huge fruit trust" surfaced in Providence in 1890 when the "peddlers . . . formed a combine to keep up the price of raspberries, and housekeepers [were] compelled to pay the price."  

The development of the dairy industry eventually made Cache Valley a leading producer of butter and cheese. Very early in the valley’s history, Brigham Young established a church farm consisting of a 9,000-acre ranch. When it was reestablished in 1864 purebred Durham and Devon bulls were used to upgrade herds throughout the valley, stimulating the improvement of dairy herds and products. There were early attempts to establish creameries and cheese plants as well. In 1871 Christian Hansen of Brigham City began running a cooperative cheese plant at Cottonwood Hollows on the divide between Bear River Valley and Cache Valley. He hired several young girls as dairy maids for the initial 100 or so cows which soon became 650. The girls, who milked up to eighteen cows per day, were paid from $2.50 to $3.50 per week. He produced about $8,000 worth of butter and cheese each year, with butter selling at 15 cents per pound and cheese at 8 cents. By 1875 his establishment produced nearly 40,000 pounds of

61 Logan Journal, July 5, 1890.
62 Ibid., July 16, 1890.
cheese for export alone, and the Hyrum co-op ran the first dairy within Cache Valley. The co-op gathered all the cows and paid “rent” for them by returning half of the cow’s production to the owner. At its peak the Hyrum dairy cared for about 300 cows. The number of dairy cattle in the valley rose from some 4,000 in 1880 to 16,000 in 1910.

Sheep and wool production flourished as well. In 1885 a herd of 1,600 sheep on the Main Street of Logan with an “enormous number” of lambs caused quite a stir as they were being driven from the range near Clarkston to Paradise. Bigger changes came in 1890 with the 300 head of breeding ewes brought into the valley from California by Willard S. Hansen. Acquiring 5,000 acres of government land, he decided that the Rambouillet sheep was the coming breed and by 1898 had built up his flock to 1,300. In that year he became the first to take a flock of Utah sheep east of the mountains when he shipped 180 head to the Omaha Sheep Show. While there he sold a ram (promptly named “Brigham Young” by its new owner) for a record price of $235. Hansen’s efforts at improved breeding not only enhanced the reputation of Cache Valley but also provided the starting point for improved flocks by others.

---
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The number of sheep in Cache Valley grew from less than 10,000 in 1880 to nearly 300,000 in 1900, and wool production increased from 62,000 pounds to more than 1.5 million. After the turn of the century the sheep population declined when the Cache National Forest was created and federal grazing controls instituted.

Advances in horse husbandry were also recorded. In 1885 an Ogden buyer negotiated for four carloads of Cache Valley horses; the local papers made proud noises about how the valley was keeping abreast in breeding.64

Toward the end of the century manufacturing work on the farm grew into a number of agriculture-related industries. The establishment of commercial creameries in the 1890s moved butter- and cheese-making from the farm into the processing plants. At the same time, the number of flour mills expanded with the increased wheat production from dry farming. Woolen mills and knitting factories produced and manufactured clothing. One local firm even began manufacturing farm implements. Its output for one year consisted of an impressive 3,000 plows, 100 bobsleds, 20 iron harrows, and 25 cultivators.65

The healthy increases in so many areas of Cache Valley agricultural production required additional railroad cars for shipping. Broadening the narrow-gauge railroad to standard gauge in 1890 created a temporary scarcity of shipping facilities. According to the Logan Journal, "Wellsville needs forty cars, Logan close on 150, Smithfield, Richmond, and Franklin each not less than sixty, while there is naturally a demand on the other [western] side of the valley." The newspaper went on to complain that if the valley could only resume shipping goods out, residents would be able to get more "ready money" than they had seen at any one time previously, and the "prosperity which now exists would be of value in the possession of coin of the realm."66 Clearly, Cache Valley's economic well-being was tied to wider agricultural markets.

Farmers felt confident in borrowing from banks to purchase implements and livestock. As elsewhere in the West, more farms were mortgaged. Newspaper editorials urged the founding of more manufacturing concerns and industries that would keep money in the valley and prevent the "constant and ruinous drain" of money going out of the community. Instead of buying farm machinery, for example, the
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money could be put into woolen mills and shoe factories. Such arguments had little effect on farmers who needed those new reapers and mowers. Farmers were in a poor position to avoid the decline in farm prices after 1893, however, and the eventual depression of 1896.

Cache Valley began its community development in 1859 in an uncertain struggle to survive. Thousands of pioneering families worked from sunup to sundown, from planting to harvesting. Farmers also sought work outside the valley to supplement income and tried various cooperative arrangements to care for the farms in their absence. They faced challenges in erecting dams and digging canals and ditches, late spring and early fall frosts, occasional hailstorms and cloudbursts, grasshopper infestations, and inadequate tools, implements, and draft power. Nevertheless, by bone and sinew, thrift and ingenuity, they survived and eventually prospered. Local villages entered into their golden age in the 1880s. As Cache Valley’s crops, livestock, and related industries networked into the national economy and farmers and farm-related businessmen increasingly drew credit from outside sources, particularly after 1900, the valley entered a new era with its own challenges and problems.
Sugar Beets in Cache Valley: An Amalgamation of Agriculture and Industry

BY CHARLES L. SCHMALZ

DURING ITS FIRST TWO DECADES THE Cache Valley sugar industry saw tentative initial efforts mature into an established industry with fac-

Mr. Schmalz, Burley, Idaho, presented a version of this paper at the Mormon History Association annual meeting in Logan, Utah, May 1988. The author thanks C. W. (Bill) Owens of Rupert, Idaho, for the loan of photographs and newspaper clippings from his extensive collection of sugar factory memorabilia.
Sugar Beets in Cache Valley

This was followed by a boom period during and immediately after the First World War when in the space of a few years three additional factories were built and valley beet acreage reached all time highs. A drastic sugar price drop in the early twenties brought the boom to an abrupt halt, leaving three plants closed and the remaining two facing rather uncertain futures. The industry then settled into a gradual decline and ultimate demise some fifty years later.

Through the 1890s, prompted by the success of sugarbeet processing plants in Lehi and Ogden, Cache Valley farmers experimented with the crop. By 1900 sugarbeets had become a staple crop in Cache Valley, the beets being shipped to Ogden for processing. Yields and quality varied, but these efforts established that the climate, water, and labor resources of the valley could sustain sugarbeet culture. Lack of a local processing facility inhibited expansion, however. The cost of shipping the beets to Ogden was quite high, and growers customarily paid freight to the factory. Beet payments averaged $4.00 to $4.50 per ton with freight costs as much as $1.00 per ton. A Cache Valley sugar factory was needed.

Responding to the demand, David Eccles established the Logan Sugar Company to build Cache Valley’s first sugar beet factory. Nominaly a stock company, the Logan Sugar Company was almost wholly owned by Eccles, the other shareholders having only minority positions. The factory, built just south of Logan, was completed in the fall of 1901.

The Logan plant was originally built to process or slice 350 tons of beets per day, a typical size for the period. Machinery and initial operating know-how were furnished by the E. H. Dyer Company, an Ohio-based construction and engineering firm. Dyer specialized in sugar beet factories, building some seventy-odd during the first third of this century. The factory buildings themselves were constructed from local materials under the supervision of Nils Flygare, pioneer Ogden contractor. Like most of David Eccles’s ventures, Logan was well fi-

---


2 Nils C. Flygare built many of the early buildings in Ogden; he appears to have specialized in large masonry structures, including the old Ogden Tabernacle and Ogden’s original ZCMI building. A longtime associate of David Eccles, he had previously built the Ogden Sugar Factory. His most prominent surviving building is USU’s Old Main. An active Mormon, he served three missions in Scandinavia and was a counselor in the Weber Stake presidency for the last twenty-five years of his life. See Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Andrew Jenson History Co., 1901-36), 1:461.
nanced, well managed, and apparently successful almost from the start. By 1906 the factory had been expanded to 700 tons per day and was processing the beets from 3,500 acres.\(^3\)

Cache Valley's second sugar factory was built at Lewiston. The town had been runner-up in the race for the original Cache Valley factory. After losing out to Logan, Lewiston citizens continued lobbying for a factory. C. W. Nibley, who formed the Lewiston Sugar Company in 1903, spearheaded the project. He had previously been a close business associate of David Eccles but by this time was more of a competitor than a partner. The Lewiston factory was completed in 1905, de-

spite initial opposition from Eccles who doubted the area’s capacity to support a second plant and voiced his concern in contemporary newspaper accounts.\(^4\) Ironically, although Eccles’s predictions about the limited beet-growing acreage in Cache Valley were accurate, Lewiston proved to be the longest running of any of the area’s plants.

Available acreage aside, most of Eccles’s opposition to a second Cache Valley factory was probably due to another factor, his involvement in the Sugar Trust. Through much of the nineteenth century American sugar production resembled a private club. All sugar consumed was imported as raw sugar, primarily from tropical cane plantations built or controlled by U.S. capital. The raw sugar was refined in eastern port cities, principally Baltimore, Boston, New York City, and Philadelphia. The owners of the refineries formed a tightly knit group that controlled the supply and dictated the price. The Sugar Trust was organized in 1887 to further this control.\(^5\) Although there was competition, it was of a limited nature. The success of western sugar beet ventures in the latter part of the century threatened this comfortable arrangement. In 1901 the Sugar Trust moved into the sugar beet industry in an attempt to tighten its hold on the country’s sugar production. Their methods are described by an entry in Anthon Lund’s 1901 journal:

> Mr. Willet, representing the sugar interests east [sic], said they intend to go into the beet sugar industry and propose to buy half the stock of the factories already going. . . . They control prices in the market and also the railroads, and they propose to furnish no money to build [additional] factories.\(^6\)

In light of modern business practices, the above seems unusually frank and perhaps illegal in part. It was typical of the era’s business practices, however, when cooperation and communication between nominal competitors was commonplace. Sugar was no different, even in Utah. The first product shipped by the Logan Sugar Company was handled by Joseph Geoghegan, the same Salt Lake City broker who represented the Utah Sugar Company and the Ogden Sugar Company.\(^7\) In fact, until threatened by legal action in 1920 their successors,

---


\(^6\) Anthon H. Lund, Journal, November 11, 1901, LDS Church Library-Archives, Salt Lake City. This meeting was in reference to church ownership of the Lehi factory. Direct church involvement in the Cache Valley sugar industry did not come until 1914.

\(^7\) Deseret News, November 11, 1901.
the Amalgamated and Utah-Idaho Sugar companies, shared the same national distribution network and general sales manager.8

The Sugar Trust succeeded in its 1901 efforts, buying an interest in essentially all of the sugar beet factories in operation or then being planned, including Lehi, Ogden, and Logan.9 Leaders in the Utah industry were reluctant to sell, but the area’s chronic need for capital prevailed. Lund, for one, felt it would be better to retain local control of Utah’s industries. His doubts seemed justified a few years later when the Sugar Trust worked to block Nibley’s efforts to establish the Lewiston factory. The situation put the LDS church in an awkward position between its eastern partners who opposed any additional sugar beet factories and the interests of church members in northern Cache Valley who needed the industry.10 This particular conflict was resolved by an arrangement through which both Eccles and the Sugar Trust ended up owning portions of the Lewiston factory.11

The next decade was a period of consolidation and maturation for the valley’s sugar industry. The Ogden and Logan Sugar companies were merged to form the original Amalgamated Sugar Company in 1902. The Lewiston Sugar Company came under the Amalgamated umbrella in 1904, although retaining its corporate identity until 1914.

The industry itself was maturing. As factory personnel gained experience, the quality of operations improved. Plant personnel learned what the machinery would do and, more important, what it could not do. Sugar recovery increased and losses were reduced.

Farmers also learned how to grow better sugar beets. In this they were aided by scientific studies of the crop. Beets became an important early research subject at the Logan Agricultural Experiment Station. Initial work dealt with selecting and evaluating suitable growing areas.12 Subsequent researchers worked to optimize agronomic practices and develop disease resistance. In succeeding years Utah State

9 The Lehi factory and the one built in Garland in 1903 were operated as the Utah Sugar Company, later reorganized as the Utah-Idaho Sugar Company. The LDS church was a principal backer of the venture, and church leaders served as directors of both companies. The Sugar Trust continued to hold a half interest in the consolidated company until 1914. See J. R. Bachman, Story of the Amalgamated Sugar Company (Ogden: Amalgamated Sugar Company, 1962), p. 50.
11 Actually, the Sugar Trust and Eccles owned most of the company. Under the agreement the Sugar Trust held 50 percent and Amalgamated held another 25 percent of the shares issued by the Lewiston Sugar Company. This was in return for financing a major portion of the plant.
12 John A. Widtsoe, Utah Sugar Beets (1897) (February 1989), Bulletin No. 53 of the Experiment Station, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan.
Agricultural College (now Utah State University) produced a large quantity of research data on sugar beets and trained many individuals for careers in the industry. Even today USU alumni make up a significant portion of the industry’s agronomic managers and technical researchers.

When David Eccles died suddenly in 1912, his son LeRoy became manager of the sugar company. LeRoy had served an LDS mission to Germany in 1902 and following his release stayed to study sugar beet factory operations there. Upon his return to Utah he became very involved in the Eccles’s sugar interests. Rising rapidly in the business, he was named Amalgamated’s general superintendent in 1907. By all accounts LeRoy was a fairly competent sugar technologist but, as subsequent events demonstrated, not the businessman his father was.

In April 1914 the LDS church, in a move orchestrated by Nibley, purchased the Sugar Trust’s interest in both the Amalgamated and Lewiston Sugar companies. The church considered repurchasing Utah-Idaho Sugar Company at the same time. They did not, though,
feeling that the asking price was too high. Nibley subsequently purchased a major interest in Utah-Idaho Sugar on his own account.\textsuperscript{16}

With the outbreak of the First World War and its subsequent impact on European sugar beet growing areas, interest in the U.S. sugar beet industry rose. Cache Valley was not exempt from this fever. Sometime in March 1916 a group of west side farmers approached Logan businessman J. A. Hendrickson with a proposal for "a sugar factory across the river from Smithfield."\textsuperscript{17} Hendrickson started to promote a company, announcing the fact in the Salt Lake City press.\textsuperscript{18}

Initially, Hendrickson stated that Amalgamated and Utah-Idaho would be purchasing half of his company’s stock. Representatives of both corporations promptly denied any knowledge of, or interest in, the venture. Hendrickson also claimed to have a contract with E. H. Dyer for the factory’s machinery. This may have been somewhat premature because a few days later Amalgamated announced that it had contracted with Dyer to build a plant in Smithfield, almost next door to Hendrickson’s proposed factory. The Hendrickson deal subsequently fell through, possibly as a condition of Amalgamated’s agreement with Dyer.\textsuperscript{19} Logically, Dyer would have preferred a firm commitment from an established business like Amalgamated to a possible contract with a company that might never be able to arrange financing.

With the Dyer deal dead, Hendrickson and his partner, Leonard Stohl, set out to locate an idle sugar factory that could be moved into the valley. They finally arranged to purchase one in Raymond, Alberta, Canada, owned by Jesse Knight. The plant had originally been erected in 1903 by Dyer and was apparently similar to the Logan facility in design and capacity. Cannon-Lynch Construction Company of Salt Lake contracted to dismantle the Raymond plant and rebuild it in Utah.

Amalgamated interests continued efforts to block the venture. About November 15, 1916, Hendrickson was approached by LeRoy Eccles and offered $25,000 for his interest in the venture. Hendrickson refused. The next day LeRoy and his brother Royal called on Stohl in

\textsuperscript{16}C. W. Nibley, \textit{Reminiscences} (Salt Lake City, 1934) p. 128; Lund Journal, April 14, 23, 1914. Nibley’s wealth evaporated with the crash of the sugar industry in 1922, and the church took over his interest in Utah-Idaho Sugar.

\textsuperscript{17}J. A. Hendrickson, Journal, microfilm copy in LDS Church Library-Archives. Hendrickson’s journal provides interesting insight into the business climate in Cache Valley at this time. Unfortunately, the journal’s daily entries cease in mid-1908. On or about June 7, 1922, Hendrickson resumed his daily entries, inserting a capsule summary of the 1908–22 period.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Deseret News}, May 12, 1916.

\textsuperscript{19}Hendrickson Journal; \textit{Deseret News}, June 1, 14, 15, 1916.
Salt Lake City and offered $75,000 if he and Hendrickson would abandon the project. Stohl was willing but Hendrickson talked him out of it, claiming allegiance to the West Cache growers.20

Hendrickson may have had another motive for refusing the Eccles offer. On December 28, 1916, the West Cache Sugar Company was formally incorporated. One of the first items of business was an agreement to purchase Hendrickson and Stohl’s interest in the Raymond factory and their Cannon-Lynch contract for the sum of $529,000 in cash and stock.21 Since their total commitment was in the vicinity of $300,000, the sale made the partners a tidy profit.

Amalgamated’s Smithfield factory (actually located to the west at Amalga) was obviously a defensive measure to stop the factory planned by the Hendrickson group in the area. Not only did Amalgamated’s contract with Dyer apparently block Hendrickson’s negotiations with that firm, but the Amalgamated plant was located only two and a half miles from his original site. Amalgamated proceeded with construction of the Smithfield plant, apparently without problems, through the spring and summer of 1917. The factory started slicing beets in November 1917. Never able to get an adequate supply of beets, Smithfield operated only a few seasons. After sitting idle for many years it was dismantled and moved to Clarksburg, California, in 1935.

In the meantime, the West Cache Sugar Company negotiated a plant site at Cornish. After considerable struggle, hampered by wartime shortages and Cache Valley’s celebrated winter weather, West Cache also completed its factory in time to process the 1917 crop. The company’s need for funds to complete the factory resulted in the Knight family’s acquiring a controlling interest. In the spring of 1918 Ernest R. Woolley, a Utah mining broker and entrepreneur, bought the West Cache Sugar Company from the Knights.22 Hendrickson, then West Cache’s general manager, claimed to have had no prior knowledge of the move. Woolley promptly replaced the company’s directors and fired Hendrickson. A few months later West Cache filed suit against Hendrickson and Stohl to recover what it claimed were the excess profits of the original Raymond factory sale to West Cache. Following some three years of countersuits, trials, and appeals, the affair was finally settled out of court in January 1921.23

20 Hendrickson Journal.
21 Hendrickson Journal.
22 Deseret News, April 15, 1918.
23 Hendrickson Journal; Deseret News, June 11, 1918, August 23, 1918, April 9 through 25, 1918; Logan Journal, January 21, 1921.
An interesting sidelight on this matter concerns Woolley’s intentions and source of funds. Hendrickson always maintained that the ultimate goal was to punish him and put West Cache out of business. He claimed Amalgamated or Eccles interests were backing Woolley, a charge denied in court by Royal Eccles and others.24 There is record, though, of a David Eccles Company loan to Woolley of $365,000 secured by shares in West Cache Sugar Company. The Eccles Company in turn sold these shares to Amalgamated in 1920.25 West Cache was essentially in bankruptcy by then, due in part to the drain of Woolley’s legal actions.26 Amalgamated operated the Cornish plant intermittently for the next few years. The factory was permanently closed after the 1926 season and its machinery moved to Missoula, Montana, in the spring of 1927.

The last Cache Valley sugar factory to be built was located at Whitney, near Preston, Idaho. In March 1918 LeRoy Eccles announced Amalgamated’s plans to build a plant in the Preston area. To this end Amalgamated purchased the Oneida Irrigation District, a troubled attempt to bring Mink Creek water to land west of Preston. The canal venture failed, partly because the builders underestimated the work needed to complete the project and partly because Amalgamated had financial troubles of its own. Amalgamated, in addition to its Cache expansions, had just completed or was attempting to build factories in Idaho, Montana, and California. These activities stretched the

24Deseret News, April 15, 1918.
25Bachman, Story, pp. 71, 77. The David Eccles Company was formed to manage the assets and interests of Eccles’s Ogden family following his death. Leonard J. Arrington, David Eccles, Pioneer Western Industrialist (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1975), p. 190.
26Salt Lake Tribune, August 27, 1921.
company’s resources to the breaking point. One result of this was the ouster of LeRoy Eccles in late 1918. The following years saw a number of reorganizations and bank loans in an often harrowing but ultimately successful attempt to keep Amalgamated afloat.\textsuperscript{27}

Following Amalgamated’s decision to pull out of Preston, local farmers persuaded Job Pingree and his sons, principals in the Hooper Sugar Company, to form the Pingree-Idaho Sugar Company and purchase an idle factory located in Corcoran, California. Construction began and Corcoran machinery was moved to Whitney, but the firm ran out of money and the project stalled.

Ernest R. Woolley stepped in and bought out Pingree’s interest in June 1920, possibly with the proceeds of his West Cache sale to Amalgamated. Woolley then formed the Interstate Sugar Company. Six months later he sold Interstate to Pioneer Sugar Company, a farmers cooperative. Pioneer had originally planned to build a plant in the Salt Lake Valley but changed its plans when the movement expanded to include Cache Valley growers. Within the year the overextended co-op was in trouble, and the Whitney project was once again high and dry.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} Lund Journal, September 18, 24, 1918; Bachman, \textit{Story}, pp. 75–85.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Salt Lake Telegram}, July 19, 1922.
Yet another group took over the project. This time the principal source of funds was a Seattle lumberman, H. A. Gould. Gould’s group finally got the Whitney plant built and operating in the fall of 1922. It must not have been a great financial success because by 1924 the plant was on the market. An offer to sell to Amalgamated was refused. Gould subsequently sold out to a group headed by the Carlton family, principals in Holly Sugar Company of Denver.

By 1926 much of the Logan factory’s machinery had become worn or obsolete. This and the valley’s excess beet slicing capacity led to the decision to shut the Logan plant down. A decade later it was dismantled. Some of its components were salvaged and incorporated into other Amalgamated sugar beet factories.

By the late twenties, then, there were two factories operating in Cache Valley, the Lewiston and Whitney plants, operated by Amalgamated and the Franklin County Sugar Company respectively. Amalgamated would move or scrap its three closed plants, Logan, Smithfield, and Cornish, over the next ten years. Of Amalgamated’s proud Cache Valley expansion of a decade earlier, Lewiston alone remained.

29Bachman, Story, p. 89.
Much of the blame for the boom and bust cycle in the Cache Valley sugar industry can be laid to events related to World War I. Soon after the outbreak of the war in Europe, sugar prices, like those of many farm commodities, begin to rise. If anything, sugar rose faster, going from $4.00 to $7.25 per 100-pound bag in just a few months and ultimately much higher. Much was made of the fact that the Western Front lay directly on a large portion of the European sugar beet growing territory. C. W. Nibley was particularly bullish toward sugar beets, based largely on his belief that the European industry would require generations to recover from the ravages of the war.

It took only a few years to prove Nibley’s forecasts about the recovery of European sugar producers false. In mid-1920 sugar prices peaked at more than $25.00 per bag. Buoyed by high sugar prices, sugar beet farmers throughout the West had demanded and received contracts for beets at about $12.00 per ton (from which the companies would extract about 200 pounds of sugar). Before the sugar from these beets could be marketed, sugar prices fell to around $5.00 per bag. All sugar beet processors, with warehouses full of sugar produced from beets bought at high contract levels, suffered substantial losses. Those in Cache Valley were especially vulnerable. Amalgamated was still shaky following its recent reorganizations. Whitney, operated by a young, thinly financed company, was also hard hit by the crash. The unfortunate plant had started up just in time to feel the full impact of the drop in sugar prices.

The LDS church was peripherally involved in all of the Cache Valley sugar plants. Eccles and Hendrickson were both noted Mormon businessmen. Nibley, a confidant of church president Joseph F. Smith, later became presiding bishop. Woolley was a grandson of Apostle Charles C. Rich. Other local industry promoters and directors were nearly all Mormons of varying degrees of activity. Many more church members grew beets or worked in the plants, reflecting the Mormon presence in the valley. The church itself was not an active underwriter or promoter of any Cache Valley plant, however.

The LDS church’s direct financial involvement in the various Cache Valley sugar ventures was limited to a period between 1914 and 1930. It started with acquisition of stock in the original Amalgamated and Lewiston Sugar companies in the spring of 1914. When reorgan-
ized as the Amalgamated Sugar Company in December 1914, Joseph F. Smith was named president. Since he was also president of Utah-Idaho Sugar, this move made him the chief executive officer of both major Utah sugar beet companies. At the April 1915 meeting of Amalgamated’s directors President Smith resigned and was replaced by Anthon H. Lund, a counselor in the church’s First Presidency. This apparently was a move to quiet threats of legal action under the Sherman Antitrust Act. Lund remained as president of Amalgamated until his death in 1921. Subsequently, Anthony W. Ivins, the new second counselor to LDS President Heber J. Grant, became a member of Amalgamated’s board, joining Apostle Stephen L. Richards who had become a director in 1920. Ivins was not elected president of the company, however, becoming chairman of the board instead. This move marked the beginning of a gradual withdrawal of church leaders’ direct participation in Amalgamated’s operations which continued until the church sold its stock to American Beet Sugar Company in 1930.

Obviously, large sums were invested and ultimately lost in the many failures, bankruptcies, and reorganizations that took place. It does not appear that much was lost by Cache Valley residents though. Primary sources of capital for the projects were eastern investors, with Salt Lake City money the secondary source. Most stock offerings mention only limited amounts reserved for local citizens. The rural economy of Cache Valley just did not have the money needed for a factory building scheme. What stock was taken locally was most likely purchased on a partial payment basis and the full amount never paid.

The driving force behind all of the Cache Valley sugar factories was the need for easily shipped cash crops, this in marked contrast to early Utah sugar-processing efforts aimed at meeting the local demand for sugar. Prior to 1891 Utahns had to spend scarce hard currency to purchase and import sugar from the East. By the turn of the century, with successful factories at Lehi and Ogden, this was no longer the case. The pioneer Utah plants produced sufficient sweetener to meet local needs. By 1902, with the new factory at Logan operating and another at Garland under construction, it was estimated that fully half of Utah’s production would be available for shipment to other markets. With expanding production this trend would continue.

31 Deseret News, December 19, 1914; Bachman, Story, pp. 52–104. Interestingly, during the twenties the church became deeply involved in Utah-Idaho Sugar, largely through assuming Nibley’s interests in that company.

32 Deseret News, December 20, 1902.
Utah's consumption was between 19 and 24 million pounds per year through the first decade of the twentieth century. By 1906 the state's total production was 88 million pounds, leaving a considerable excess available for shipment to other markets. Cache Valley contributed about a third of this amount.\(^{33}\)

Sugar beets were one of the most profitable crops available to Utah farmers. Despite being the first crop planted, the last harvested, and requiring large amounts of hand labor, beets netted farmers over $2.00 per ton or $35.00 to $40.00 per acre. One government report stated it was "not probable that any standard crop would . . . yield better net returns . . . than beets."\(^{34}\)

The sugar industry significantly affected life in Cache Valley. Financially, the growers benefited from the cash crop. As in other developing areas, beets were credited with paying many a mortgage. Many farm families additionally benefited directly from the sugar factories. The short, seasonal nature of a sugar factory's operation fitted neatly with the workload of farmers. During the winter, when they could not do anything in their fields, farmers could earn needed cash by working at the factory.

One difference between Utah and other beet-growing states was the small size of most farmers' acreages. Many averaged less than 5 acres, when 20- to 40-acre plots were common in Colorado and Nebraska. With these smaller plots all of the hand work was kept within the farmer's family.

Despite the many small plots and claims that additional help would not be needed to grow them, sugar beets did bring migrant, non-Mormon labor to Cache Valley. A December 1904 newspaper article discounted the need for outside labor: "A family of 5 or 6 can easily cultivate 40 or 50 acres of beets."\(^{35}\) Anyone with sugar beet-growing experience knows this to have been somewhat optimistic. Later news accounts bear this out. One item published a few months later stated: "Quite a force of Japs are in Lewiston preparing dwelling houses to live in during the present season." The Japanese came to do manual labor in the beet fields, while farmers worked the horse teams.\(^{36}\) In later years Mexican and Indian workers provided much of the muscle

\(^{33}\) USDA Report No. 82, p. 74.


\(^{35}\) Logan Tri-Weekly Journal, December 24, 1904.

\(^{36}\) Logan Republican, April 8, 1905.
needed to thin, weed, and harvest beets. One group who supplied much of the hand labor in other western beet growing areas, Volga Germans, apparently did not come into Cache Valley in any great numbers.

As in many other areas of the West, sugar beets spurred urban growth in the valley, particularly in northern towns like Lewiston. The factory payrolls, especially during the construction phase, brought banks and stores. They also brought "outside influences." Some drinking, shootings, and other forms of lawlessness occurred in factory construction camps. While probably mild by western boom town standards, such things stood out in rural Mormon settlements. When built, the factories provided stable, long-term employment opportunities. They permitted many who would otherwise have left to stay in Cache Valley.

37 The American Sugar Industry and Beet Sugar Gazette, 10 (1908): 345. Also see H. W. Sykes, Second Hoeing, reprint (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), for background on the subject.

38 Logan Republican, March 21, 1905; Tri-Weekly Journal, May 18, 27, 1905.
The young men of the valley benefited greatly from the industry. Factory machinery gave many their first view of equipment larger and more complex than a dump rake or mowing machine. Along with introducing them to power greater than a team of horses, sugar factories also presented career opportunities. Factory builders typically brought only a small group of skilled men to assemble and start a plant. They relied extensively on available local talent, even for management positions. Quite a few who started as laborers in the early days at Logan or Lewiston rose to positions of responsibility. No record of it exists, but it is logical to assume that many others who got their start in Cache Valley sugar beet factories rose to prominence in other industries.

Work in early sugar factories was hard and hours long. Many jobs required heavy exertion in a hot, humid atmosphere. Until well into the thirties factories operated on a twelve-hour shift, seven days a week during the operating season or campaign. Fortunately, most Cache Valley campaigns were of short duration, seldom exceeding seventy-five days. During the off season a nucleus of full time workers rebuilt and otherwise maintained the machinery. The balance of the crews, the so-called campaign workers, were laid off and went to other occupations, typically farming.

Working in sugar factories was not without its hazards. Insight into this comes from accounts by L. C. Budge, pioneer Logan physician, whom David Eccles retained as the Logan Sugar Company doctor in the fall of 1901. Eccles extended Budge’s contract to include Lewiston in 1905. The factory workmen’s lack of familiarity with the power of machinery and heat of steam apparently gave the doctor plenty to do. Some injuries, particularly burns, required months of hospitalization and nursing care. All too often accidents resulted in fatalities.

Farmers and company management frequently failed to see each other’s viewpoint. Disputes over the price paid for beets, taring practices, and load weights developed right from the start. For many valley farmers the sugar companies were their first direct contact with “big business,” and friction often resulted. Anthon Lund described a
1920 visit by growers' representatives who wondered why the local price of sugar had been permitted to rise so high. The nationwide relationships of price and demand were apparently strange concepts to many farmers. A pamphlet published by C. W. Nibley in 1916 also discusses the subject in some detail.

Cache Valley's sugar industry, never very robust, did manage to weather the depression of the thirties fairly well. It even made a comeback of sorts during the last few years of the decade. Later, during World War II there was a push to expand the industry, but manpower shortages made this difficult. Many young men were drafted into the services, and others went to work in the war-related industries springing up around Ogden. Those remaining on the farm opted for crops that required less labor. The area did make an effort though. Women and "Japs" went to work in the sugar factories. Junior and senior high schools released students for two- or three-week harvest "vacations." Despite such efforts, beet production continued to fall through the war years.

Following the war, the industry continued its decline. Although only two factories remained, area farmers did not grow enough beets to support both. Acreage controls placed on the industry in the mid-fifties were probably the final straw. The allotments were based on acreage history in the period 1950–54, a time when local farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Built by</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Fate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Scrapped (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Scrapped (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Amalgamated</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>To Calif. 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornish</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>West Cache</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>To Mont. 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Scrapped (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Much of the machinery in these plants was removed and distributed to other operating factories, a practice still followed today.
(2) Pingree—Woolley/Interstate/Pioneer—Gould

---

44 Nibley, *Facts about Sugar*.
45 Deseret News, September 25, 1943.
were reducing their beet acreage. By the latter part of the decade Lewiston and Whitney were each running at about half capacity. This bears out David Eccles’s forecasts concerning the beet-raising capacity of the valley made over half a century earlier.

The Franklin County Sugar Company operated the Whitney plant with at least modest success until 1960 when it was sold to Amalgamated. During Whitney’s last few seasons campaigns lasted only about 60 days. Lewiston was no better off, with some campaigns lasting only 45 days. Even after absorbing Whitney’s beets following that plant’s closing in 1962, Lewiston only managed to run 80 to 90 days at about 1,800 tons of beets per day. Such short campaigns just wouldn’t justify the investment in machinery required by today’s sugar factory where typical campaigns run from 140 to 160 days at much higher slice rates. Since it was apparent that area farmers could not or would not grow more beets, Amalgamated closed its Lewiston plant in 1972. Limited sugar beet growing continued in Cache Valley for a few more

years, with the beets being shipped to Idaho plants for processing. Small acreages and high transportation costs finally forced Amalga­mated to eliminate all Utah growing areas after the 1979 crop year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Refined Sugar Price, N.Y. 100# of Sugar</th>
<th>Utah Farmers Paid Per Ton of Beets</th>
<th>Total Utah Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Refined sugar price is the 12-month average New York market price—very close to the price received by Utah producers since all sugar was sold on a freight allowed, base price system.

The 1920 average price of $15.25 reflects the rapid run up and later fall of sugar prices that year as they peaked at over $25.

The 1905 and 1910 beet prices are estimates or extrapolations from other sources.

Cache Valley sugar beet acreage data is not available separately. In the 1900 – 1910 period Cache acreage was about 25 – 30 percent of the total for Utah. It is reasonable to assume that it remained near that level, with the possible exception of the peak years when it may have been somewhat less. It is doubtful that Cache Valley beets ever exceeded 20,000 acres.

Source—Sugar Data 1944, Mountain States Beet Growers Association, H. E. Hogsett, editor.

When most people in Utah hear the name Hogle, the first thing they think of is the Salt Lake City zoo that bears that name. Few know much more about the influential name associated with the zoo. Gerald M. McDonough’s publication of the The Hogles provides the opportunity for readers to know more. The book is a history of this prominent Utah family from their immigrant roots in Ireland to the death of James A. Hogle in 1955.

The story begins with Patrick Gilmore who left Ireland in 1839 and finally settled in Illinois in 1854. Though Patrick seemed content in Illinois, his son, James, was not. He became infected with gold fever and set out for Pikes Peak in 1859 at the age of twenty-one.

James, like thousands of other gold miners, found that striking it rich in the hills was not as easy as he thought. However, he learned quickly that gold miners, rich or poor, need a place to drink and spin yarns. As a result, James began a long career as a saloon owner. By 1865 James Gilmore had become known as James Hogle, the reasons for which we do not know completely.

The saloon business brought James to Salt Lake City in 1871. His establishment soon became the most popular in town. He used his profits wisely and carefully invested in local real estate and numerous mining ventures. By the turn of the century he had amassed a fortune.

The Hogle family estate was built further by James’s son, James A. Hogle. The success and prominence of James A. is attributable to more than the determination and shrewdness he gained from his father. His mother, Ida Elizabeth Hogle, saw to it that he received a first-rate education, graduating from Yale and Columbia universities. With this training he became a mining consultant and stockbroker. James A. Hogle and Company eventually had branch offices in many parts of the West.

James A. married Mary Copely, one of the most fascinating women in early twentieth-century Utah history. It was Mary and James A. who donated their Emigration Canyon farm to Salt Lake City for the establishment of a city zoo.

The book provides a delightful jump into Utah and western American history through the lives of four generations of Hogles. The description of the education of James A. at St. Paul’s in New Hampshire in the 1890s is excellent. Also fascinating is the story of the Mary Hogle Foundation and its battle with the medical establishment and the Federal Trade Commission.

Though I enjoyed the book very much and recommend it to others, there were a few minor instances of historical error. For a few examples,
McDonough attributes the Panic of 1857 to the passage of the Tariff of 1857, states that the Civil War started in 1860 and, claims the Emancipation Proclamation came at the end of the war. All are inaccurate. I also was disappointed in the lack of footnotes; however, McDonough states that the book was meant "for the general reader rather than the historian" and therefore intentionally left the footnotes out.

**MICHAEL E. CHRISTENSEN**
Salt Lake City

Utah Historical Quarterly

These concerns are relatively minor. The book is well written and for the most part well researched and informative. Anyone interested in reading about the rise of a prominent Utah family and its impact on the state will enjoy reading *The Hoges*—I did.


With their book law professors Edwin Brown Firmage (University of Utah) and Richard Collin Mangrum (Creighton University) have attempted to fill a rather large hole in published LDS history. They have provided a single volume with an exhaustive and near complete discussion of all the judicial conflicts involving the LDS church. While the book is not for the casual reader, it is an important reference work that should be in the library of any serious historian of the Mormon movement.

The authors should sound familiar. Professor Firmage has been on the UU law faculty since 1966 and regularly appears on national television as a constitutional law expert. He is the grandson of Hugh B. Brown and recently edited Brown's memoirs, published last year by Signature Books. His article "The Judicial Campaign against Polygamy and the Enduring Legal Questions" in *BYU Studies* in 1987 is an interesting reflection on the substantive content of this book. Professor Mangrum has been on the Creighton law faculty since 1979. His articles have previously appeared in Mormon quarterlies. Both authors are extensively published in law reviews.

Their book is divided into three parts. The first is headed "Early Mormon Legal Experience" and discusses legal harassments of Joseph Smith, Jr., and his followers through the Nauvoo period. It also traces the beginnings of the ecclesiastical court system, the later stages of which are discussed in the final section.

The second section deals with federal attacks on the LDS community in Utah Territory, concluding with the chapter "The War against Mormon Society." One of the current gaps in Mormon letters is an informed study of the use of the federal judiciary, actually abuse in many instances, to force Mormon assimilation into mainstream American society. It was a period when accepted constitutional guarantees were often dispensed with to meet the passionate public denouncement of Mormon life. Here the authors provide a basic discussion of the main congressional anti-Mormon acts and many of the over one hundred reported appellate decisions that came out of the struggle, mostly in the late 1880s and early 1890s. Each of the dozen U.S. Supreme Court opinions on plural marriage that followed *Reynolds v. United States* in 1879 are ex-
amined. Criminal lawyers will be surprised at the lax evidentiary standards and denial of due process that were approved by the appellate courts in these cases. The absence of a single legal bibliography and the publisher’s failure to use proper legal citations is a disappointment, but the book still gives enough information to locate any of the opinions in a good law library.

The authors’ approach in this section is that of legal scholars, which they are. They examine the arguments, the inconsistencies, and the application of the various legal rules applied to Mormon defendants. Any discussion of external pressures or the more colorful historical characters involved in these cases is left for another work. For instance, Franklin S. Richards, a key figure as church counsel from 1879 until his death in 1934, comes in for only two references in the book. This is unfortunate, but given the very broad scope of the book that kind of social history is probably not possible.

Part three is an extremely interesting discussion of the far-reaching ecclesiastical court system that developed in the Great Basin. It is a further development of Professor Mangrum’s excellent article “Furthering the Cause of Zion: An Overview of the Ecclesiastical Court System in Early Utah” in the 1983 Journal of Mormon History. It draws from unusually broad access to church court records in the LDS Archives. The section discusses the resolution of divorces in plural families, commercial disputes, land and water rights, torts, and a variety of other conflicts.

Researchers will appreciate the fact that the book provides extensive endnotes and the authors’ thorough bibliography. This book is obviously the product of years of research.

This book can be demanding at times and presumes a fair amount of basic knowledge on the part of the reader. It is, however, an important work and likely will become a standard reference book for historians concerned with how the American majority responded to nineteenth-century Mormons as well as how pioneer Mormons governed themselves.

KEN DRIGGS
University of Wisconsin Law School

Two Worlds: The Indian Encounter with the European, 1492-1509. By S. LYMAN TYLER. (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1988. x + 258 pp. $25.00.)

S. Lyman Tyler’s Two Worlds is a fascinating account of the first sustained contact between Europeans and Native Americans in the New World. It is an oft-told story of Indian hospitality and Spanish greed, focusing upon the early voyages of Christopher Columbus and the Spanish occupation of Española (modern Haiti and the Dominican Republic). What gives Two Worlds its reason for being, however, is the way the story is told—through the words of the early European observers themselves. Those words reveal that the conquest of the New World remained tragically imprisoned within the shackles of Old World preoccupations and beliefs.

Tyler’s primary purpose is to “view the Indian through the eyes of contemporary observers, so that the Indian appears as he was seen at particular times and in particular places.” Secondly, he wants “to enable the reader to visualize the Spaniard as he was portrayed by contemporaries in the Caribbean islands, so that the reader can understand the observer and can place his description of the Indian in the proper perspective” (p. 3). To do so,
Tyler presents extended excerpts from three major texts: Dominican friar Bartolomé de las Casas's abstract of Christopher Columbus's journal, which has been lost; Las Casas’s own monumental Historia de las Indias; and Antonio de Herrera y Tordesilla’s General History of the Continent and Islands of America, Commonly Call’d the West Indies, etc., to 1531.

The book’s strength is the immediacy of those texts. We see Columbus’s sense of wonder about the new lands quickly overwhelmed by his need to justify the expense of the expeditions. We see how easily the Spanish crown’s desire to protect the Indians was subverted by the gold fever of Spanish colonists. Above all, we see the vulnerability of Native American society in the face of European weapons and the Iberian ideology of conquest. Wooden spears were no match for fighting dogs or armored horsemen steeled by the campaigns of the Reconquista.

Unfortunately, however, Tyler does not provide the scholarly apparatus that would have made Two Worlds a critical edition of the texts themselves. First, the excerpts are not placed in the context of what was left out. Unless the reader is familiar with the complete versions, he or she has no idea how representative the excerpts are. Secondly, the book is underannotated, containing very little information about the geography of the Caribbean or the ethnology of the Native Americans living there. More detailed footnotes and more extended introductions would have made the texts far more illuminating than they are now.

More disturbing is the virtual absence of any critical commentary about the accuracy of the observers themselves. Two Worlds relies heavily upon the perceptions of Las Casas, who was, without question, a sincere defender of the Indians. Nevertheless, scholarly controversy still rages about the Dominican crusader’s portrait of Arawak society, his estimates of Indian population, and his bitter condemnation of his Spanish contemporaries. Yet Tyler discusses this controversy in a woefully inadequate fashion. As a result, Two Worlds must be read with care. When used with other, more informed sources, the book does, indeed, offer a “window on both the Spanish and Indian worlds.” When consulted alone, however, it merely perpetuates the Black Legend of unbridled Spanish cruelty and greed.

THOMAS E. SHERIDAN
Arizona State Museum
Tucson

A Stranger in Her Native Land: Alice Fletcher and the American Indians. By Joan Mark. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988. xx + 428 pp. Cloth, $35.00; paper, $16.95.)

As Joan Mark notes, Alice Fletcher belonged, along with Frank Cushing, F. W. Putnam, and others, to that early generation of “lost anthropologists” who dominated the last two decades of the nineteenth century (xiii). Mark’s biography of Fletcher, A Stranger in Her Native Land, is an attempt at feminist biography that examines an individual woman within the context of gender oppression and the resultant struggles that shaped her life.

Fletcher’s life, according to Mark, was characterized by two themes: her lifelong battle against male authority and power in her professional and personal life and her feeling of being a
stranger in America—a person without roots to the land. Combining her interest in women’s rights with the fate of the “vanishing Redman,” Fletcher launched her career in ethnography under the tutelage of Frederick W. Putnam of the Peabody Museum. As an ethnographer Fletcher wanted to record American Indian culture before it disappeared, as she believed it inevitably would. She avidly supported the Friends of the Indian movement, which sought the eradication of Indian culture and the destruction of the tribal estate. To her mind, contemporary Indians should ignore their past and seek total immersion in the melting pot. From Fletcher’s perspective, only professional white anthropologists could study the Indian past, since they alone were capable of understanding it (p. 267).

Fletcher’s desire to record a culture that she regarded as fossilized led her to fieldwork with the Sioux, Nez Perce, and, especially, the Omahas. Assisted by Francis La Flesche (the son of an important Omaha tribal leader who became her translator and adopted son), she produced an ethnographic study of the Omahas while, at the same time, carrying out allotment as an agent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fletcher’s ability to observe and faithfully record, with just the right touch of condescending affection, the culture of the Omahas as she oversaw the oblation of their traditional way of life provides an enlightening case study of intellectual schizophrenia. Perhaps Fletcher’s very “rootlessness” and lack of strong attachment to her own past allowed her to dismiss the Omahas’ culture as unimportant to them. Some of her opinions changed under the influence of La Flesche, but he broke with Fletcher over her ethnocentrism and his own growing opposition to assimilation.

Fletcher’s feelings of animosity toward traditional Omaha culture were typical of white reformers of her time. Yet, much of her treatment of Indians may be explained by her struggle against male oppression, which can be traced all the way back to her abusive stepfather. Fearing and resenting males in positions of power, she employed coquettishness as a means of winning sympathy and fair treatment from them (p. 13). At the same time, she regarded Indians as backward children and did not object to adopting a patronizing and even tyrannical attitude toward her Indian associates. Did Fletcher employ against Indians those tactics of dominance that had been used against her, or was she simply venting her resentment of and frustration with men on less threatening targets, her Indian subjects? Neither conclusion would be comfortable, and it is no criticism of Mark that she leaves such decisions to her readers.

Joan Mark’s biography of Alice Fletcher is well written and copiously documented. A Stranger in Her Native Land is a revealing portrait of Victorian womanhood and of the unfortunate consequences of both the sexism and ethnocentrism that dominated that era.

**JODYE LYNN DICKSON SCHILZ**
*Mankato State University*

---

*Myth and the History of the Hispanic Southwest.* By **DAVID J. WEBER.** (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988. xii + 179 pp. $27.50.)

Historians of the Anglo frontier have often ignored the study of the Spanish Borderlands, but as United States–Latin American relations have
become more controversial in recent times, Borderlands studies have acquired a renewed importance among scholars and the general public alike. Borderlands studies began with Herbert Eugene Bolton and continued through the efforts of scholars such as Lawrence Kinnaird, Donald E. Worcester, John Francis Bannon, and others. In Myth and the History of the Hispanic Southwest one of today's leading specialists, David J. Weber, explores southwestern myths and realities to demonstrate how their interaction produces the image of the Borderlands in the American mind.

Weber begins by noting that non-specialists have largely misunderstood the Hispanic Southwest. Traditional Borderlands history begins with Coronado and ends at 1821. As Donald E. Worcester has written, however, the study of Chicano history is an extension of the field that Bolton established. Worcester insists that Borderlands studies include the demographic expansion of Iberian civilization—including the arrival of Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexicans in the United States. While Weber and Worcester recognize the continuity of the Hispanic frontier, they observe that the Borderlands was also a process by which the Hispanic frontier expanded and coalesced. Many authors such as Ellwyn Stoddard have come to include ecology, culture, ethnohistory, and political issues within the scope of Borderlands studies.

In one of his nine essays in this collection, "Turner, the Boltonians, and the Borderlands," Weber makes the excellent point that disciples of Frederick Jackson Turner have largely ignored ethnic minorities, preferring instead to see the Anglo-American frontier experience as uniquely white. On the Anglo frontier Turner noted that Europeans had to become Indianized before they could become Americans. Indians themselves, however, were excluded from the evolutionary process. By comparison, in the Spanish Borderlands, as Weber and other Boltonians point out, Spaniards not only learned Indian culture but also included Indians in Spanish institutions. Silvio Zavala and Oakah Jones have also noted that democratic government spread rapidly on the northern frontier of New Spain, far from the central power in Mexico City.

The relative unimportance given the Borderlands in Anglo-American historical tradition is, as Weber sees it, the fruit of provincialism. He notes that writers of American frontier history have looked at the West as a realm of Anglo expansion only and have dismissed the Borderlands as mere local history. As Weber points out, a student of standard frontier history would "gain the impression that Anglo-Americans were playing the only game in town" (p. 94). Weber decries the failure of historians to deal in biographical studies of Spanish frontiersmen, fur traders, soldiers, and other heroic figures. The inherent danger in such provincialism is that students are left with impressions of the Borderlands and, indeed, all of Latin America, that impede and even warp their perception of its role in American history and culture. It is this deficiency Weber masterfully seeks to overcome.

Myth and the History of the Hispanic Southwest is a milestone in the historiography of Borderlands studies. Weber's writing is enjoyable and concise and his work is thoroughly footnoted. The author and his publisher have put together an attractive volume that will serve scholars of Borderlands studies for years to come.

THOMAS F. SCHILZ
Mankato State University
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