

with petitions, rallies, and a national network of various antipolygamy groups. Iversen explores the way antipolygamy split the already fragile suffrage movement. In the 1882 Edmunds Bill, for example, Mormon women were disfranchised as well as polygamous men, and antipolygamists (who were often suffragists) could not agree on whether disfranchising Mormon women was a step forward for moral womanhood or a defeat for woman suffrage.

Iversen has clearly read widely in Mormon history and U.S. women's history, and is aware of the major historiographical issues in both fields. One of her richest chapters explores the discourse of antipolygamy; like Givens, she uses fiction and "proto-pornographic" anti-Mormon tracts as windows to understand the anxieties of American culture (135). Iversen follows the story through the early twentieth century to examine how antipolygamy discourse changed. Whereas the antipolygamy campaigns of 1882 and 1898 flourished and attracted widespread popular support, women's efforts to expel Reed Smoot from the Senate in 1905 failed because

the discourse of Victorian womanhood had shifted. In its place, Iversen, drawing on the work of Gail Beder- man, argues a "masculine backlash" appeared which heralded the strength of manliness as the crux of civilization. President Theodore Roosevelt publicly defended Smoot and Mormonism in a national magazine, much to the disappointment of antipolygamy activists. Antipolygamy soon faded as a national preoccupation "because its fundamental assumptions about womanhood and marriage were themselves transformed" (255).

Iversen's book is not as theoretically nuanced as Givens's, and many of the complex issues she raises could use further development. However, it is clearly presented and impressively researched in both primary and secondary material. (Unfortunately, its \$60 price tag may keep it out of reach for individual readers.) Both Iversen and Givens have made great contributions to our understanding of anti-Mormonism as a test case for larger issues, such as the construction of heresy and the framing of gender discourse.

Celebrating Utah's Centennial

Charter for Statehood: The Story of Utah's State Constitution. By Jean Bickmore White. (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1996).

Reviewed by M. Guy Bishop, adjunct instructor of Utah history, Salt Lake Community College.

CHARTER FOR STATEHOOD chronicles Utah's constitutional history from its territorial days through the present. Dr. White, emeritus professor of political science at Weber State University, employs her vast skills in state and local history and constitutional law to

tell the often intriguing and occasionally frustrating tale of Utah's evolution from the generally distrusted Mormon commonwealth of Deseret through nearly fifty years of undesired territorial status to the final achievement of statehood in 1896.

Readers of *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* may wonder why this book, clearly Utah history, not, strictly speaking, Mormon history, is being reviewed here? I pondered this question myself at first. But, in many ways, Utah history and Mormon history are inextricably joined. Simply put: you can't have one, this reviewer concludes, without the other. True, the physical region that is today's Utah would exist with or without the Latter-day Saints, but would it really be the same place?

As Jean White makes abundantly clear throughout, the contributions of Mormon culture and beliefs are readily apparent in Utah's constitutional history from 1847 on. One fascinating aspect of *Charter for Statehood* which should appeal to both Utah and Mormon historians (it's my assumption that the two are divisible) is the author's thorough biographical sketches of the delegates to Utah's constitutional convention (see the appendix).

A majority of the delegates was, predictably, LDS. The non-Mormons ("gentiles") were dominated by the presence of mining interests, lawyers, and Protestant clergymen—notably Park City mining magnate Thomas F. Kearns, attorney Dennis Eichnor, and the Rev. George P. Miller, a Methodist Episcopal minister from Sevier County. The Mormon church was represented by several high-ranking churchmen like John Henry Smith,

Moses Thatcher, Presiding Bishop William B. Preston, and Brigham H. Roberts. Smith was unanimously elected to preside over the meeting. Many lower-ranking church leaders were also numbered among the delegates. These varied representatives—wealthy and middle class; Mormon and gentile; farmer, stockman, banker, and merchant alike—all primarily sought the attainment of statehood. None wished, in the author's words, to "jeopardize" this goal (54).

Of the Utah state constitution, White observes, "it clearly was a product of its time and place" (46). It diligently tried to address issues like the state's aridity (through favorable land and irrigation laws), concerns over natural resources (particularly water, minerals, and timber), the separation of church and state, and attempted successfully to bridge the often troubling gap between Utah's Mormon and non-Mormon residents.

White's concluding chapter, "Fitting the Constitution to the Future," addresses many issues of present interest to Utahns—taxation and revenues, funding of public schools, pay for state legislators, and the urban-versus-rural distribution of political power and the state's economic resources. The many efforts at constitutional revision, so evident in the twentieth century, are also treated in this chapter.

Charter for Statehood is generously illustrated with many appropriate, yet relatively unknown, photographs. It contains a selected bibliography of the topic which should prove useful for future students of Utah constitutional history. As part of the University of Utah Press's Centennial Series, this book provides a fine addition to the

state's one-hundred-year celebration. Jean Bickmore White and the press are to be congratulated on their efforts.

This book makes a solid contribution to the literature of Utah's statehood centennial.