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INTRODUCTION

On July 24, 1847, the first Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley led by Brigham Young. As the Latter-day Saints emerged from the mouth of a mountain canyon and caught their first glimpses of the Salt Lake Valley, Young surveyed the prehistoric lakebed and proclaimed, “This is the place.” These words became the most famous in Mormon history because they represented more than just one man’s opinion – they were sufficient in themselves to consecrate the new Zion.¹ Young was the president of the church, he alone had the authority to anoint valley as the future city of God. The moment that Young uttered these words, he changed the course of history.

The Mormons – urged into the American frontier by persecution at the hands of non-Mormon citizens – were searching for land where they could settle, free from the hostility of outsiders and establish the capital city of their religion.² The founder of the Church, Joseph Smith, had created the first plat of the city years before the Latter-day Saints arrived in the Salt Lake Valley.³ For the Mormons, Salt Lake City was a sacred city; theological ideas shaped space and informed decisions about urban planning.⁴ The city was platted to be an agricultural community, the streets cut the land into rectangular blocks of equal size, and each block was divided into equal lots.⁵

² Ibid.
⁵ Cecilia Parera
The emphasis was on communalism with every resident contributing to the greater community, each resident had a role to play in constructing and sustaining the city.⁶ The rectilinear plat was a representation of this egalitarianism in space. The plat was intended as a proscription for a certain lifestyle, one that valued community and religion above all else.⁷ As more settlers came to the region however, spatial, social and economic hierarchies began to develop.⁸

Those who had been members of the 1847 pioneer train received the best lands, those that arrived in following years received marginal lands that were less fertile.⁹ Additionally, Church officials and leaders were given more land in the most prestigious location: near the Temple. The Temple was and is, though not the geographic center of the city, the origin of the city’s planned axes; in other words, the Temple is bordered by East, West, South, and North Temple streets and one block in any direction yields 100 East, 100 West, 100 South, and 100 North respectively (see Appendix). So while progressive city development has yielded many more blocks to the south of the city, making the Temple no longer the physical geometric center of the city, the city is still oriented around the Temple, with every street and every address inextricably marked by its distance from the Temple. Thus lands nearer the Temple were more prestigious than those farther away. As the population of the valley grew, lands farther to the south, east, and west were settled, creating a radial hierarchy – with distance from the Temple inversely proportional to prestige.¹⁰

---

⁸ Ibid.
⁹ Ibid.
¹⁰ Ibid.
These rings of valuable land and the status associated with it would ultimately be ruptured and polarized around the turn of the century when the railroads opened up Salt Lake City to the rest of the nation.\textsuperscript{11} The railroads disrupted the isolation the Mormons had worked so hard to ensure by migrating into the western wilderness. The railroads brought in minority laborers and the Gold Rush brought business men and prospectors through and into the city.\textsuperscript{12} The railroad tracks that cut through the city along a few blocks to the West of the center of the city became the catalyst and site of the cleavage between the city as the Mormons had planned it and infectious capitalist impulses which created social and economic hierarchies in the region.\textsuperscript{13}

Factories, smelters, and granaries that enterprising businessmen built near the railroads in order to efficiently utilize the trains. The labor force for these industries similarly took residence near the tracks, on the west side of the city.\textsuperscript{14} The Central Business District developed just to the east of the industrial area, perfectly aligned with the Temple; thus non-Mormon establishments and commerce clustered around the religious center of the city.\textsuperscript{15} In this way, the city became economically as well as religiously centered around the same city blocks.\textsuperscript{16} The sudden presence of a large range of social, racial and economic classes in the city produced a separation of low-wage, racial minority laborers (on the west side of the city) and middle to upper class white residents (on the east side) that still persists today.\textsuperscript{17} The aim of this thesis is to
uncover the social and legal mechanisms that created – but more importantly maintained – this dichotomous organization of Salt Lake City’s residents.

Impetus for the project came from my own experiences growing up in Salt Lake City. I once recounted an anecdote about my friend’s dad almost calling the police simply for seeing Black teenagers in our almost exclusively white middle class neighborhood in my junior colloquium. This experience brought up questions regarding how certain places contain unspoken and viciously enforced rules regarding what kind of people may inhabit certain places. I became curious about the origins of these conceptions and regulations. Though the scope and aim of my project has changed substantially since then, a few of the resources remain critical to the project. Most notably, Martha Sonntag Bradley’s article “Colliding Interests: Mapping Salt Lake City’s Westside,” was a catalyst for the project. Bradley’s work inspired me to take an urban studies and geographical theory approach to the subject. I found the idea of mapping religious, economic and social pressures and interests into space particularly compelling, especially given my own experiences of how the west side of the city has been conceptualized in the minds of east side residents.

When I began my research I thought I would be able to trace property law in Utah and reveal some discriminatory practices which had created the stark residential segregation that is so pervasive in Salt Lake City. It took reading an entire treatise on Utah Real Property Law for me to realize that such blatantly discriminatory as I had expected, did not exist, nor was there really an easy way to find them if they ever did. Even more significantly, I discovered I was looking in the wrong place. I had had a
hunch that I might be able to find something in planning and zoning ordinances and what Utah State Code told me was that municipalities have control over their own zoning, which meant Salt Lake City itself was where I needed to be looking.

Still, as I approached examining planning documents, I had an expectation that somewhere in the initial city plans I would find, in very blatant language, some provision which articulated residential segregation by race. I soon realized that the law was more than just the text on a page. The law is about historical and social context, political contests, as well as popular understanding. Moreover, when the first planning documents were produced, when the first Master Plans for the city were created and ratified by the City Council, there was no need to explicitly exclude minorities from middle class or upper class neighborhoods. Economic factors had placed them in the regions near the lowest paying jobs and social policy had kept them in low wage jobs so they couldn’t afford to leave such areas. Additionally, if any family wanted to move into a “better” neighborhood, a “whiter” neighborhood and had the means to, they would have had to leave the safety of their racial enclaves, they would be, at best, ostracized by their neighbors and at worst, openly discriminated against or harassed.

It became clear that the racial segregation was never explicitly planned. It came about through other markers such as employment and class factors, both of which are structured by race. It was, however, maintained through city planning under the guise of organization and orderly expansion as well as through social pressures which kept racial and ethnic minorities in lower wage jobs and out of middle class neighborhoods. Since planning and zoning laws do not contain racially
explicit language, they appear to only deal with land use and building types, but their implications are farther reaching than those things.

Where I had thought I would find legal policy to keep minorities gathering in one geographical place, I instead found social and economic pressures that accomplished that job and legal policy that made it possible to continue those policies without having to resort to overtly bigoted language. The selectivity of these laws is illustrated in the way that certain ethnic and racial minority groups have been allowed to move into middle class neighborhoods on the “right” side of the tracks as they have been accepted as white, or nearer to white than other, newer or darker, immigrants. I found it surprising that segregated groups changed over time, that their disenfranchised position was mutable and inconsistent. I had more or less assumed that the targeted groups would be the same ones I had witnessed being disenfranchised in my own lifetime, namely Hispanics, Blacks, and Pacific Islanders.

I began with Utah State Code and a treatise on Utah Real Property Law. I learned that planning and zoning are the jurisdiction of municipalities under Utah law and therefore I would need to look at Salt Lake City’s laws and governmental bodies. Additionally, a law librarian suggested I look at restrictive covenants which, although I did not find many useful primary sources, lead me to an excellent article by Polly Hart on class divisions and restrictive covenants in Salt Lake City in the early 20th Century.18 Hart discussed the creation of suburban subdivisions and the institution of restrictive covenants in those subdivisions in order to keep racial minorities out.

After the law library, I began to investigate the resources available at the Utah State Archives. I chose to begin at the beginning – with city development; I traced the city’s growth through the use of Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, which the Historical Society keeps on microfilm. These maps gave me a basic understanding of how the city developed but not who was living where, only that the city flourished rapidly and residential areas grew quickly near the train tracks as well as on the east side. After establishing at least a basic understanding of how Salt Lake City’s various residential areas developed, I turned to planning documents. Through the State Archives I was able to look at planning documents from the initial commissioned report up through the 1980s.

In 1918, Salt Lake City’s City Council commissioned George Kessler of Missouri, a man of purported national reputation, to set out a rough plan for the city’s development. This set in motion a series of efforts to follow his recommendations as well as to incorporate public opinion and create comprehensive zoning ordinances for the city; additionally the City Council set to work creating a planning commission to oversee the implementation and evolution of such zoning ordinances. Over the years the Salt Lake City Planning Commission has produced several Master Plans, zoning ordinances, and revisions of the same. For a more detailed account of these efforts and developments, I read through the Salt Lake Municipal Recorder – a monthly publication which detailed the meetings of the city council, the ordinances they passed, and the projects they took up. These publications detailed the creation of the first master plans as well as the various boards and commissions which were set to
enforce and change them, namely the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the Board of Adjustment.

After studying the progression of planning in Salt Lake City in the 20th Century, I set about looking at the actual ordinances and zoning maps. I wanted to have an idea of how zoning laws and policies had evolved over the many years of their implementation. In order to accomplish this I went to the University of Utah Marriott Library Special Collections which held a number of zoning maps and extracts of zoning ordinances. These resources allowed me to create a chronology of the laws themselves to accompany the chronology of their creation. I discovered that – contrary to the ideal of simplicity which was purported to be essential in the early plans – zoning in Salt Lake City has become progressively more complex from its original imposition to its current state.

At this point in my research, I had collected as comprehensive an examination of zoning and planning in Salt Lake City as my resources would allow, so I turned to examining the histories of racial and ethnic minorities in Utah. A former employer, Greta DeJong, pointed me in the direction of Leslie Kelen, executive director at Center for Documentary Expression and Art in Salt Lake City. Kelen and Eileen Hallet Stone had collected oral histories of minorities in Utah. I read this in conjunction with Helen Papanikolas’s *Peoples of Utah*. Both were excellent and fairly comprehensive resources and together with some articles from Utah Historical Society publications such as Beehive History and Utah Historical Quarterly, I was able to put together a adequately comprehensive look at the minority experience in

---

19 Editor of a local publication, Catalyst Magazine, in Salt Lake City
Salt Lake City, the rise and fall of various ethnic and racial enclaves and a collection of anecdotal minority experiences. In order to complete the histories of specific enclaves such as Plum Alley (a small Chinatown) and Japan Town, I looked at contemporary newspaper articles which provided some information on their expulsion and efforts towards longevity.

These narratives of peoples and places enforced my understanding of the cyclical nature of Salt Lake City’s west side minority population in terms of economics and class and shifting ideas of race and exactly who is considered a minority, or other, by the white Mormon majority. Additionally, these narratives bring up the question of agency. Certain racial enclaves fell apart because certain groups chose to leave as they were accepted as white enough to join the middle and upper classes and move into nicer neighborhoods. Some enclaves fell apart as the city bought the land and disassembled the neighborhoods by force. These differences create interesting questions surrounding the reasons some enclaves are forcibly destroyed, the populations of those enclaves forced to integrate, while other minority groups remain segregated and others still are allowed to join the masses by choice.

With this thesis I am examining the geographical expression of a racial hierarchy. I am narrating how it came to be by explaining the socioeconomic, cultural, and legal mechanisms, which shaped it. To be clear, when I say describe legal means, I do not simply mean the black text that makes up a statute or ordinance, I also mean the manner in which those laws are enforced, their impact. In order to understand these mechanisms, we must understand the ideological background of the Mormons. We must understand their history and what they sought when the chose to
build Zion in the Salt Lake Valley. Much of the Mormon ideology was mapped into the city when it was first laid out. As the city expanded, religious and social beliefs and behaviors shaped the city. Unraveling these beliefs is essential to comprehending the development (and segregation) of Salt Lake City.

There are many things at play here. Race is unquestionably tied to class. Racial discrimination commonly manifests itself with disparities between socioeconomic classes. Racial minorities tend to be employed in lower wage jobs and thus live in higher densities in lower income neighborhoods. If we look deeper into the situation, however, we also see a dialogue between cultural expression, and the desire – if not necessity – to create communities, subspaces which provide feelings of unity and safety in an otherwise hostile city. Though outright hostility may not be what it was one hundred or even fifty years ago, there is still a rationale for living near people with the same cultural values and ideals. Racial enclaves were a product of internal draws to community and external pressures from the white majority, but racial enclaves cannot be understood without understanding the presence and lifecycles of other racial enclaves.

What we see in Salt Lake City is not the end game for this dialogue between social definitions of race and residential segregation. It is merely one stage of an ever-changing racial hierarchy. It is a geographical representation of contemporary racial lines. Traces still exist of the racial enclaves that existed before, leaving a visible map (and a hidden structure that inhibits geographical change) of a history of discrimination. I am examining the spatial evidence of discrimination, past and present. I am analyzing the significance of this spatial organization as it pertains to
the religious doctrine that created the city and its interaction with the law and social policy.

This thesis is organized into three chapters which build off each other chronologically and intellectually. In the first I explore the physical geography of the Salt Lake Valley, the Indigenous peoples native to the valley, and the history of the LDS religion prior to the Mormon pioneers entrance to the valley in 1847. I aim to do three things with this first chapter: to develop and understanding of how the land existed and how it was understood by the local Indigenous peoples before the Mormons; to give a theological and historical background for the LDS religion in order to establish an appreciation for the visions, ambitions, and anxieties the Mormon settlers had upon entering the Valley; and to demonstrate the process of negotiation between Mormon expectations, the physical geography of the land and Indigenous interests as well as how these factors affected the construction of Salt Lake City. The first chapter provides the background for understanding the tensions and motives present in the rest of the thesis.

The first chapter establishes the canvas upon which the second and third chapters build; the physical canvas of the land itself as well as the religious and intellectual overlays of the Mormon settlers. When the Mormons entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1847, they brought with them a highly ambitious set of expectations and dreams; their plans for and construction of Salt Lake City were inscriptions of those ambitions onto the land. The Mormons thus rewrote a land that was already storied and understood in a particular way by the Indigenous peoples of the region.
The concept of writing and rewriting land and space is critical to this thesis. The first chapter accounts for the base layer of this rewriting by describing the land as it existed and as the Indigenous peoples understood it before the Latter-day Saints arrived and how the Saints inscribed their own set of beliefs to that same land and ultimately, by taking control of that land, asserted the superiority of their stories over those that previously existed.

The first chapter introduces Salt Lake City as a religious “project,” and its significance as such. In using the term “project” to describe Salt Lake City, I refer to its role as an imagined space with a particular set of associations and values as well as its significance as a settler colonial city. Religiously speaking, Salt Lake City was, for the Latter-day Saints, meant to be the world capital of their religion and thus had to perfectly represent the values of the church. It was an ongoing process of highly intentional planning and interpellation of values in space. The project of Salt Lake City was the process of actualizing the Saints’ religious expectations in the physical city, the striving toward a particular image, the realization of a holy city. The ambitions for Salt Lake City were grand and the Saints were highly invested in its success. Furthermore, in order to achieve their religious goals, the Mormons had to first assert that the land was indeed theirs to build on. This assertion of proprietary ownership implicated the Saints as settler colonials; the tactics and strategies they employed in order to establish themselves as the true owners and inhabitants of the land are also discussed in this chapter. These interests had a significant impact on the social structure of the city, governing who was an acceptable resident and who was not. These social pressures in turn manipulated the geography of the city.
In the second chapter I discuss the various racial and ethnic enclaves that formed in Salt Lake City, who lived in each, where the neighborhoods were built, and why they lived in those locations. This is, in many ways, another iteration of altering the way the land – or at this point the city – is spatially understood. The very presence of these minorities undercut the theological paradigm the city hoped to embody. The second chapter explores Chinese, Japanese, Greek, Italian, Jewish, Black, Mexican and Pacific Islander communities. Each community is explored in terms of the discrimination they faced and the ways in which their different outsider positions were established and enforced by the white Mormon majority. This chapter, unlike the first and last chapters, does not engage with many intellectual or critical theories; rather, its purpose is to provide the necessary background regarding the presence and movement of minority populations and the development of their neighborhoods in Salt Lake City to thoroughly engage with the legal and analytical material of the third chapter. In order to understand the full force of the legal structures explored in the third chapter, it is necessary to have a historical and racial mental map of the city – that is the task of the second chapter.

In the final chapter, I explore the role planning and zoning practices played in the creation and maintenance of this dichotomous racial geography as well as the significance of this geography. The geographical orientations developed in the second chapter are essential to comprehending the full effects of the laws, policies, and practices in this chapter. The third chapter also situates Salt Lake City’s planning and zoning tactics within the national history and racist origins of planning and zoning practices. Planning and zoning has a long and racially significant history in the United
States. Land use regulation and zoning ordinances became popular methods of urban organization in the early 1900s; the organization of various kinds of land usage was quickly used for social rather than practical concerns – to arrange cities along racial lines.\(^{21}\)

In the third chapter I also develop the significance of Salt Lake City’s racial geography in terms of racial identity formation as well as social and economic discrimination. This part of the third chapter draws on two critical families theories. Primarily, racial formation theory, as first developed by Michael Omi and Howard Winant and theories regarding spatial identities – predominantly what Karin Aguilar San-Juan has coined “place making.”\(^{22}\) In Omi and Winant’s pivotal work *Racial Formation in the United States*, they argue that racial categories are politically, economically and socially produced. Omi and Winant assert that racial ideas pervade society in the United States and thus shape political action. Significantly, Omi and Winant discuss how racial categories evolve as the political, economic, and social forces that configure them change. The malleability of racial categories is critical to understanding the shifting racial geography of Salt Lake City. Just as racial categories are not fixed, neither is the racial shape of the city.

I engage this theory with place-making as developed by Aguilar San-Juan in her book *Staying Vietnamese in America* in which she compares two Vietnamese-American communities in Boston and Orange County in order to explore the effects


of space and place-making on identity formation. \textsuperscript{23} Aguilar San-Juan defines place-making as the transformation of buildings and streets into a particular “lived world that draws together territory, culture, history, and individual perceptions.” \textsuperscript{24} Through the application of ideas and perceptions to space identities become projected onto spaces and those that inhabit those spaces. In this way, I argue, place making is a racial formation project in the sense of Omi and Winant’s theory. The legal mechanisms with which these spaces were racially and economically segregated are therefore implicated in a process which defines race by locating it geographically within the city. I further argue that this racial formation project is an extension of the settler colonial pressures discussed in the first chapter.

In summary, the first chapter develops the colonial, racial, spatial and theological pressures that act as the background for the following two chapters. The second chapter provides the chronological evolution of Salt Lake City’s racial geography which both reflects the persistence of the impulses explored the first chapter while simultaneously providing the necessary geographical background for comprehending the third chapter. The final chapter demonstrates how the pressures from the first chapter are represented in the planning of the city and how these ideas endure through the implementation of planning and zoning practices.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{24} Karin Aguilar San-Juan, \textit{Little Saigons: Staying Vietnamese in America}, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009). 6
DESERET:
Early Ideological and Spatial Negotiations

*I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert*
- *Isaiah 43:19*

The land that the Mormon pioneers beheld when they entered the Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847 was in fact still under Mexican jurisdiction. Only a few Spanish – and later Anglo-American – explorers and trappers had passed through the valley however.¹ The Mormons were most likely aware that they were settling in lands outside the United States; this was preferable because they would not be subject to legal restriction and persecution at the hands of the US government.² By mid-September, two months after the Mormons arrived in Salt Lake City, the Americans took Mexico City ending the Mexican-American war. With the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, the Mormon settlement officially became a part of the United States.

Unlike other contemporaneous settler projects – in which settlement patterns were determined predominantly by convenience and executed chaotically – the Mormons had a concrete plan for how the area they claimed should be peopled and

organized. Brigham Young intended to create a large network of outposts and colonies. The original goal was to create this network in such a way that Mormons could lay claim to a majoritarian share of the recently acquired western lands. The Mormons quickly set up an informal government, with Brigham Young as the governor of the settlement. The church had substantial control over the pioneers and therefore had little, if any, trouble setting up the systematic distribution of people to land and selecting people for provisional government positions. Those who had joined the church and agreed to journey into the wilderness to begin with had already submitted to the authority of the church leadership. Furthermore, these individuals were not likely to challenge the only structural authority they had in an unfamiliar and potentially dangerous land. Some scholars postulate that westward moving frontier settlements were characterized by a dependence on the law because other forms of social control were essentially absent (such as religion or family); the Mormon settlement in contrast, was characterized by its religious purpose, and therefore religion became the dominant form of social control. In the face of danger and uncertainty, settlers unquestioningly entrusted their wellbeing to whatever authority was present, in this case the church hierarchy. Additionally, those that chose to make the pilgrimage into the wilderness in there interest of the church were not likely to undermine the project in which they had willingly enlisted themselves.

4 Ibid.
The vision of the LDS Church in 1847 included land as far north as the Columbia watershed in present-day Idaho, as far east as the continental divide in Colorado; as far was as the Sierra Nevada; and as far south as the Gila River which was, at the time, the border with Mexico.6 Brigham Young christened this great expanse of land “Deseret,” a word from the book of Mormon for honeybee, “symbolizing the industriousness of the ideal society.”7 Deseret was to be a land in which all the settlements, and all the individuals, worked in harmony – worked as a hive – all members working for the good of the community and doing the work of God. Almost immediately, pioneers were sent to the far reaches of this territory, creating settlements in Las Vegas and the San Bernardino Valley.8

In 1848 the Mormon Council voted to petition congress for territorial status.9 Delegates from the colony left for Washington in May of 1849.10 John Bernhisel, the delegate who would play the most substantial role in the petitioning process, arrived in in New York City in October of 1849. When he arrived, a letter from Utah was waiting for him. The Church leadership had changed its mind and decided to petition for statehood rather than territorial status.11 The reason for this change in ambition is not clear, though it is likely that the Mormons wished to have more independence from the federal government, to elect their own leaders and be on equal footing with

---

6 D.W. Meinig, 198
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid. 198-201
10 Ibid. 10
11 Ibid. 16-17
other states in the nation.\textsuperscript{12} Had the Mormons been successful in their application for statehood, the state of Deseret would have been the largest state in the nation.\textsuperscript{13}

In early 1850, Bernhisel, had a series of meetings with Stephen A. Douglas who was a chairman of the Senate committee on territories. Douglas disliked the name “Deseret,” and insisted on the name “Utah” in deference to Ute Indians that resided in territory – who by this time had become nationally known through the writings of regional trappers and explorers.\textsuperscript{14} The Ute Indians were infamous for their influence in the region, likely the federal government was more concerned with keeping relations with the Utes relatively amiable than giving the Mormons the satisfaction of naming their proposed state. Furthermore, the word “Deseret,” specifically came from the Book of Mormon, a document that the nation as a whole had little respect for, surely the federal government was not eager to allow a state to have such a name.

Douglas also indicated that Congress would substantially reduce the proposed boundaries of Deseret.\textsuperscript{15} Mormons were not – and would never be – popular with the federal government and Congress had no intention of allowing the Mormons to create such a large state on the fringes of the country where the government would have little control. As a territory, the federal government would have control over the governing officials rather than allowing residents to elect them if statehood was granted. This failure on the part of Congress to accommodate the Mormon proposal

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. 18
was a good indication that the country was not going to shape itself geographically any more than socially around the Mormons. The nation did not trust Mormons and, what they viewed as their “degenerate lifestyles;” Mormons were seen as polygamists at best and sacrilegious revisionists at best. As much as it must have pleased the Gentiles that the Mormons had settled on the edge of the United States, the federal government undoubtedly felt better maintaining some level of control over these perceived deviants; social pressure and persecution had pushed Mormons to the fringe, and the federal government would keep them from gaining too much independence. The nation was operating under the dichotomous desire to shut out the Mormons while keeping them from gaining too much power or autonomy, especially in their newly acquired western lands.

In September 1850, President Fillmore signed the substantially reduced borders of Utah territory into law. Bernhisel now had an even more challenging task: to convince the president to keep the church leadership in territorial government positions. Bernhisel, with the argument that the Saints should be able to elect their leadership, rather than being prescribed leadership by the federal government, managed to secure Brigham Young as the governor of the territory, but most of the other positions were assigned to politicians from other states.

Territorial status meant that the Mormon colonies were firmly enmeshed in the federal government. As Mormonism – more specifically polygamy – became more and more of a national cultural and political issue, tensions with the federal

---

16 Meinig, 201
17 The Mormon word for a non-Mormon
18 Christopher B. Rich
19 Peter Crawley
20 Peter Crawley, 19-20
government increased.\textsuperscript{21} During the first Republican National Convention in 1856, slavery and polygamy were named the “twin relics of barbarism.”\textsuperscript{22} In 1857, the tensions culminated in the dispatch of a federal army toward Utah to quell a rumored rebellion which was fabricated out of the national reputation of Mormons as disloyal to the government due in large part to their polygamist practices.\textsuperscript{23} The Mormons were determined to resist this intervention; Brigham Young, in an attempt to concentrate his resources, called in all the settlers of outposts near and far. At the end of the affair, the federal government was able to put on a spectacle of force without blood shed and with minimal effect on the Mormons. However, no effort was made to reoccupy the outposts which had been abandoned.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, ten years after the instigation of the plans for the great Deseret hive, the Mormon population was more or less concentrated in the Great Salt Lake Valley. This shrunk what was a multistate religious project down to the size of one frontier city. This means all the pressure, all the expectations, for the New Zion were concentrated into the Salt Lake Valley. All the energy and organization that was meant for the state of Deseret was thus condensed into a small region. Salt Lake City became the only region in the world that served as the capital for the Mormon religion; a city planned, built, developed, and operated by the LDS Church. Furthermore Salt Lake City would be the only city in the world to serve as the capital for the church (platted and built by the church) and therefore had to represent the church’s ideals perfectly. Salt Lake City – it’s design

\textsuperscript{21} D.W. Meinig, 201
\textsuperscript{22} Christopher B. Rich, 86
\textsuperscript{23} Kenneth Alford 77-78
\textsuperscript{24} D.W. Meinig. 201
and image – had to be representative of the Mormon faith and the values inherent therein.

Utah would not be admitted to the union as the 45th state until 1896, after the LDS Church accommodated national sentiment and officially renounced polygamy in 1890. Thus Mormons were forced to compromise on their theological tenets in order to gain the sovereignty granted by statehood. Utah today – though not the size it was originally imagined to be – is known as “The Beehive State.” The official state emblem is the beehive (which is the centerpiece of the state flag), the state insect is the honeybee, and the state motto is “Industry.” These symbols harken back to the original project of Deseret which persisted long after the federal government restricted its scope. These references to Deseret are incorporated directly into the state constitution, latent but powerful reminders of the ideology which gave birth to the modern state. Though the Mormons never achieved the state of Deseret they petitioned for they still had a chance to create the emblematic community they had dreamed of and the idea of that project remained alive in the early community of the Great Salt Lake City. In many ways, because of the disapproval of the federal government and the nation at large, efforts to create

The tensions between the Mormons’ desire for autonomous sovereignty and their simultaneous quest for recognition and validation illustrated in their early petition for statehood are emblematic of many of the central paradoxes and paradigmatic tensions explicated in this chapter. In fact, Utah’s fight for statehood

reveals deeper implications for the Mormon people which are more thoroughly investigated later in this chapter. Furthermore the manner in which the state the church coded Utah as Deseret in an effort to navigate federal pressures while continuing its larger project is representative of the inconspicuous way the Mormon ideology operated through time in spite of seeming to fade in order to placate the federal government. Among the themes examined in this chapter are those that engage with land and indigeneity; the interaction between settler colonialism and racial formation; and the intersection of religion, race, gender and sovereignty.

Understanding the linkages and tensions between these themes and how the Mormons embodied, fought, is the foundation for explaining the myriad mechanisms which created and maintained racial segregation in Salt Lake City. In order to appreciate the full implications of the racial geography of Salt Lake City, the full and complex ideologies which informed its creation must be thoroughly unraveled and elucidated.

In this chapter, I provide the historical and theoretical framework that informs much of the legal and analytical discussion of this thesis. The historical information provided in this chapter is essential to understanding Salt Lake City as an ideological project, specifically, a distinctly white Mormon project. In other words, the way the conception and construction of Salt Lake City was a manifestation of their religion, it was a settlement meant to embody and support their ideology tangibly in space. I argue that this background plays a significant role in the racial segregation of contemporary Salt Lake City; the ideological tensions that informed and confronted the Mormon settling of the Salt Lake Valley are firmly enmeshed in contemporary life in Salt Lake City.
In the first section of this chapter, I consider the Salt Lake Valley as it existed before the Mormons, and the Mormons as they lived before they settled in the Salt Lake Valley. I begin with describing the Salt Lake Valley as it existed before the Mormon pioneers arrived in 1847. It is important to understand how the land and the people that occupied the land existed prior to Mormon arrival so that the full implications of Mormon efforts can be understood. To this end, I discuss the land itself – its natural geography. This enhances the analysis of the Mormon vision for the land as a world capitol for their religion and the new American Zion – as they saw it: God’s chosen city on Earth. I also deal with the Indigenous peoples of Utah, their beliefs, subsistence practices and attachments to the land. Second, I offer a brief the history of Mormons before they reached the Salt Lake Valley. I expound their cultural origins, their distinctly New England Puritan roots, and their search for Zion. An understanding of the Mormon cultural history is critical to understanding the way Mormons viewed the Salt Lake Valley as well as their efforts to claim it as rightfully theirs.

After establishing the land before the Mormons and the Mormons before the land, I use the second section of this chapter to describe and analyze what happens when the two meet. In order to understand the strategies and investments or the white Mormon settlers, it is necessary to introduce the settler colonial analytic, specifically as Patrick Wolfe postulates it. Wolfe theorizes settler colonialism in relation to franchise colonialism and genocide. According to Wolfe, settler colonialism, like genocide, inherently includes elimination of the native population; however, present
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in settler colonialism but not necessarily included in genocide, is the impulse to destroy in order to replace. Settler colonialism eliminates the Indigenous population in order to assert their own indigeneity. It is this assertion of indigeneity that differentiates settler colonialism differs from franchise colonialism, where lands outside the imperial motherland are exploited for resources settler populations from the imperial power are not sent to colonize the foreign territory. Both genocide and settler colonialism, according to Wolfe, are organized around the grammar of race; they both pit certain groups against each other based on racial categories. These categories, however, are not static or inherent, they are “made in the targeting.” In other words, these projects of elimination mark racial categories in order to organize and subsequently erase.

In the classic example of Anlgo-European settlers colonizing the Americas, indigeneity was created and proclaimed in order to establish a difference and independence from the imperial mother-country – England. In this American example, the assertions of indigeneity did not stop with the thirteen colonies or even with the Revolutionary War, they continued right into the western frontier. Through elimination and the ideology of Manifest Destiny, Ango-Americans continued to eliminate native populations – often through frontier homicide – and establish themselves as America’s Indigenous population. Tactics of elimination are not always genocidal in the physical sense – they can include assimilation strategies as well.
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Assimilation strategies may include boarding schools with assimilation agendas, kidnapping, forced miscegenation, and laws requiring a certain percentage of Indigenous heritage to legally claim such an identity.\textsuperscript{33} Thus racial categories were created, as were the rules for belonging them, in order to serve the settler colonial population. Forced assimilation as well as laws regarding racial identity produce the same essential end that frontier homicide does: a cultural and ancestral extermination – they hides, if not erases, the histories that threaten the settler colonial population’s claim to indigeneity.

Settler colonialism is an ongoing process through which the settler colonial population is continuously asserting and defending their claim to indigeneity, it does not stop at the frontier – it carries on in mores subtle (often legal, bureaucratic and political) ways but always with the same motive of eliminating the prior indigenous alternative.\textsuperscript{34} This chapter is concerned with the early stages of this project in the Salt Lake Valley, specifically the ways the Mormon and Indigenous peoples interacted with one another on an ideological level as well as physical level. Additionally I argue that the Mormon settler project in Salt Lake City was, in many ways, a continuation of the Anglo-European colonial project in the thirteen colonies. I use the theoretical frameworks of settler colonialism and indigeneity as well as gender and racial formation – and the interaction between these frameworks – to inform this discussion.

In the final section of this chapter, I delve into the plans for the City of Zion as a theological project. I consider how it was designed, how it was constructed and the
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ideological background and implications of its design. In building Salt Lake City, the Mormons were attempting to rewrite the land. They were attempting to take a land which already had stories, erase those stories, and impose new stories upon it. The Mormons were engaged in a project of pulling Zion out of the wilderness. This project resulted in what one historian calls, “an ideology mapped in space.”\footnote{Martha Sonntag Bradley, “Colliding Interests: Mapping Salt Lake City’s West Side,” Journal of Urban History, 31, no. 1 (2004)} I investigate the paradoxes of the city – a city which was platted to propound egalitarianism but was peopled systematically to mirror the church hierarchy. Such tensions have been complicated in the years since early settlement, but they still play a fundamental role in the organization of the city.

Finally, I illustrate the interruption of this ideological spatial project. By 1870, Salt Lake City was linked to the rest of the nation by way of railroads.\footnote{Linda Sillitoe, A History of Salt Lake County, (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1996).} These railroads in addition to Salt Lake City’s geographical position made it the gateway city to western frontier. It was in many ways, a “fateful irony,”\footnote{D.W. Meinig, 209} that Salt Lake City, which began as an attempt to seek refuge and separation from the nation, became such a center for national migration and industry. In fact, while the Mormons had propounded the idea of industry as central tenet of their community, the explosion of industry in Salt Lake City is precisely what caused an influx of outsiders. The railroads punctured the theological bubble and interrupted the project by altering the integrity of the city’s population.
I. GENISIS

Before the Mormons arrived, the valley of the Great Salt Lake was an expansive high and dry prairies nestled at the foot of majestic mountain ranges. It extended twenty to thirty miles, bordered on three sides but mountains and on the fourth by a large salt-water lake. The valley was the floor of an ancient fresh water lake. A river cut through the valley from North to South, emptying into the lake. Water from snowmelt at the tops of the mountains ran down mountain canyons and created lush, grassy swamps at the base of the mountain ranges. Eventually these creeks found their ways into the larger river, and ultimately to the Salt Lake. Rainfall was only about seventeen inches a year, however, so the valley was mostly dry. The soil varied from gravel in the foothill, to clay in the valley.38

High in the mountains there were taller trees and evergreens but the foothills of the valleys were covered in tall dry grasses and small straggly scrub oak trees. Few, if any, trees grew in the valley.39 From most elevated points in the foothills one could see across the valley for miles, from one side to another: mountain range to mountain range to lake. It was not a naturally fertile land – much of the soil closer to the lake contained too much salt for agricultural use and the land was generally too dry with fertile borders on the various rivers and creeks that ran from the eastern mountains into the lake. Additionally the high salinity of the lake would not support a thriving fish population.

Thirty to forty miles southeast of the large salt water lake was a smaller fresh water lake. This lake was nestled much closer to the base of the eastern mountain
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range than it’s large salt-water counterpart. The land surrounding the lake enclosed by mountain ranges on the west and east. Water flowed from the canyons into this lake and flowed out the greater salt-water lake to the north west, which was at a slightly lower elevation. This constant in and out flow kept the water fresh. The lands surrounding this lake were more lush and supported grazing areas for herds of western Bison (until a severe weather and overhunting killed them off in the early 1800s). A variety of fish—suckers, chubs, and cutthroat trout—lived in the lake. No other area of the Great Basin was equal to this in its variety of aquatic resources. Because of these resources, this area was the most densely populated in the eastern portion of the Great Basin.

The Timpanogos Nuche—a branch of the Nuche tribe; Timpanogos refers to the rocky river in which they fished. According to their beliefs, they had been placed on their land by their creator. Nuche territory alone extended over most of modern day Colorado and Utah, it even included parts of what is now northern Arizona and New Mexico, a total of about 225,000 square miles. The Nuche did not understand their homeland in the same way that the incoming settlers would, as occupied or unoccupied or property that could be held, but as their homeland. Their relation with the land was infinite,
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they did not occupy the land in a permanent sense but moved through it in bands.\textsuperscript{47}

Their alimentary traditions were based in hunting in gathering, they did not find it necessary to demand yield from the soil; the land was not viewed a resource to be dominated and taken from, but a spiritual entity to be respected and adhered to.\textsuperscript{48} The Timpanogos River supported hundreds of people. In the spring, Nuche bands would gather in this area for a sacred springtime festival. The Nuche traveled in small bands of family groups in and around their vast territory, but the fast or famine food cycle encouraged social flexibility, at least within their own tribe.\textsuperscript{49}

To the northwest of the Nuche bands, in arid regions southwest of the salt-water lake lived another people: the Goshutes. Like the Nuche, the Goshutes do not have a migration story. According to Goshute beliefs, their people have always lived in the region southwest of the Great Salt Lake. Goshutes inhabited lands which were less fertile. They cultivated seeds from many different species of vegetables. They lived in a fragile balance, taking from the land all they could without exhausting or altering it. This land was simultaneously advantageous and inconvenient. It was harder to live on and it was isolated, but it was also protected from other tribes and, later, European explorers.\textsuperscript{50}

To the north and northeast of the Goshutes, lived the Shoshone people. The Shoshone were very skilled hunters and migrated seasonally in order to obtain food and other resources necessary for survival. Eventually the Shoshone would adopt the
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use of the horse in order to hunt larger game. Unlike the Nuche and Goshutes to the south, the Shoshone people were fortunate enough to avoid substantial contact with the Spanish in the early years of Spanish exploration.

These tribes, though different in their migration patterns, subsistence techniques, and specific spiritual beliefs, all had a very similar respect for family and relationship with the land. Family was the center of life for these Native Americans, and familial loyalty was the fabric of their societies. This is why tribes were often broken into smaller patrilineal family bands, but maintained contact and grouped together for certain celebrations or for special hunting parties. For the Nuche at least, religion had always been extremely individualistic in application. Group assemblies and rituals were not common, with the exception of the yearly Bear Dance.

For the Indigenous peoples, land was kin. Their homelands were extensive and their claim to them was not proprietary in nature nor was it dependent on sedentary settlement. In fact, seasonal migration was often critical to survival – especially for the Shoshone. Indigenous peoples lived in relation to the land, not in domination of it. They did not force the land to fit them, they moved to fit the land. Living on the land was more akin to living with the land, it was an existence based on mutual respect and accommodation.

The Nuche were engaged in the trade and politics of the Spanish settlers by the early seventeenth century, but contact was made primarily with the southern
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bands of the tribe. It is through this contact that the Nuche people receive the name “Yutas,” from the Spanish, later Anglicized to “Ute.” \(^\text{57, 58}\) Though some names for Indian tribes stem from derogatory descriptions of the tribe, the word “Yuta,” seems to just be loanword from an Indian language, it’s precise origin is uncertain. Similar names are found in a number of neighboring Indian languages, such as “Jicarilla yóta; Hopi yóta; Comanche yú’hta; Shoshone you tah; Southern Paiute yu’ta’ci.” \(^\text{59}\)

The introduction of the horse via contact with the Spanish changed the Ute way of life substantially. It allowed them to hunt bigger game and move through their vast homeland faster and more often. The Utes developed trade with the Spanish. The Spanish introduced the Utes to the violent slave trade, and the Utes quickly became predatory upon neighboring non-equestrian communities. The Utes captured members of these tribes and traded them to the Spanish for guns, horses and other goods. \(^\text{60}\) These Spanish-Ute relations gradually spread northward to the Timpanogos Utes. \(^\text{61}\) The Goshutes and Shoshones were frequent victims of the Timpanogos Ute’s economic ambitions. \(^\text{62}\) Ute hostilities gradually spread to the Spanish as well. \(^\text{63}\)

In the early 1800s, European and Euro-American explorers and fur trappers began to explore the region as well. Most of these trappers moved through Shoshone homelands, exhausting the region’s furs. These explorers also observed and wrote about the Ute’s bellicosity towards other tribes and the Spanish in New Mexico. In
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this way, the reputation of the Utes as a magnificent and violent people spread to the United States.\textsuperscript{64} This reputation would have a significant influence on the early settlement patterns of the Mormon settlers when they entered the valley in 1847.

In 1820, while the Utes were capturing Great Basin Indians from neighboring tribes, a young man on the other side of the country, in upstate New York, had the first of many visions that would give birth to an entire religion. Joseph Smith, 14 years of age at the time, claimed the Holy Father and Son appeared to him as he prayed in a grove of trees on his father’s farm in Manchester, New York. Between 1823 and 1827 he was visited several times by the resurrected Moroni who revealed the existence of ancient golden plates from which Joseph was to translate and construct the Book of Mormon. In March 1830, the first printed copies of the Book of Mormon were made available in Palmya, New York. One month later, the Church of Latter-day Saints was officially organized in Fayette, New York – though Joseph Smith would not give it that name until 1838. According to Smith, around the 1831 New Year, the Lord called the Mormons to move to Ohio. Six months later, Smith said the Lord had revealed the site of the City of Zion: Independence, Missouri.\textsuperscript{65} This vision begins what would become a massive migration, fueled by persecution, into the American frontier.

The Book of Mormon – a text of complex and frenetic genealogies – is ultimately a narrative that migrates the sacred drama of the Bible from the Holy Land
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to North America. According to the Book of Mormon, the descendants of Lehi flee to America before Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem. The descendants of Lehi’s sons, Nephi and Laman, fragment into antagonistic groups, the Nephites and Lamanites. The dark-skinned Lamanites lived nomadically while the fair-skinned Lamanites built great cities. The two groups alternate roles as the righteous and the wicked. Ultimately, the Lamanites revert to idolatry and villainy; the Lamanites extinguish all the virtuous Nephites along with the last vestiges of Christianity. The last of the Nephite scribes, Moroni, records the history on gold tablets and hides them. The Book of Mormon identifies these Lamanites as the Indigenous peoples of North America. The Book of Mormon identifies America as the new promised land, the land promised by God to Joseph’s descendants. As Peter Coviello argues, the Mormon project, then, may be understood as a theological cosmology that aims to indigenize Christianity; specifically, Mormonism seeks to indigenize Christianity to the America, to its peoples and its land. By moving the site of biblical drama from the Middle East and implicating Indigenous peoples in the story, Mormonism reorients Christianity and its subjects to America.

In many ways Mormonism mirrored the Puritanism of the New England region from which it emerged. Both Joseph Smith, the founder of the LDS Church, and Brigham Young, the man who lead the LDS pioneers into the frontier after
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Smith’s assassination were born in Vermont.\textsuperscript{71} New England culture was indelibly tied to the Puritan Protestant colonial project. The Puritans left England in order to establish a more perfect religious community in America. John Winthrop’s infamous assertion that the Massachusetts Bay colony would be a “city upon a hill,”\textsuperscript{72} with the eyes of God and all people upon the settlers. Winthrop believed that the Puritans were going to America because God had brought them to America in order to, “overcome Satan…and dispossess him of his kingdom.”\textsuperscript{73} Therefore, through their religious beliefs and projects, they justified their settlement as sacred.

The Puritan city upon a hill is so similar to the Mormon project of building Zion, that one scholar has called Mormonism “an afterclap of Puritanism.”\textsuperscript{74} Both were religious projects in which the proponents believed God was on their side and that they were engaged in building a new community for God and the proper faith. Both used the term “gentile” to refer to those not engaged in their specific projects, however the Mormons altered the word by capitalizing it. Both were projects which attempted to bring paradise and divinity out of the frontier. Both were settler colonialist projects which asserted religious claims to lands which already supported Indigenous peoples.

Additionally, both projects emphasized communalism and egalitarianism which – at least on the surface – differed from the individual-driven, capitalist and imperialist motives which pushed the expansion of the American frontier. Likewise both suffered from internal paradoxes which undermined this purported communal
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project. Like Puritanism, Mormonism is based on a strict patriarchal and theocratical hierarchy. In Mormon settlements for example, top church leaders took plural wives in greater numbers than the two or three that were encouraged for ward bishops. Furthermore, they selected their lots of land first and always lived nearest the temple. (The spatial significance of Mormon town planning will be thoroughly explored later in the chapter.) In short Mormonism was, in many ways, not simply a product of Puritan culture but a continuation of the Puritan settler colonial project.

While Mormonism kept much of the Puritan paradigmatic framework, it also directly rejected and altered central tenets of Puritanism. While Mormonism directly opposes Puritanism by editing the original scripture, the most fascinating contradictions deeper within the implications of the religion. One of the most frontally heretical revelations of Smith is the assertion that God has a kind of biography; the assertion that God was a man who became a God. According to Smith, godhead is something that is achievable for all men; the most pious men can achieve godhead and become another Creator.

Furthermore, Smith challenged the Puritan belief that man lives in a fallen world. According to Smith, “some say the kingdom of God was not set up on earth until the day of Pentecost…But I say in the name of the Lord that the kingdom of God was set upon the earth from the days of Adam to the present time wherever there as been a righteous man on earth unto whom God revealed his word.” Smith was therefore in direct opposition to many Puritan theologists like Samuel Sewall who
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believed that man dies everyday in order to get closer to Christ. Smith on the contrary, believes in loving life, loving the pleasures of life. Peter Coviello argues, this is a central component of polygamy. Coviello argues that for Smith, “plural marriage [for men] is in essence the becoming-normative of the heavenly language of the body…it is for Smith the mode by which one might best live out the almost inconceivable fact that one is living in the body of a God not yet enlarged…It is a body that partakes of the enlargement, the fullness, above all the numerousness Smith so associates with godhead.”

In this way, Smith harkens back to Puritans such as Jonathon Edwards, for whom the sublime was a central tenet of divine light and understanding. Smith like Edwards holds the body to be a site of divine experience. Edwards’ dedication to the sublime, however, ultimately caused him to fall out of favor with the Puritans, and he never went so far as to suggest plural marriage. However, much of the United States saw Smith as he feared they would: an “all-too-ordinary man dressing up his foibles and frailties in sanctimony and godliness.” While some did convert to Mormonism, the majority were not understanding or tolerant.

In 1844, Smith was martyred at 38 years old in Illinois. After his death, Brigham Young took over the church and lead the Saints west, into the frontier and away from persecution. As the pioneers trekked across the American Midwest, they
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violated federal law and made treaties with Native Americans in Iowa to secure land to spend the winter before venturing into the Intermountain West.  

The Mormon pioneers set off into the North American wilderness with several significant beliefs. First, that they were believers of the true sacred text and that they were on the path to godhead. Second, that they were walking in the land guaranteed to them by divine covenant, that they were, in a sense, indigenous to the land they were traveling into even though they had never seen it before and did not understand it. Furthermore, they had witnessed tremendous violence and bloodshed and were seeking to escape to a land where they could build a safe community and do the work of God. So they ventured forward to reclaim and rebuild the promised land; they believed it was their providential duty to build a capitol for the church, to provide a center of worship, to claim space in the American promised land for the Saints of the world to assemble in. The assertion that the land was promised to them and that the Indigenous peoples were Lamanites, brethren in a sense, would cause some trouble for the Mormons when they actually settled on the land of the Lamanites. Additionally, their desire to maintain a distinction from the Indigenous tribes in the face of a highly judgmental nation would influence their dealings with Indigenous peoples as well.

II. BECOMING GODS

The wagon trail of LDS pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley from a mountain canyon, their path from the canyon would lead them into the northeastern
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quadrant of the valley. Their first priority was to begin settling the region efficiently. The most immediate rewards and challenges the Mormons faced were related to the geography and climate of the region; later, interaction with the peoples already inhabiting the region created a different set of dilemmas.

Upon first examination, the valley must have seemed like a providential gift. It was on the outer-reaches of the United States government – in fact it was still Mexican territory. It was a region of the continent that no Europeans had made significant attempts to settle, a land that no Europeans or Euro-Americans seemed to want. It was far from both Mexican and American colonies. The valley was bordered on three sides by mountains, and on the fourth by a large salt water lake. It was protected, it appeared uninhabited, it was far enough from any discernable authority that the Mormons were sure they could colonize the area and live peaceably and follow their religion without interference or persecution.

As they established themselves in the West, they continued to seek and receive a substantial degree of isolation. This process forced them to lose connection, not only to the country, but to all other physical locations which were significant to their religious past (such as Palmya, New York and Independence, Missouri). \(^{84}\) In this way, the Mormons concentrated all of their efforts in the city of Zion. This project became their safe haven, as well as their only chance to construct a space of religious significance. It was, undoubtedly, a project undertaken with great care and determination. Furthermore, they were settling on the fringes, sharing space with the Indigenous peoples of the region. Theologically, this proximity made sense to the

Mormons, it was their job to reach out to and convert their Lamanite brethren. This relationship, though initially uncharacteristically amiable, would take several years before it fully reared its paradoxical and troubling head.

The physical features of the area determined the methods and forms of this early colonization. The annual rainfall was only about seventeen inches, not enough to support agricultural crops. Fortunately, there were several fresh water creeks and rivers running from the mountain peaks into the Great Salt Lake. However, the distance between these water sources was substantial and thus the area to be colonized was extensive. This pattern of settlement tended to produce isolation in spite of the communal intentions of the settlers.\(^8^5\)

The foothills of the mountains contained large stretches of deep, fertile soils as a product of seasonal snowmelt. These lush areas were, understandably, already inhabited by the Indigenous peoples of the area.\(^8^6\) This presence was the first way in which the original inhabitants influenced the settlement of the Mormons. The Indian politics of the area almost ensured that the Salt Lake Valley would be the place for the Mormon pioneers. The northern portions of the Wasatch Front were the subject of competing claims of inheritance. Both the Utes and Shoshones believed this land to be theirs, but neither of them staked any sedentary claims on the land. Thus the Mormons seized upon the ostensible Indigenous spatial and political vacuum, partially settling in the borderlands between equestrian Utes and Shoshones. The Mormons, in light of their geographical location, created a buffer between the two
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tribes and aimed to mitigate the animosity amongst them. While the Mormons appreciated the theological reasons for living near the Native America tribes, they did not want to provide any incentive for violent confrontation, especially before they had the opportunity to meet peaceably and begin the campaign for conversion of Indigenous peoples.

Immediately after arriving in the Salt Lake Valley, Brigham Young assembled the vanguard of LDS pioneers and delivered a sermon to remind them of their moral duties. Young emphasized the moral duty of all to submit to the patriarchy of the church, that is, for wives to obey their husbands and for husbands to obey the Lord. This included the principle of plural marriage. This practice was to be extended to their Indigenous brethren. Young envisioned a community in which LDS men married wives of every tribe of Indians and “showed how the Lamanites would become a White & delightsome people & how our descendants may live to the age of a tree & be visited & hold communion with the Angels.”

In other words, Mormon expectations for their relationship with their Indigenous neighbors were very high. The Mormon settlers began reaching out to the region’s tribes almost immediately after arriving in the valley. The first meeting between Utes and Mormons was very cordial, even warm; both sides seemed intrigued and impressed by the other. The Mormons described the Utes as exceedingly good-looking, brave, and intelligent – more so than any other tribe they encountered on the west side of the Mountains. Mormons perceived that the Utes were, in turn, quite taken with the white settlers. Indeed, according to Mormon
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records, the Utes expressed a desire for the two peoples to live among each other and professed a great interest in cooperation.\textsuperscript{89}

The Mormons, however, probably did not account for the economic incentives as well as the survivalist motivation for the Utes’ cooperation. These were not the first European or Euro-American people that the Indigenous peoples of the region had encountered. Though relatively few had come into the territory, many tribes had encountered fur trappers and explorers, the southern nomadic tribes had had substantial contact with Mexicans to the south and west.\textsuperscript{90} These tribes were familiar with the economic possibilities as well as the potential violence that accompanied Euro-American settlers.\textsuperscript{91} Utes, specifically the southern tribes, came to Salt Lake City to meet with the Mormons in order to trade horses procured in California raids. Though the Mormons purchased these valuable animals, they were not comfortable with the idea of trading in stolen goods. In the midst of this trade, the Mormons requested assurance from the Indians that the raids and stealing would stop.\textsuperscript{92}

Additionally the Utes were facing an environmental crisis which was adversely affecting their way of life. The buffalo population which had once thrived, had decreased substantially. This decline was resulted from several severe winters; more efficient techniques which arose from the acquisition of horses and guns; and, most significantly, the ecological imbalance caused by invasive beaver trapping by the local mountaineers. To the Indigenous population, aware of these changes, it must have seemed like a good time to take advantage of whatever the Euro-Americans had
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The Mormons provided a market to sell Indian goods and goods acquired from raids on the Mexicans, as well as a supplier of Euro-American goods. Whether out of a heightened sense of paternalism or brotherhood for the Indians or simply due to a greater ability to receive and produce goods, the Mormons offered the Indians Euro-American goods at a much higher quantity and lower price than the mountaineers in the region. This treatment also provided incentive for the Indians to pursue benevolent relations with the Mormons. Furthermore, for the nonequestrian peoples of the region, the Mormons brought a reprieve from Ute domination. The Mormons held a strong moral opposition to the slave trade that the Utes had set up with the Mexicans as well as the practice of raiding and trading in stolen goods. Some of the smaller bands in the area were drawn to the Mormon settlers for protection from these Ute attacks. The Utes in contrast, did not understand why these newcomers to their land found it necessary to disrupt their economic system which had been serving them so well throughout the previous decades.

In spite of the predominantly cordial and beneficial trade relationship that developed among the Mormons and the tribes of the area, Brigham Young’s primary concern remained Indian salvation and assimilation. In general, the LDS Church viewed the Indigenous peoples as unredeemed children. In an effort to save these children, the Mormons instigated a number of household adoption programs. These adoptive efforts brought many into the church as spiritual kin. It is well known that Mormons purchased children from local Indian tribes, the extent to which these
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children were relegated to forms of servitude is, in contrast, not so well
documented.\textsuperscript{98} However, the paternalism which conducted these programs also made
the church extremely controlling of adoptees; as Indigenous adoptees sought to gain
opportunities outside and within the LDS society, Mormons tried to regulate their
actions.

The Saints quickly became more confident in their relationship with the
Indian tribes in the area. The Southern Ute tribe, lead by a tall charismatic man called
Wakara (or Walker as he is most commonly known in Euro-American-centric
history), assisted the Mormons in spreading their settlements to the south of Salt Lake
City and into central Utah. Wakara and many of his tribesmen, but relatively few
women, even agreed to be baptized. The gender imbalance may be because the Utes
viewed the baptism as a diplomatic or an act of friendship more than anything else
and such political natures were more the domain of men than women.\textsuperscript{99}

In an episode of either extreme presumptuousness or desperation or both,
Brigham Young ordained a number of prominent tribal leaders in a campaign to
increase the number of Indigenous converts. Wakara and other prominent Ute chiefs
– Unhoquitch, Sowiette, and – were camping in the plains beyond the Jordan River to
the west of Salt Lake City. When Young found out about their presence he and other
Mormon leaders went to visit the chiefs. Young and his compatriots preached to the
chiefs and encouraged them to preach to and baptize their bandmen. In order to
ensure this possibility, the Young and LDS leaders ordained Wakara and the other
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chiefs. Though a surprising number of ceremonial baptisms did occur at the hands of Mormons, it is not well documented if any were committed at the hands of these ordained chiefs. It is also not clear what impact, if any, beyond the symbolic significance to the Mormons, these baptisms had on Indigenous attitudes.

The degree to which the Indigenous converts understood the baptismal ceremony and its theological implications is not clear. While it is probable that most understood that the ceremony was religious in nature, they probably also believed that Mormon traditions complimented rather than replaced their own. Additionally, It is very likely that, as with most other accommodative acts, the Utes participated mostly in order to foster good relations and protect their economic interests. As long as Wakara and other chiefs were on good terms with the Mormons, they had much more diplomatic power to preserve the regions resources and their lifestyles. This accommodation on the part of the Indigenous peoples, though it had immediate security and economic benefits, may have allowed the Mormons to assume too much about their position in relation to the local tribes. As the Saints became more comfortable and more populous in the area, the fact that their Euro-American style of agriculture and the Indigenous practice of hunting and gathering used the land in mutually exclusive and competitive ways, became increasingly apparent and detrimental to the regions’ tribes.

In 1849, only two years after their arrival in the valley, Mormons established a lakeside settlement just to the south of Salt Lake City near the Timpanogos Utes. This
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settlement would eventually become Provo, but at the time it was home to the best natural resources and thus, the highest concentration of Indigenous peoples. The initially benevolent and cooperative attitudes of the regions Indians may have lead the Mormons to believe that this settlement would be an opportunity for cohabitation and ultimately assimilation. The Saints were not, apparently, sufficiently assured because they built a fort to keep the tribespeople out, though they simultaneously expounded a policy of welcoming their Indian neighbors to their settlement. Tensions increased over the following decade as Mormons gradually over fished the lake and displaced the lake tribes from their territory. During this time, relations oscillated between respect and disgust, violence and benevolence, and segregation and attempts at integration. At the height of the violence, at least eleven unarmed male Utes were brutally murdered in front of their families on the ice of Utah lake.

In 1849, in light of these kinds of confrontations, Brigham Young began to express doubts that these Indigenous people would actually be converted. Young began to worry that they would instead, “die and be damned.” By 1850, he was arguing for the removal of all tribes from the Utah Territory. The Mormon interruption of the slave trade – a central pillar of the Ute economy – as well as their appropriation and consumption of the region’s resources were proving too much for the Indians to allow. Additionally, Indians were not willing to submit to the Mormon sovereignty that the settlers believed should be theirs on the basis of the “material superiority” of their culture. Furthermore, the central clash between Mormon and

104 Jared Farmer, 42
105 Ibid.
106 Ibid
107 Jared Farmer, 42
Indigenous lifestyles and cultures inevitably engendered tension simply because the two groups were living in such close proximity.\textsuperscript{108}

By 1855, however, the LDS Church experienced a renewed faith in the possibility of Indian redemption. On April 8 a conference of the Church was held in Salt Lake City. Missionaries were called and sent to establish missions among the various tribes in the region. Missions were to be located in central Idaho, southeastern Utah, and western Nevada.\textsuperscript{109} The geographical emphasis for these missions was concentrated on tribes farther from the Salt Lake Valley, so perhaps, it was easier for the Mormons to impose their expectations on these more distant tribes rather than their more immediate neighbors who had already disappointed their assimilative and theological expectations. This reinvigoration of the project of Indian redemption and increased faith in Indigenous solidarity was known as the “Mormon Reformation,” of 1855-57.

Indian farms became a concerted policy effort of the LDS Church. In an attempt to encourage Indians to live and work with the Saints, farms were set up where Indigenous people could learn Euro-American style farming, farms were set up near Mormon settlements. These farms, though they initially seemed successful, ultimately fell apart. To cite one example, Wakara’s tribe, after successfully sowing the fields in their area, left the region and the crops they harvested, in order to pursue their seasonal hunting rounds.\textsuperscript{110}

In 1857, the Mormon desire for strong ties with the Indigenous peoples became far more urgent than at any other time in the previous decade. President
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Buchanan, after receiving exaggerated complaints from territorial officials who were frustrated by the Mormon shadow government, sent a large armed force to install a non-Mormon appointee to the territorial government. Brigham Young publically bragged about his influence over the Indians and sent his chief liaison to the Indians, Dimick Huntington, to negotiate with local chiefs and attempt to convince them to ally with the Mormons instead of the Gentiles. At the end of the day, no blood was shed nor did any significant confrontations take place. More or less, the federal government succeeded in demonstrating some kind of authority over the fringe settlement without causing any significant change to the Mormon way of life or forcing the Mormons to test the limits of their relationship with the local tribes.

In the 1860s and 70s, after tensions with the federal government had subsided somewhat and tension with local tribes had increased, federal reservation treaties began pouring out of Utah territory. In 1865, Ute leaders met federal representatives on the banks of the Utah Lake and signed a reservation treaty. They were moved to a distant, lakeless region; they officially forfeited the land that the Mormon settlers had been slowly taking from them for almost twenty years. In 1875, the Northwestern Shoshones, after converting to Mormonism and submitting to LDS farming communities, were expelled from the area based on unfounded rumors of rebellion, and forced them north into Idaho. In 1887, the General Allotment (Dawes) Act, which granted parcels of land to individual tribe members, converting communal and spiritual ownership of the land into a system recognizable to American capitalism,
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allowed Euro-Americans to purchase land from individual tribe members. In this way the U.S. government vastly reduced the tribal lands, specifically that of the Ute tribes.\(^{115}\) The individual allotment of land was useless to peoples who were accustomed to hunting over large ranges of territory. Furthermore, they were expected to farm, even though most did not have the skills nor the inclination to farm. Since white neighbors were better equipped and more predisposed to farm, the Indigenous people ended up losing their individually allotted lands.\(^{116}\) In this way, the federal government was able to appear conciliatory – giving the Indians their just lands – while, in fact, making it far easier for whites to purchase the land in a way that seemed just and honorable. Tribal ownership of land was threatening to a system which operated on an understanding of private property, as “Indians were the original communist menace,”\(^{117}\) a threat to all that the American capitalist system held to be sacred.

There are a couple significant components to this narrative that warrant thorough development and analysis. First, the vacillation between diplomacy and cooperation and confrontation and violence; the terrain of Mormon-Indigenous relations was uneven, fragile and inconsistent. Second, the multifaceted struggle for sovereignty; the Mormons against the Indigenous peoples, and the Mormons against the federal government. It is important to remember that these two sets of tensions are inherently and inevitably intertwined; power, patriarchy, theology and colonialism are
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interlocking and mutually informing frameworks. The dilemmas of indigeneity and diplomacy, and the campaigns for sovereignty reveal certain critical aspects of the cultural and ideological forces at work in the Salt Lake Valley in the mid 1800s. These forces will continue to affect the social and cultural atmosphere for decades to come. These interactions are also significant in their influence on the project of planning and constructing Salt Lake City.

First the manner in which the Saints applied their claim to the land and how they viewed and thought of it in connection with the Indigenous peoples of the region must be reviewed and analyzed. For Mormons, the land represented both safety from persecution as well as the opportunity to construct the New Jerusalem. The land was therefore serving both immediate interests of safety as well as the greater theological goal of constructing the prophetic city. In this way, the land was meant to both connect with its purported ancient past (as a part of the land occupied by the Book of Mormon’s history) as well as serve as the center to bring forth the future of the Church, all while offering a sanctuary to victimized people. The future that the Mormons sought for the land was thus justified by their immediate fears as well as the role American land played in their providential story.

In many ways the Mormons’ claim to the Salt Lake Valley was justified by their religious beliefs. These same beliefs, however, required that they acknowledge the Indigenous claim in a way that previous settler projects did not. Traditional Euro-American settler populations cemented their claims to land in the proprietary understanding of ownership; in other words, because Indigenous peoples failed to claim the land in the way Euro-Americans recognized – the construction of
permanent edifices, marking the land with agriculture, and sedentary concentration of populations – Euro-Americans were permitted by their own logic to claim the land.\textsuperscript{118} The LDS Church, as discussed earlier in this chapter, is undoubtedly a product of this settler colonial history.\textsuperscript{119} However, the narrative of the Book of Mormon literally gives a proprietary claim to the Indigenous peoples by asserting that they, the Lamanites, were the last living descendants of the biblical people that traveled to America. The Mormons, at this time, believed themselves to be spiritual kin at best, and thus to only have a spiritual claim to the land.\textsuperscript{120} The Mormons in their assertion of claim to the Salt Lake Valley were thus engaging a circular paradox: the land was theirs by spiritual connection; but, according to the same doctrine that gave Mormons claim to the land, the was historically the Indigenous peoples’; the land was, by its history, meant to protect the Mormons and be the site of prosperity and growth for the LDS Church which was justified in the pursuance of noble and providential ends; but those ends came from a narrative which claimed that by the rules of capitalist competition, the land was the property of the Indians. In short, the capitalist ideology which might rationalize Mormon settler claims was both fortified and underwritten by the very faith that lead them to seek it.

Perhaps, the Mormon pursuance of close relationships with Indigenous peoples was, in part, as an attempt to resolve this paradox. Of course, the primary justification for these relationships was that the Lamanites were also God’s chosen people, but that they had been tainted by sin, and thus it was the duty of the Saints to redeem them. The presupposed spiritual kinship between Mormons and the
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Indigenous people, although a compelling reason to pursue a relationship with the Indians, was also useful in that it gave Mormons an opportunity to acquire their land in a more legitimate way, in a way that acknowledged Indigenous claims – though more on the terms of the Mormon narrative rather than on Indigenous understanding.

Brigham Young’s choice of the Salt Lake Valley as the initial settlement site was, as previously examined, due in part to the fact that the small pocket of land was not highly valued or regularly occupied by large tribes.¹²¹ In projects of expansion Young actively sought approval and assistance from local chiefs.¹²² Young’s attempts at compassionate association with the local tribes, however, engendered a different set of dilemmas for the church. Before the Mormons even made it to the Salt Lake Valley they were already plagued by national accusations of allegiance with the Native population.¹²³ In the battle for sovereignty and recognition, this association caused substantial challenges.

Patrick Wolfe’s theory of settler colonialism as a project is useful in understanding the aims and paradoxes in the Mormon project. According to Wolfe, settler colonialism invariably includes an assertion of indigeneity on the part of the settler population. This claim, argues Wolfe, does two things for the settlers: establishes a rightful claim to the land, and expresses a separateness from the country of origin. In order to do this, traditionally, indigenous claims to the land are underwritten through an argument that ownership requires sedentary settlement. After removing the Native presence (by 1910 the Utes were sequestered on reservations far
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outside Salt Lake City),\textsuperscript{124} settler colonialist groups (such as Mormons in this case) seek to recuperate indigeneity in order to purport separateness – and thus independence – from the mother country (in this case the United States).\textsuperscript{125} Thus the settler population aims to assert that the land they lay claim to belongs to them rather than the Indigenous peoples or the mother country.\textsuperscript{126} The effective elimination of the indigenous alternative is, Wolfe emphasizes, an ongoing project which persists in the social, legal and bureaucratic structures of settler colonial societies indefinitely.

The Mormons, like the generic settler colonial model, were attempting to separate themselves from the Gentiles that had persecuted them and pushed them to the fringes of society.\textsuperscript{127} This quest for separation – and indeed safety – was complicated by a need for recognition from the federal government in order to garner enough power to be allowed to function autonomously. As soon as the territory officially changed hands from Mexico to the United States in 1848, the Mormons had to reconcile the fact that they would need the federal government to legitimize their settlement in order to protect their territorial and security interests as the country expanded.\textsuperscript{128}

While the LDS faith in and of itself asserts a claim to indigeneity, this claim requires that Indigenous peoples be respected and incorporated rather than eliminated. Simultaneously, however, the Saints had to appeal to the federal government in order to gain recognition and legitimated sovereignty. Association with Native Americans
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would almost certainly not impress the federal government, since the government systematically reduced the population and territory of the Indigenous people as lands became desirable. Any hope the Mormons had of appearing to the federal government as a standard Euro-American settler force was drastically undermined when the Mormons campaigned for Indian allies when President Buchanan sent federal troops to the territory. While this move did act as a demonstration of separateness, it also further relegated the Mormons to a fringe population, a minority group that ultimately would not be able to escape the control of the federal government. Thus while desiring isolation, and trying to maintain a good relationship with local tribes as a concern of faith, the Mormons had to find a way to appeal to national sentiment.

Peter Coviello argues that, the LDS Church found a solution to this dilemma in polygamy. In spite of national attitudes that polygamy made white women into slaves, and was thus an abominable institution, the Mormon Church did successfully use it to assert familiar patriarchal values. Since the Mormons could not easily discard their relationships with their Indian neighbors and become a traditional and nationally recognizable settler force with gratuitous violence and appropriation of land, they could separate themselves with the practice of plural marriage. Coviello terms this practice a “hypertrophied patriarchy,” or a patriarchy of the sublime. This sort of patriarchy, elevated to the very level of bodily experience, was also a part of process of becoming gods: an experience of plurality, numerousness, an elevation beyond what had been conceived of as human. While this practice may have made the Mormons more legible in the terms and conditions of patriarchy, it did nothing to
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release the Mormons from their status as deviants. The Mormons, in their quest for sovereignty would, in fact, have to reject polygamy in order to be granted statehood. In short, though polygamy did serve to separate Mormons from the Indians via patriarchal extremism, it was ultimately unsuccessful as a justification for autonomy.

Mormon relations with local tribes were further complicated as the expectations of the Mormons regarding the script the relationships would follow, were not met. Mormon reconciliation of their settler colonial project with the unique perspective of their faith only made sense if the local tribes participated in very specific ways. In order for the Saints to successfully settle in the Salt Lake Valley without offending the tenets of their faith in regard to their Lamanite brethren, the Indigenous peoples would have to accept the Mormon presence, learn the religion and their place in it, accept the tenets of the Mormon faith and allow themselves to be redeemed. When the Indigenous tribes did not submit to this narrative, the Mormon faith was in crisis. If the Indigenous peoples would not be converted, if they would not play their part, then the Mormons would have to accept their failure as a force of redemption. Furthermore, if the Indians would not surrender their land and become good contributing members of LDS society, then the Mormons would either have to accept the failure of their project to build the city of Zion, or they would have to take the land by force and accept their failure as a force of redemption.

In all likelihood, it would ultimately be the racist attitudes that Mormons inevitably inherited from Anglo-American society that tipped the scale. While the LDS faith required a certain attitude toward Native Americans, the Church was still,
indubitably, a product of a specifically racist American society. Thus, in the end, when the Indigenous peoples did not play their part in building the city of Zion, they were forced out, their land taken, and their presence expunged from the landscape. If the Saints, on the path to godhead, could not control the tribes of the area, if the tribes would not cooperate with the Mormon story, they must be eliminated. The church needed to acquire ultimate sovereignty in the region in order to legitimate their religious project. The Indigenous people were already subverting these efforts simply by being associated with the church. As soon as it became clear that this association would do nothing to further the particular narrative of the LDS Church, the easiest option was removal.

The eradication of local tribes ostensibly solved all of the church’s dilemmas. It relieved the Saints from the pressures of association. It was recognizable as an act in the truly traditional “American” narrative of Manifest Destiny. Finally, It allowed the Mormons to continue building the city of Zion without resistance on the part of the very people who were meant to assist them. Thus, when reality began to contradict the Mormon narrative, the Saints simply moved to change reality by way of pushing certain populations out of the picture. In this way, the Mormons enacted their power as gods-to-be by ensuring a certain story, to alter the geography of a region on a physical and symbolic level. In spite of this assertion of godly power, however, the LDS Church was still engaged in a struggle for sovereignty with the federal government. These ideas, attitudes, and insecurities are critical in examining the planning and building of Salt Lake City.
III. THE CITY OF ZION

The Saint’s attitudes toward traditional legal and governmental structures are significant in understanding the planning of Salt Lake City. In 1844, before the Mormon pioneers had begun their westward pilgrimage, Joseph Smith coined the term for the government he envisioned for the new Zion: a Theodemocracy. Smith hoped Zion would be a place, “where God and the people hold the power to conduct the affairs of men in righteousness.”

This desire for the interweaving of church and government was accompanied by a general distrust of traditional American laws. The Mormon legal experience was colored by the persecution they had faced in Missouri. The legal system had done nothing to help Mormons escape armed attacks at the hands of Gentiles (non-Mormons). Legal officials were unwilling to protect Mormons or their property from hostile attacks; when Gentiles threatened or assaulted Mormons, or damaged Mormon property, police were generally unhelpful or nonresponsive. This kind of mob persecution was relatively common as the Mormons migrated across the United States. Rather than as a mechanism for protection, the Saints saw the law only as a tool for lynch mobs. For example, Joseph Smith in the company of several disciples were indicted without evidence for murder, arson, treason, robbery and several other felonies. Though there was ultimately not enough evidence to convict them, the very fact that their indictment was possible made Mormons uneasy about
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Gentile legal institutions – it was clear to the Saints that these were institutions that were not meant to protect them, but to protect the interests of the Gentiles.

While the Saints were still in transit, trudging across the plains and mountains on their way to the Salt Lake Valley, an all-purpose church-government regulated the lives of the pioneers. Once they arrived at the site of Zion-to-be, the mechanisms of the church were readily available to make, enforce, and interpret rules as they built a civilization in the wilderness.137 The same desire for safety and religious freedom that pushed the Mormons to settle on the fringes of the country, also pushed them to create laws which differed from those of the nation. The Saints were pursuing safety and religious fulfillment geographically as well as ideologically and legally – since the legal system of the United States did not allow for this safety, the church established a new order which would. In order to ensure the safety and authority of the Church, the Saints made the Church the only governing body in their settlement – Church authorities, organized into local and regional agency, performed the full range of governmental functions for the young settlement, “from the granting of permission to engage in business, to the levying of taxes, the building of public roads and bridges, and the provision of for the welfare of the needy; the definition and provision of punishment for the full schedule crimes…the exercise of unlimited power to adjudicate in civil and criminal cases; the appointment of law enforcement and other officials, [and] the creation of a militia.”138 By positioning the Church as the ultimate authority of the region, the Mormons hoped to avoid the prosecution they had faced when under Gentile jurisdiction.
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Scholars have argued that the nineteenth century frontier societies, depended on the law as a form of social control because – in rowdy mining towns where women were scarce and families scarcer still – the usual social controls, such as families and religion, were weak. In frontier towns where large groups of adventurous or ambitious men lived together, typical structures of morality broke down quickly; without women, religious institutions, or children to protect, law was often used as the last resort to order society – though with inconsistent results. Orma Linford argues that this analysis breaks down with the Mormon example. The Mormon settlers, though they adopted many aspects of a frontier society, clung to traditional institutions of social control and morality.\(^{139}\) Though the Mormons did follow the western migration narrative in terms of asserting a Euro-American presence and displacing Indigenous peoples from their tribal lands, they did not cling to legal systems in order to justify their settler project.

The Euro-American settler project depended on proprietary claims to land through the joint imposition of capitalist understandings of ownership and Euro-American legal systems to reinforce ownership claims.\(^{140}\) The Mormons turned away from the legal system and instead used faith to justify their project. In fact, when the entered the valley they had left the legal jurisdiction of the United States. Even after the land was granted to the United States in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, the Mormons remained for a time beyond the effective reach of federal law. This reliance on faith and casting off of the Gentile tyranny of persecution was central to establishing the city of Zion. The Saints would pursue this geographical and legal
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separation as long as possible. Ultimately, in order to protect their religious interests, the Mormons would have to engage with the very systems they sought to abandon.

Isolation was a key principle for the Mormon settlers; separation and protection from a nation of persecutors and nonbelievers. The plan was to create a new emblematic holy city for the church out of the reaches of any external governing forces. The City of Zion was meant to be a utopian model, therefore it had to be free of any Gentile influences. In order to do that, however, the Saints had to find a way to assert their own sovereignty. In 1849, when gold was stuck in California and influx of non-Mormons into the territory seemed imminent, a civil government, the State of Deseret, was created under a constitution adopted by popular referendum.\textsuperscript{141} This informal government stood until Utah Territory was officially created, at which point a territorial government took over. The territorial government adopted all the laws of the State of Deseret which were not inconsistent with the federally prescribed laws.\textsuperscript{142}

Once federal officials began to take their offices in the territory, however, they began to notice some practices which were frustratingly inconsistent with federal systems. For instance, the Saints set up their proto-government in such a way that individual and private rights were subordinate to the community. Furthermore, a strict order as dictated by the LDS Church had already been firmly established among the pioneers. Traditional classifications of law had little to no significance in the young city. Rules were legitimized only when they served the project of building Zion.\textsuperscript{143} If two Mormons were ever in conflict, they would present themselves before the president of the stake – their regional church – and twelve previously agreed upon
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councilors who would mediate the disagreement. Before the Gentiles came to Salt
Lake City, there were allegedly no police or police courts.\textsuperscript{144} The Mormons modeled
their ideal government using the New Testament, rather than Euro-American
traditions.\textsuperscript{145}

In 1874, in response to reports of friction between federal judicial officers and
the citizens of Utah Territory, Congress passed the Poland Act. The act reigned in the
powers of local officials and bolstered the powers of the federal officers.\textsuperscript{146} Slowly
and reluctantly, the church relaxed its ban on the civil courts. In 1896, when Utah was
finally granted statehood, it was forced to trade its religiously centered legal system
for sovereignty. Specifically, the Church had to reject the practice of polygamy and
submit to federally recognizable standards for statehood which meant modeling the
state around the federal system and, at the very least, making a convincing show of
secularizing the government. The increased autonomy came with a requirement to
adhere to certain federal structures – most significantly, the church had to accept a
reduced legal presence. Even still, the church still has a substantial influence in the
laws of the land, if for no other reason than because the majority of successful Utah
politicians are inevitably members of the church.

When Joseph Smith thought of the legal system for the future Zion, he also
created the first plat for the city.\textsuperscript{147} Just as Smith envisioned a society where the legal
system was constructed around the church, the city itself was to be built around the

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid. 231
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid. 232
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid. 226
\textsuperscript{147} Cecilia Parera, "Mormon Town Planning: Physical and Social Relevance," Journal of Planning
physical LDS temple. The temple at Salt Lake City would be geographical the center of the city, just as it would be the international center of the LDS religion. In designing the New Jerusalem, Smith drew from, among other things, the Bible’s description of Old Jerusalem. A significant part of the LDS faith revolves around moving the biblical scene from the Middle East to America, which meant to a certain extent re-creating the middle-eastern Zion in America. Critically, while harkening back to the biblical origin city, Salt Lake City would also assert a particular American and Mormon identity.

Zion was planned to be the epitome of regularity, a square patterned city surrounded by agricultural land. Because Salt Lake City was meant to be the “City of God,” it had to assert order and uniformity, it had to dominate the wilderness. The priority was simplicity and cleanliness over the mess and confusion of the wilderness. The square grid model for towns had a long and significant history. The grid was first popularized by the Spanish in their American colonies. The grid enabled the Spanish to impose a rational order on an “uncivilized” wilderness. Furthermore, the grid “urbanized” the land in a specifically European way. Spaniards and Englishmen believed the recreation of European civil society in an otherwise alien environment to be the vital preliminary to their permanent occupation of the new land. Both the Spanish and later the English in the north, participated in the same western European tradition which, as John Eliot explicates, took for granted that the systems of, “patriarchal family, ownership of property, and social ordering that as nearly as possible patterned the divine were the essential elements of any properly constituted
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civil society.”¹⁵⁰ That is, in their physical occupation of space the European colonists sought to both lay permanent claim to the land as well as impose their western values on the land in order to organize the land in a familiar way, thus furthering their European claim by endowing the land with European qualities.

It was a way of asserting a very particular kind of civilization on a land previously marked and known in other ways. The grid made the land legible to the Spanish, it enabled them to take a land that was not legible and rewrite in their own language of space. In replacing the Indigenous order with their own, they effectively became the sole mappers, readers, and controllers of the land. Additionally, the rectilinear pattern asserted power in a different but equally significant way: the straight streets and geometric simplicity allowed towns to grow indefinitely until significant geographic barriers were reached. In this way, the grid demonstrated an inevitable expansion of the settler society.¹⁵¹ Furthermore, these grid cities had the much desired effect of rooting a colonial population in an ordered environment, the stability offered by this design offered a sense of control and safety in an alien land.¹⁵²

By the seventeenth century, the English were aware of the urban patterns and tactics of the Spanish settlements in the Indies; the rectilinear pattern thus became the archetype of northern American towns as well.¹⁵³ The relative ease with which it could be expanded was critical in the accommodation of the constant influx of immigrants. Philadelphia, for example, designed in 1682, consolidated the grid
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pattern and acted as a model for efficient and rational towns throughout the British colonies, and later, other American towns.\textsuperscript{154}

Just as Mormonism contained ideological echoes of its Puritan history, the design of the city of Zion was firmly rooted in the Church’s colonial past. The Saints, like the Puritans, saw their religious project as justified by the will of God, saw their settlement as a reclamation, re-sanctification of land. The Mormons, in the midst of the unsettled Western wilderness, used the grid as a way to impose a legible order on the land they occupied. Furthermore, this grid pattern in all of its clean geometry, served to erase the natural patterns and landmarks that would have made the land legible to the Ute and other Indigenous peoples of the region. The reason the Mormons found the grid so appealing was its ostensible egalitarianism; equal portions of land, divided cleanly and uniformly.\textsuperscript{155} The grid was primarily meant to assert utopian principals of communalism, a space where individual plots of land fit seamlessly into the design of the city as a whole, much like each individual had a designated place in the church but the position was almost indistinguishable from any other individual’s place. The intention of the plat of the city of Zion, was to assert an egalitarian ideology, but it was not without its structural hierarchies.

Another spatial structure that the Mormons adopted from the Spanish pattern was a hierarchical approach to residential placement. The Spanish model of building cities called for beginning with the construction of the central plaza and expanding the city out along straight streets in perpendicular directions.\textsuperscript{156} The more powerful,

\textsuperscript{154} Cecilia Parera, 155
\textsuperscript{156} Arnold Bauer, 56-63
more socially significant members lived closer to the plaza in nicer, more ornate houses. Farther from the plaza, residences tended to be made of cheaper material, and housed poorer individuals. The Mormons too began with the temple as the centerpiece for the city, and the lots nearest the temple were given to the top church leaders. This hierarchical ordering of public space demonstrated the imposition of a specific spatial legibility, with those outside the grid – the Indigenous peoples, for example – being wholly removed from the hierarchy, cast out of the holy city, outsiders. As the grid expanded, those in its way could either be incorporated or further removed until they were pushed out of the dominion of the city.

In placing the Temple in the center of the city, Mormons highlighted the centrality of religion in their lives. The grid was meant to assert communalism, but inherent in this specific grid pattern was a inside outside mentality. With an ideological and hierarchical focus on the Temple and its surrounding residences. In order for the center to maintain its significance, the residences farther outside the center had to become even less consequential. Salt Lake City was therefore a city meant to map a particular ideology of egalitarianism into space. What it ultimately imposed was however, a paradoxical notion of a rigid patriarchal hierarchy in the face of purported communalism both within in the city and in the very building of the city itself on the land of purported spiritual kin. Thus while the LDS Church claimed kinship with the Lamanites, they still laid claim to their land and restructured its geography in a distinctly Euro-American way, it also created a spatial hierarchy within its professed geometric equality. The city itself, therefore, physically and
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Spatially embodied the central paradoxes that the Church was confronting at the time. In its imperfection, however, the city perfectly represented the ideology of the Church. This purposeful ordering of space as well as the security of the city and its residents would be threatened both by internal and external pressures in the years immediately following its founding. The Church as well as individual members responded in harsh, even extreme ways, to protect the integrity of their city as they understood it.

The first example of Mormon measures to protect Deseret from outsiders, occurred as a response to a sudden increase in national westward migration. The discovery of gold in California in 1849 put the Mormon settlement (at the time, they were still working toward the larger State of Deseret) directly in the path of prospectors moving west en masse. The provisional government of the State of Deseret was, in part, a response to these invasions. But the Mormon settlement was still young, still extremely vulnerable, not ready to be tested by a great influx of Gentiles. The threat of these continued invasions as well as tensions with the federal government lead to what has been named the Mountain Meadows Massacre.

In September 1857, the LDS Church took drastic action to assert its sovereignty and act as an example to likeminded emigrant trains that hoped to pass through Deseret. Mormons along with a few Indian freebooters, descended upon a wagon train of emigrants traveling through southern Utah, and slaughtered everyone – including women and children – using knives, rocks and guns. Some scholars estimate the number killed to be around 140; approximately 40 or 50 men, 30 or so
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women, and about 50 children between seven and eighteen years of age.\textsuperscript{160} For many years following the massacre, Brigham Young claimed that Southern Paiutes were to blame for the deaths.\textsuperscript{161} Even today there is substantial disagreement as to whether or not Brigham Young ordered the attack or not. Scholars such as David Bigler and Will Bagley argue that Brigham Young certainly had the power to order such an attack and that historical evidence suggests that he was the most likely culprit. The LDS Church however, claims that the act was solely the action of Mormon settlers near Cedar City in southern Utah.\textsuperscript{162}

This event illustrates a number of significant tensions plaguing the Mormon project at the time. First, the tension between the Mormons and the Gentiles, which was also playing out in the political struggle for sovereignty between the federal government, the territorial government, and Church officials. Further, it demonstrated the tension between Mormons and their Lamanite brethren. Though Young had tried to persuade the Indigenous peoples of the region to unite with the Mormons against the federal government and the outside world, his pleas were only nominally successful. At the time of the massacre, Young had asserted that he had substantial influence over the Indians and that he would protect Deseret with the help of his spiritual kin. In the end it was the Mormons that descended upon the emigrant train dressed in native garb. Thus Mountain Meadows was simply the Church, if not Young himself, performing the kind of spectacle of Indian-Mormon unity they wished for as well as providing extreme incentives for Gentile emigrant trains to stay out of Deseret.
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This performance enacts several significant tensions in the young Mormon settlement. First and most apparently, the tension between Mormons and Gentiles, the LDS Church and the federal government. Secondly it illustrates a multifaceted struggle with the Indigenous peoples. The performance falsely implicated Indians in a way that Brigham Young had promised they would be, and believed they should be. The Mormons, in some ways, were enacting the relationship they believed they should have with the Indians. The Lamanites were meant to assist the Saints in building Zion, surely this should extend to keeping the outsiders at bay as well. However, when the Indians did not cooperate with the enthusiasm the Mormons had anticipated and desired, the Mormons simply tried to force their involvement through a performed fantasy. While a few Indian marauders did participate in the massacre, their involvement was likely a result of diplomatic and economic incentives – to keep up relations with the Mormons settlers and raid the emigrant train – rather than support for the Mormon ideological position. In involving what few Indians they could convince, the Mormons thus aimed to convince both themselves and the outside world that the Indians were committed to their religious project the way that their religion posited they would or should be. Though this performance had elements of fantasy, the lives it took were very real, as were the social and political implications.

In addition to attempting to implicate the Lamanites in their ideological project and the protection thereof, the Mormons also implicated the Indigenous peoples as scapegoats for the Saints’ own violent agenda. In enacting this violent warning, the Mormons seemed to think it necessary to dress as Indigenous people to accomplish the sordid affair. The assumptions surrounding this decision both further
the national view of Indigenous peoples as inherently violent, but also granted the
Mormons what seemed to be a perfectly legitimate alibi. The Mormons appeared to
have no fault in the attack. The Saints received the full benefit of scaring Gentiles out
of their territory, without taking any of the blame that could hurt their chances at
receiving statehood or other recognizable forms of sovereignty from the federal
government. In blaming the Indians and implicating them in the Mormon ideological
project, the Mormons made took just enough blame to be a force to be reckoned with
but not so much to make them enemies of the Union.

The Indians, on the other hand, are implicated both as murderers and as the
Mormons’ allies. As the Mormons fought to distinguish themselves from the
Lamanites they had become so closely associated with in the eyes of the nation; this
episode allowed the Mormons to appear civilized while their barbaric spiritual kin
carried out the attack. This episode demonstrated the willingness of the Saints to use
the image and reputation of their supposed brethren for their own ends. As already
discussed, when Indians did not live up to Mormon expectations, they were stripped
of their land and expelled, for all intents and purposes, from Zion. The Indigenous
people could be used in a particular way, whether they complied or not.

In the time period between 1869 and 1890, the Mormons faced an entirely
different perceived threat to Deseret, one that came primarily from within the church
itself. During this time, the Church put forth an intensive missionary program to the
Hawaiian islands. The Saints had some luck with garnering Kanaka Maoli – as the
Native Hawaiians called themselves – converts for their church and, as would be the
policy for years to come, encouraged all converts to immigrate to the young Salt Lake City in order to pay homage to the city of Zion. Hawaiian converts slowly complied with these requests and left their home in order to fulfill this religious obligation. In the eyes of the Mormon missionaries, immigrating to Utah was necessary for the spiritual salvation of the Kanaka Maoli. 163

What the Native Hawaiians found in Salt Lake City was, however, not the welcoming they were promised. Between 1883 and 1889, the small Kanaka Maoli community in Salt Lake City became the subject of increasing scrutiny from white Mormons. They were chronically underemployed and were intensely ostracized by the white majority. 164 The contemporary discourse surrounding race in Salt Lake City was caught up in the same Mormon-against-all-others discourse which had marked the entire Mormon project since their expulsion from Missouri. The vicious persecution the Mormons had faced during the early years of their religion, created a highly self-conscious and weary community; the Mormons trusted their religious brethren but no others. Additionally, Mormons also actively mobilized the same racist discourse pervasive in the Gentile United States, which was steadfastly insisting on white against non-white distinctions. 165 So while the Mormons may have felt the impulse to unite with the Kanaka Maoli as spiritual kin in a religion where unity in the face of persecution had recently been so critical, they also undoubtedly felt the pressure to continue the particularly Euro-American project of rejecting and subordinating the racial other as a means of maintaining white supremacy.
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Mormons thus faced a unique challenge in the Hawaiian converts, not entirely dissimilar to the challenge posed by the Indigenous peoples the Mormons encountered. Like the Indian tribes, the LDS faith required the Mormons to accept the Kanaka Maoli converts as spiritual kin. Unlike the Indian tribes, the Hawaiians had actually attempted to move in to the city and integrate into Mormon society, at least geographically. Ultimately, the Kanaka Maoli were rejected in much the same way the Indians were. Both populations were initially embraced and subsequently geographically removed in order to preserve the integrity of Zion. The Indigenous peoples threatened the project on an ideological level because of their refusal to take up the roles the Mormons expected of their Lamanite brethren. The Kanaka Maoli were rejected because they presented a threat to the particular Euro-American standards of white purity that the Mormons could not escape no matter how much they purported to. In the end it was the white ostracism and vigilantism characteristic of Euro-American racism that won out over the ideological pressure to welcome the Native Hawaiians.  

In the summer 1889, the social and economic discrimination of Native Hawaiians at the hand of the white majority was so severe, that church leadership felt it would be best to find a place to settle the Kanaka Maoli outside the city.  

Additionally, in 1889, the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah issued a decision to exclude native Hawaiians from citizenship based on an interpretation of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which argued that Hawaiians, as a subgroup of Polynesians,
belonged to the Malay race and were thus excluded from citizenship. The court in this case was acting in the interests of the Gentiles, who wanted as few Mormons to have legitimate claims to citizenship as possible. Nonwhite Mormons faced extraordinary boundaries to citizenship because the nation feared the potential political consequences of an accumulation of Mormon voters.

Native Hawaiian converts in Salt Lake City were thus spatially categorized as other through ostracism and eventual removal at the hand of their white fellow Mormons. They were further legally defined as other by the Gentile legal system in an effort to undercut potential Mormon power. The combination of the Mormon’s continuation of Euro-American racism and Gentile fears of the increasing power of the Mormon Church did not bode well for any incoming minority converts. The very apparatus which was meant to support and protect incoming converts, the LDS church, was so polluted by national racist attitudes that the only protection it could offer was separation. Like the Indigenous people, the Hawaiian converts were marked by their status as outsiders and thus forced to create a distinct colony to the south of Salt Lake City in Skull Valley.

While the LDS church was dealing with tensions surrounding Hawaiian converts in Salt Lake City, another threat to the integrity of Zion was creeping through the desert. In 1869, the transcontinental railroad was completed at Promontory Point, near Ogden, just to the North of Salt Lake City. The church
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leadership had, in 1865, urged the population to boycott non-Mormon businesses – another attempt to purge the valley from outsiders.\textsuperscript{172} This, boycott, though initially very successful, would be significantly undercut by the arrival of the railroads.\textsuperscript{173} The railroads brought both an increase in non-Mormon business as well as Gentiles for whom church policies would not be a great concern.

In 1870 Salt Lake City countered this historical event with the completion of the Mormon-owned Utah Central Railroad which connected Ogden to Salt Lake City, and thus Salt Lake City to the nation.\textsuperscript{174} The Sevier Valley Railway and the Salt Lake and Park City Railway connected Salt Lake City to Park City, a small city nestled in a canyon in the Wasatch Mountains to the east of Salt Lake City. In addition to building these railroads, Brigham Young also purchased stock in the Union Pacific Railroad in hopes of purchasing power for the Saints. Young saw the railroad as an opportunity to increase the political and economic influence of the church.\textsuperscript{175} In fact, when the Union Pacific sent surveyors to decide where the line across the Wasatch Mountains would run, the Mormons campaigned vigorously for the railroad to pass through Salt Lake City. The surveyors marveled at the large city where everything was “kept in such perfect order.”\textsuperscript{176} Little did these surveyors know that the railroad – which would end up passing just north of Salt Lake City with a short line through the capitol city – would sabotage this impressive order.
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In 1881, the Salt Lake and Park City Railroads were absorbed by the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railway Company. In 1883, a railroad connecting Salt Lake City to Denver was completed; commercial men of Utah and Colorado believed this connection to be next in importance to the completion of the Pacific Railroad in 1869. When the Rio Grande Western faced legal barriers to its desired northward expansion, it got around restrictions by laying its tracks next to those of the Oregon Short Line through Salt Lake City, which the Union Pacific railroad took control of in 1899. This collection of railroads, put Ogden and Salt Lake City right at the crux of national westward migration.

The arrival of the railroad into Salt Lake City, originally encouraged as a means of gaining national influence and power caused the city’s population to increase and diversify at a heretofore unseen rate. Brigham Young had seen the railroad and other capital gains as way of garnering enough power and legitimacy to secure sovereignty from the federal government. In order to gain that sovereignty – the ultimate protection from uncontrolled outside infiltration – he had to open the floodgates to working-class non-Mormons. Young, faced with a paradoxical choice, chose economic power as a means toward sovereignty rather than maintaining the strict integrity of Zion, which would have left it extremely vulnerable to federal regulation or alteration.

In 1867, before the railroad had a substantial presence, the population of Salt Lake City was 93% Mormon; by 1891, that percentage had fallen to half. The railroad
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as well as the recently discovered copper and silver deposits in surrounding areas
brought in fleets of unskilled workers, often immigrants, through the promise of jobs
and inevitable industrial growth. In 1882, mineral profits from lead, silver, coal and
copper soared to $10 million, and miraculously survived a depression in the 1890s.
As mines grew more productive and smelting became localized, Salt Lake City
demanded an increase in man power. Since Brigham Young, decades earlier, had
counseled Mormons to stay and work the land, they were slow to fill the unskilled
labor needs of the burgeoning industry. Foreign immigrants from Asia and
Southern Europe primarily filled those roles. Salt Lake City was also attractive for the
simple fact that it was the only major city between the Mississippi River and the
West Coast.

This sudden influx of non-Mormons presented a significant challenge to the
Saints’ way of life as well as their ideals of a carefully organized and virtuous city.
While the railroads brought increased economic prosperity to Zion, they also
inevitably brought the outside world into the very land that Mormons had selected for
its isolation. In addition to altering the demographics of the city, the railroads also
created a fracture in the clean, geometric plan of the city. The railroads cut north-
south through Salt Lake City just a few blocks to the west of Temple Square – the
center of the city. Since new railroad tracks were simply laid next to existing tracks,
the division remained singular and stark. This spatial rupture interrupted the
symmetry of the city, it skewed the possibilities of expansion. The presence of the
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railroads to the west, created a physical barrier to expansion. As the city continued to expand to the south and east, the west remained tainted and controlled by railroads.

Additionally, the increase of industrial activity and the growth of the non-Mormon, working class population, contradicted a Mormon way of life centered around religious values and a self-proclaimed Theodemocracy. The incoming populace would need rules and regulations, they would not necessarily abide by the rigid structures set up by the LDS Church. The very organization of the society was threatened because to Gentiles, the church policies would be ineffective. The Saints were thus struck with a serious conundrum, they needed to find a way to maintain order in the face of a rapidly changing urban population that would almost surely challenge the existing social and religious tenets.

The demographic and spatial disruption came head to head with the same ideological pressures that designed the city, that chronically expelled outsiders – violently if necessary – and that desired still to build the New Jerusalem. Salt Lake City – enmeshed in the paradoxical pressures of ideological obligation, Euro-American racism, and capitalist ambition – was facing an abrupt and overwhelming period of expansion and change.

Howard Winant has said that U.S. racism may be best understood as a “continuing struggle to allay fears about the instability of whiteness.” That is, a manifestation of insecurities regarding the superior position of whites, specifically the social movements and policies the white ruling class puts in place to protect their interests. These distinctly Euro-American anxieties, firmly established by the
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nineteenth century and, as we have seen, alive and well in the Mormon community, were heightened in this moment of racial minority invasion. The Saints faced the incoming population with the agitation of preserving, not only their whiteness, but also their particular Mormon whiteness. In addition to threatening their Euro-American superiority, these racial others also threatened the ecclesiastical purity of their new American Zion.

The rate at which the city was changing in combination with the sheer number of incoming Gentiles was too much for the Saints to be able to construct a clean solution. The city needed the newcomers to support its burgeoning industry, but it simultaneously revolted against their presence in much the same way as it had in the all too recent past. What happens during this time period is therefore, a mapping of these contradictory forces onto the geography of the city, physically centered on the very cause of the disruption – the railroads.

**CONCLUSION**

A number of contradictory impulses, simultaneous attractions and repulsions confronted the Mormon faith and the project of building their New Jerusalem in the wilderness. One of the first examples of these paradoxical desires is the attraction to Indigenous peoples as the last of the biblical line of Lamanites, but the simultaneous fear of being associated too closely with Indians in the eyes of a highly judgmental nation. Furthermore the Mormons, believed the Indigenous people to be spiritual kin, but when the Indians did not live up to Mormon expectations, the Saints were faced with a difficult choice: either allow the presence of Indigenous peoples whose refusal
to subscribe to their religious narrative and thus undercut the legitimacy of that narrative, or remove them, in which case the Saints would be undercutting their own religious obligations to embrace the Lamanites. In these ways, the Mormons faced strong incentives to pursue amiable relations with the Indians indefinitely and to expel them from the city of Zion. In the end, fear and self-consciousness won out over religious principles and the Indigenous peoples were slowly pushed off their lands and out of the Mormon capital. A similar situation was observed in the encouraged emigration of Hawaiian converts coupled with the intense social ostracism which ultimately convinced church leaders to move them outside of the capital.

It is important to note that the LDS Church did not treat all racial minorities the same way. The examples of Kanaka Maoli and Utah Indigenous peoples differ in many ways from the racial and ethnic minority groups that will be examined in the second chapter. First and foremost, the theological pressure to accept the Kanaka Maoli and the regions Indigenous peoples was far greater than it was for the low wage workers that were brought as a result of the railroads and burgeoning industry. Where the Native Hawaiian emigrants were converts and the Indian tribes were, from the central tenets of the religion, to be regarded as spiritual brethren, the incoming laborers were just that: low wage laborers. Furthermore, the LDS Church was a self proclaimed racist institution. While the Lamanites were tainted by their sins but still regarded as God’s chosen people, other darker skinned peoples were merely tainted with sin. Specifically, the church regarded Blacks as particularly sinful; the church
specifically denied Black men the priesthood until 1978. With this in mind, the moment when minorities penetrate the Saints’ white utopia becomes more potentially explosive. The Saints had used extreme violence to keep white Gentiles out of their city, additionally they were so invested in white supremacy that they could not accept racial minority spiritual kin. With this obvious hostility toward outsiders generally and racial minority populations specifically, the growth of industry engendered an exceptionally tense paradox.

Contradictory policies arose when the Saints’ intense desire for isolation was confronted with the necessity of appealing to the federal government in order to protect their interests, and the economic incentives to garner capitalist power and thus increase their influence and ability to protect themselves. Mormons tried to reconcile their desire for autonomy and sovereignty with the need to appeal to the federal government and legitimize their settlement in the eyes of the nation in order to be granted said autonomy. While the Saints preferred to set up their government as a Theodemocracy, in order to be any legal protection of their interests via the power of federal government, they had to submit to certain legal standards. Further, the Mormons welcomed the railroads as a way to obtain more influence in the national arena but welcoming the railroad necessitated breaking the demographic isolation which had be pursued so viciously as to instigate a massacre of passing emigrants. The railroads thus faced Mormons with the inherent tension of welcoming outsiders that both could enhance their ability to pursue their religious project while simultaneously threatening its integrity. The dual incentives of maintaining isolation
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and fearing outsiders conflicted with the need to accumulate enough power and influence to protect the project.

I suggest, then, that paradoxes described above can be mapped in space. Further, this moment of irreversible intrusion via the introduction of the railroads – and with them industrial capitalism – represents a pivotal moment in the Mormon project where the insecurities and fears must be confronted and dealt with quickly and honestly. Despite intense ambivalence toward a legal system that had allowed persecution, the Saints understood the necessity of implementing it in order to protect their city. Even accepting an intense distrust and fear of outsiders, the Mormons had to face an overwhelming influx of them at the turn of the century. The second chapter presents the experiences of these outsiders and the third explicates the structure of the legal system that controlled their geography.
EAST MEETS WEST:
Salt Lake City’s Racial and Ethnic Enclaves

*And it shall come to pass that the righteous shall be gathered out from among all nations, and shall come to Zion, singing with songs of everlasting joy.*
- *Doctrine and Covenants 45:71*

Standing on the Fifth South Street overpass in Salt Lake City, Utah, and looking north, you can see the skeletons of abandoned granaries, smelters, and textile mills surrounded by a network of defunct railroad tracks. On the east side of the tracks stands the Rio Grande Western Railroad train station, a stately building, once a hub for interstate travel, once the conduit for ushering in low wage workers to fill the mines and warehouses. Now the station is home to the Utah State Archives; the building, like the desolate tracks behind it, is characterized by stagnation, a relic that exists more in the past than in the present. No longer used for its original purpose, the station houses a small museum in its central hall, a restaurant in one of its wings, and a vast network of old documents, neatly organized and boxed, mostly forgotten except by researchers and history enthusiasts in the other wing. Once the arrival site of hopeful adventurers, young Mormon families, and low wage workers, the train station is now a site of historical preservation marked by a sterile silence rather than the hustle and bustle of intersecting lives and stories.
Legally speaking, this area is still an industrial area with some businesses permitted. Practically speaking, it is a mixture of warehouses and dilapidated factories. This mostly desolate industrial zone is an iron and concrete blemish that cuts north-south through the city, creating definite east and west sides to the city. Through approximately one hundred years of legal and social pressure, these sides have been distinctly segregated. Though the segregation purports to be one of social class, it is in effect one of race – the two are inextricably linked through historical and persistent employment discrimination. The east side is comprised mostly of middle- and upper-class whites; the west side is made up of mostly lower-income racial minorities. This chapter deals primarily with the experiences of the individuals who were legally, socially and economically coerced into racialized residential enclaves.

At this point, a brief description of the city’s layout is essential. The LDS Temple, the international center of the LDS religion, was built near the northern foothills of the valley. The city was then platted in a rectilinear fashion, stretching outward away from the temple. Each street was labeled in measurements of hundreds of units from the temple. The streets bordering the temple were labeled, North, South, East and West Temple. The streets one block in any direction were subsequently 100 (or First) North, South, East or West Streets; this pattern continued across the entire platted city. The city in 1849 was broken into 19 essentially equally sized wards – or local congregations to be presided over by a bishop.¹ Each of these wards contain approximately nine city blocks. The area allocated for these 19 wards stretched from

approximately Eight West to Tenth East, Third North to Ninth South.² When the railroads were built they cut through the city at approximately 400 West, and they grew they continued to expand west, creating a larger industrial area and a wider border between the east and west sides of the city. It was near and among these industrial buildings and railroad tracks that racial minority enclaves flourished. The “minority” groups in question are non-Mormons of a common racial, national, ethnic or religious background that came and congregated in substantial enough numbers to constitute a noticeable presence in the city. The groups investigated in this chapter consist of Chinese, Japanese, Greek, Italian, Jewish, Black, Mexican, and Pacific Islander populations. While some groups – such as Italians, Ashkenazi Jews, and Greeks – are considered “white” by contemporary standards, they were not, at the time, viewed as equals to the Anglo-American population; they spoke different languages, practiced different religions, ate different foods, and had a slightly ruddier complexion in general than the white Mormons already occupying the valley.³ These cultural differences were more than enough to mark these minorities as others, especially in a racially and religiously homogeneous place like Salt Lake City.

Though some of Salt Lake City’s minority residential enclaves have been disassembled, many architectural skeletons remain. The Greek Orthodox Church, once the center of an expansive Greek Town – home to Greeks, Italians, and Scandinavians among others – still stands at the intersection of 300 South and 300 West streets. The Buddhist Temple, one of the last markers of a relatively populous
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Japan Town, still operates at 200 West and 100 South. A new Chinese Restaurant, Plum Alley, has moved in downtown a few blocks away from the historical location of Salt Lake City’s former Chinatown by the same name; the old Plum Alley was razed and replaced by a corporate parking structure in 1952. Similarly, most of Japan Town has been demolished, replaced with the Salt Palace Convention Center which largely obscures what remains of Japan Town, trapping it behind convention center walls and loading docks.

The presence of these neighborhoods on the west side of the city indicates the paradigmatic intersectionality of race and class as well as the fluctuation of racial categories in the United States. The Naturalization Act of 1790, the first of its kind in the United States, used language confidently and unambiguously to indicate that only “free white persons” were eligible for citizenship. Half a century after these laws however, an inundation of “undesirable” immigrants from Europe engendered a change of definition. Though immigrants from Ireland were technically “white,” by the European standard, they were nonetheless undesirable and thus undeserving of citizenship. From the mid-nineteenth century years of mass immigration to the restrictive legislation of the 1920s, such as the Emergency Quota Act of 1921, whiteness experienced a complicated fracturing, the creation of a hierarchical plurality of whiteness. During this time, certain European immigrants were not
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considered wholly white by Anglo-American standards, these “subwhites” included Greeks, Italians, Yugoslavs, and others. In the face of a new racial chemistry produced by Black migrations, Asian immigration, and Latin American immigration, the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 was passed, guaranteeing people of European origin white status at the expense of these “darker” populations.

These fluctuating moral standards were generally consistent with social sentiments; “undersirable” European immigrants faced harsh discrimination when they came to the United States, and even after legal whiteness was granted, social whiteness took some years to catch up. Likewise, the fluctuation of the demographics of Salt Lake City’s west side reflect these changes in whiteness – as one group claims whiteness, their ability to climb the socioeconomic ladder and move out of the poorer west side neighborhoods increases. This ability was, however, dependent on a new racially “other” population to take their place.

Populations that have slowly gained a legally and socioeconomically whitened status gained the opportunity to move out of segregated neighborhoods into east side residences. Blacks and Hispanics still remain, for the most part, on the west side of the city. So while the population have not remained demographically stagnant, the west side has always been a place for those the white Mormon majority classified as racially inferior. This chapter will examine where these neighborhoods were and why. I will delve into the actual experiences of those who lived in these neighborhoods. Further I will narrate the fate of these neighborhoods; if they were dismantled, why and how they were dismantled, and where the residents went. In other words, I aim to
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explicate the differences between who was forced to leave, who was allowed to integrate and why the fates of these people were different. Different social and political pressures, which correspond to different attitudes about race affected the fates of each enclave. While the Chinese and Japanese neighborhoods were entirely and significantly destroyed by building projects, the Greeks and Italians left their neighborhoods predominantly by choice. Blacks, Mexicans, and Pacific Islanders in further contrast, remain largely segregated.

Though it is impossible to comprehensively account for every racial or ethnic minority experience in Salt Lake City, I aim to give as thorough an investigation as possible. This chapter aims to address each group in a predominantly chronological manner, discussing them in the order in which they gained a substantial presence in the city. When groups appear at largely the same time, the larger or more influential is discussed first. Racial and ethnic minority groups in this chapter include Chinese, Japanese, Greek, Italian, Jewish, Black, and Mexican populations.

These groupings are used for a number of reasons, all of which hinge on the availability of data on each of the populations. Though there were other groups that faced discrimination and ostracization in Salt Lake City, these groups were large enough for their residential presence to be witnessed and tracked. Furthermore, U.S. Census data has significantly affected choices of which groups to include. Because of the way the Census categorizes people and their racial or ethnic markers, certain groups had to be used in order to analyze the Census maps to discuss contemporary residential segregation.
The Census itself is a paradigmatic relic of fluctuating racial categories, often working under political and social pressure to create a measurement system which best serves the needs of those in power. The introduction of the “Hispanic” as an ethnicity option on the United Census has been, for example, a topic of great investigation by race and ethnicity scholars. This method of counting, according to Ian Haney Lopez, Laura Gomez, and Luis Angel Toro, is a tool of white supremacy to ensure its longevity while appearing to being antiracist. The central paradox according to Gomez, is that while Mexican Americans (and Latin Americans) have been legally constructed as white, they have simultaneously been socially constructed as nonwhite, more specifically, racially inferior.11

Mexicans and other Latin Americans were originally granted full citizenship under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. The broad consensus, however, among Euro-Americans was that Mexicans were not white because they were racially mixed; but at this time naturalization was a privilege exclusively granted to whites, this means that Mexicans and other Latin Americans were legally white.12 According to Lopez, this was because, as the United States acquired Mexican territory to the West and in Latin America, it best served the interest of the nation to grant the new people under their dominion citizenship rather than to become an explicitly imperial power.13 Until 1930, Census takers followed the official presumption of whiteness and classified Latin Americans and Mexicans as white.14 Then in 1930, for the first

12 Ibid. 83
14 Ibid. 44
and only time, the Census listed “Mexican” as a race, distinct from white. This creation of Mexican as an official race in the public mind, as well as the ability to quantify the number of Mexicans in the United States allowed the government to justify the expulsion campaigns between 1931 and 1935, which forced almost half a million Mexicans back across the border. Due to intense lobbying by the Mexican Government, Mexican Americans and the desire to of the U.S. to secure ties with Mexico in the face of impending war in Europe, the Bureau changed course in 1940. It is clear through this narrative that the racial category and legal status of Mexicans and Latin Americans has directly served the interests of the United States government.

The modern era of the United States Census began in 1980 when the Census changed its policy from having census takers identify the race of respondents to allowing respondents to identify themselves. Additionally the 1980 Census was the first to include “Hispanic” as an ethnic choice. This formalized the practice of conceptualizing Hispanics in ethnic terms, separate from racial terms. This enabled respondents to identify as both “white” and “Hispanic.” According to Laura Gomez, this created a racial dynamic that similarly, though less obviously, benefited the (distinctly white) United States government. Since Mexican Americans and other Latin Americans had a tenuous claim to whiteness, they had incentive to distance themselves from Pueblo Indians, other Indians, and Blacks – in short, any group they might otherwise unite with to pursue social reform and true equal protection under the
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law. Luis Angel Toro states, “The ‘Hispanic’ classification is merely the latest legal fiction that works, intentionally or not, to prevent the Mexican-American community from overcoming the disadvantages imposed by racial subordination.”\textsuperscript{18} Toro sites the ability of the U.S. Census to include Hispanic whites in studies which compare poverty levels among racial groups, thereby reducing the gap between whites and other minorities. Additionally, it ignores the anti-Mexican subordination in the United States.\textsuperscript{19} Those that identify themselves as white and Hispanic on the Census, though they may be able to legally claim whiteness as a matter of history, cannot claim it socially.

This disparity between legal and social status of Mexican Americans is seen in Salt Lake City’s residential distribution. Hispanics (white and nonwhite) are one of the most residually segregated groups – they live in extreme density on the west side, with only a few claiming east side residence. The vast majority of Hispanics in Salt Lake City self-identify as Mexican, according to the 2012 U.S. Census; most of the non-Mexican Hispanics are Puerto Ricans.\textsuperscript{20} Due to the demographics of the city as well as the historical and contemporary resources available, Mexicans and Mexican Americans will constitute the only Hispanic population investigated in this chapter.

The social pressures which enforce this residential segregation clearly follow the same pattern seen in residential placements of racial minority groups, arguably


\textsuperscript{19} ibid.

\textsuperscript{20} United States Census Bureau, American Fact Finder "Salt Lake City Community Facts: Selected Characteristics of the Native and Foreign-Born Populations." Last modified December 17, 2013. 
more so. Hispanics are more severe in their east/west division than either African Americans or Asians. Hispanics are most similar to Pacific Islanders in terms of residential distribution. Clearly, there is a racist project at work. However, in classifying Hispanics as an ethnic group, and thus Mexicans as white ethnic others, it alters the discourse around the issue making it seem, at least on the surface, not to relate to race at all. It is clear by the residential distribution of Mexicans in Salt Lake City that they are not receiving the same white privileges as those that identify as non-Hispanic whites; in spite of their legally white status, they remain just as geographically and socially marginalized as groups that are classified as racial minorities. In spite of their legal whiteness, they are still treated as if they were racially other – in other words, even if it is legally an ethnic difference, it operates as a racial difference.

Additionally – as this chapter will demonstrate – European groups such as Italians and Greeks were able to whiten their legal and social status over time, and move into Salt Lake City’s whiter neighborhoods. Thus some non-Anglo whites such as Greeks and Italians were able to overcome their ethnically marked difference while Mexicans were not. This suggests that not all ethnic others are treated equally, and in fact the treatment of Mexicans follows more closely with the treatment of racial minorities rather than white ethnic groups. Others racial minorities like the Chinese and Japanese were not permitted to become legally white, but the white majority essentially demolished their neighborhoods and forced them to disperse. So while they no longer live exclusively in their west side enclaves, they have experienced a certain racialized residential fate. In contrast, Greek and Italian neighborhoods were
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abandoned by their residents as Greeks and Italians were able to move into the middle and upper classes as a product of shifting economic and employment policy.

While race is a product of legal, political, and social pressures, it is also very much a product of class. In Salt Lake City, as in other places, European immigrants, Blacks, Mexicans and Asian immigrants, faced a hostile social and economic environment.\(^\text{22}\) Sequestered in neighborhoods were the white majority did not want to live; where the rent and land was cheap, and affordable for their low wages.\(^\text{23}\) These groups were segregated not only by their appearance, but by their culture and their income.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first discusses the Chinese enclave – Plum Alley – which was unique in its geographical location. Plum Alley was nestled between large commercial blocks downtown rather than on the west side like the others. This is probably why, as I will discuss later, no trace of Chinatown is left. While other disassembled neighborhoods still have their relics, Plum Alley has been completely demolished. The only building which harkens back to its existence is a new restaurant which does not stand in the old neighborhood’s exact location. The Chinese population, one of the first to gain any concentration was brought into Utah as a result of railroad construction.\(^\text{24}\) Industrial growth and development as a result of the railroads brought most of the remaining minority groups.

The section two discusses historical west side inhabitants, the Japanese, Greeks, Italians and Jews. Foreign labor agents brought Japanese, Italians, and

\(^{22}\) Philip F. Notarianni, "We Had to Help Ourselves: A Case of Who is on the Bottom," \textit{Beehive History}, 27 (2001): 6-9, 6
\(^{23}\) Ibid. 6
\(^{24}\) Matthew Kester
Greeks to Utah largely as strikebreakers because they would work for less than Americans would. Jews came of their own accord, often as junk peddlers or neophyte shop keepers. Over time the Greeks, Italians, and Jews were able to move up, able to make more money and move into better neighborhoods, accepted into the socially and residentially white class. The Japanese were not as lucky – the Japanese neighborhood in contrast, was forced into obscurity by city building projects, likewise its inhabitants dispersed into the rest of the city.

The third section discusses those groups that live on the west side today. Black residents still live in the same neighborhoods they lived in during the worst years of segregation and discrimination. Hispanic populations, predominantly Mexican, live almost exclusively on the west side. Brought in originally as strikebreakers for European immigrant labor, they have not had the same opportunities to improve their socioeconomic status as their labor predecessors have. Pacific Islanders, predominantly Tongans and Samoans, came as a result of missionary efforts by the LDS Church but as a result of low paying jobs and large families to support live predominantly on the west side as well. The movement – or lack thereof – of these various populations, I will show, largely reflects changes in the contemporary social definitions and attitudes regarding race.
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I. PIONEERS
Plum Alley and the Early Chinese

The construction of the Central Pacific Railroad from Sacramento, California to Promontory, Utah brought the first Chinese immigrants into Mormon territory. At the time, there were 12,000 Chinese workers employed by the railroad companies. Once the railroad was completed, however, these imported workers found themselves unwelcome, the targets of hostility and suspicion. In 1882, The U.S. Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, effectively ending the immigration of Chinese workers into the United States. Though many chose not to stay in Utah, some migrated south from Promontory to the bigger city of Salt Lake in order to continue making money to send home to their families. The 1890 Census counted 271 Chinese in Salt Lake City.

The first racial enclave and the one exception to the forthcoming east-west dichotomy, the small China Town called Plum Alley, was located near the heart of Salt Lake City’s commercial district, mere blocks away from the temple. Plum Alley was nestled between First and Second South, between State Street and Main Street – one block south, two and half a blocks east of the Temple. While their presence near the heart of the city might seem like a sign of acceptance or integration
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at the very least, Plum Alley’s life cycle demonstrates fairly explicitly the white
Mormon insecurity and hostility of the late nineteenth century and beyond.

Plum Alley was the length of one city block, snuggly set in a narrow alleyway
between tall commercial and office buildings.\(^{34}\) Chinese immigrants were prevented
from owning or renting property near their workplaces outside of Plum Alley – such
as the rail yards, mines, groceries, or restaurants – they were forced to live in
boarding house above shops and laundries in Plum Alley.\(^{35}\) The boarding houses were
vastly overcrowded and without heat; residents had to burn coal to keep warm and
there was only one toilet for every ten rooms.\(^{36}\) At its height, during the late
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, upwards of one thousand people might have
lived in this dense neighborhood, one thousand people inhabiting an area less than a
single city block.\(^{37}\)

One of the staples of the small China Town was the Bing Kung Tong, which
was an essential organization for Chinese in Utah. It provided services in translation,
letter-writing, legal assistance, and employment.\(^{38}\) The Bing Kung Tong found jobs
for new arrivals, helped them send letters home, and translated English documents –
which was critical since most labor contracts and other legal documents were in
English regardless of who they were addressing.\(^{39}\) The Bing Kung Tong also served

\(^{34}\) Ibid.
\(^{35}\) Ibid. 224
\(^{36}\) Ibid. 203
\(^{38}\) Don C. Conley, 276
as a meeting place where the immigrants could enjoy speaking their native language – a respite from the strangeness and unfamiliarity of Salt Lake City.\footnote{Don C. Conley, 276}

This business and residential concentration ensured that the Chinese of Salt Lake City inhabited a single space, that this single space was the only space racially marked as Chinese.\footnote{Ibid. 224} The, predominantly male, Chinese population was crowded into the short, narrow alleyway. The Chinese men would work upwards of sixteen hours a day for very little money.\footnote{Helen Gim Kurumada, interview by Leslie Kelen, "Helen Gim Kurumada, 69, Director of the Office of Asian Affairs, Real Estate Agent," Missing Stories: An Oral History of Ethnic and Minority Groups in Utah, 1996: 229-238.} Because of their low income, their crowded living situation, pervasive gambling and the fact that they were nearly all male, they were viewed by the white city as physically and morally degenerate.\footnote{Ibid.}

Salt Lake City never formally zoned Plum Alley as a Chinese district, though white residents did attempted to do so twice – in 1874 and 1882.\footnote{Michael Lansing, 223} While the area was never officially zoned, white residents did all they could informally to ensure Chinese residents lived exclusively in Plum Alley. The hysterical efforts on the part of the community to contain the Chinese in the small alley is representative of the Mormons’ fear and distrust of outsiders – it was best to keep them in one place; this not only made them easy to monitor but also kept them out of the white neighborhoods. While white men could come and go from Plum Alley – taking advantage of the laundries and the gambling – Chinese men had a much harder time moving around the streets of Salt Lake City. When a white police man encountered a
Chinese man outside of Salt Lake City, the typical policy was to arrest the Chinese man and ask question him later.\(^45\)

Additionally, because of anti-miscegenation laws, Chinese men (or women) could not marry white women (or men). In some cases, they could not even marry people of other racial minority groups. A Chinese man, Quong Wah, attempted to marry Dora Harris, a part white, part black woman. They were denied a marriage license because, as the Deputy County Clerk asserted, Harris could be considered white – though, based on racial attitudes and definitions of the early 20\(^{th}\) Century, she would certainly not have been considered white by any other legal or social standard. The standard of the time, the one-drop rule,\(^46\) means Dora Harris would have been unquestionably classified as black in any other situation. This anxiety around maintaining the “purity” of racial categories is demonstrative of the intense organizational desire of the Mormons. The city of Zion, originally the paradigm of organization and egalitarianism was under constant threat by newcomers. Almost in an effort to maintain legibility and simple classification it seems, the Mormons not only kept the Chinese workforce in one small neighborhood, but made sure they did not mingle with the outside in any way – socially or geographically.

The early Chinese experience in Salt Lake City was marked by strict regulation of bodies, specifically through the creation of boundaries and the privilege to cross them. While white citizens could assert their dominance by traversing the

\(^45\) Ibid. 234

streets as they pleased (and into Plum Alley if they desired), Chinese individuals were faced with extreme suspicion and hostility whenever they left their enclave. In this way, Plum Alley provided Mormons with a place to put the Chinese residents; strict informal regulation of Chinese residents provided a way for the white population to control what was perceived as a potential racial invasion; the regulation of space allowed white residents to spatially control and subordinate the Chinese population. 

The pioneer era Chinese also had little interest in assimilating to white Mormon society; the conversion to Christianity or Mormonism was minimal, and most never intended to stay, but merely to work long enough to send money home before returning home themselves. There was a sense of safety in Plum Alley, a small community where the cultures and traditions of home were concentrated. Additionally, the hostility of the community outside Plum Alley, made the relative safety and familiarity of their small enclave essential to surviving in the Mormon Zion.

While the neighborhood reached a peak in the years between 1900 and 1930, by 1940 the population had fallen to 500 – half of what it had been estimated at its height. For the second and third generation Chinese residents, Plum Alley’s characteristic isolation and rigid containment began to represent stagnation. In the words of Helen Kurumada who had grown up as part of the Chinese community but married a Japanese man and became involved in that community as an adult, Plum Alley became more and more like a “collection of seedy bars you’d see in New
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York…All these single, mostly old men were there, gambling. And they had terrible personal habits.” The older Chinese men, who stayed or returned to Plum Alley, did so out of a sense of community and tradition; but the strict exclusionary and segregationist policies of the white majority had left the community to crumble. Years of working long hours for mere pennies left the Chinese community without the social or economic resources to protect, maintain or develop their neighborhood. Thon Gin remembers returning from service in the Second World War to find that Plum Alley had become decrepit, “There were a few residences. It was essentially a neglected alley with old storefronts. Nothing in it that didn’t smell of slum—if that’s a term that can be used. Just old dilapidated buildings and storefronts, with interiors that weren’t much better.”

After World War II, a new wave of Chinese immigration began, facilitated by new immigration legislation. The Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed in 1943, the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 officially approved immigration from Asia, and the Immigration Act of 1965 allowed Chinese immigrants to enter the country and the state in greater numbers. In the wake of the abolition of these restrictions, university students from Hong Kong and Taiwan came to Utah, many of them stayed and became citizens. However, in the midst of this increase in the Chinese population, Plum Alley – or the festering slum it had become – was demolished. By 1952 it had been replaced with a seven-story parking lot – the white residents had successfully
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eradicated the Chinese presence from downtown. The Chinese residents of Salt Lake City dispersed into different residential districts.

Each racial enclave established after Plum Alley was established on the West Side of the city. It is not clear why the Chinese were able to infiltrate the center of the commercial district; it is clear, however, that no group after the Chinese was similarly successful (except perhaps the later Jewish immigrants, but that district was likewise impermanent). The Chinese were, at first, subject to substantial social pressure to remain contained, however, containment policies ultimately fell to dispersal policies. Perhaps the Mormon anxiety around the Alley as a den of vice for righteous white men finally took hold and they traded the simplicity of containment for the “safety” of diluting the Chinese population by allowing them to scatter throughout the city.

II. OLD WEST SIDE
Japanese, Greek, Italian, and Jewish Communities

Utah’s immigrant population at the turn of the century was comprised mostly of Italians, Greeks, Yugoslavs, and Japanese; most of them came to Salt Lake City as laborers, drawn by the industrial boom that followed the railroads. There were two prominent labor agents responsible for bringing immigrant labor to Salt Lake City: a Japanese man named Daigoro Hashimoto and a Greek man known as Leonidas Skliris. These immigrant groups clustered together on Salt Lake City’s west side, near the smelters, textiles, and rail yards where the labor agents contracted them to
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work. This clustering occurred in part out of the convenience of proximity to work, the fact that these areas were not desired by the white Mormon upper classes and thus affordable for the low-wage workers, as well as the desire of the immigrants to have the security of living among their own kind.\[^{57}\]

Around the turn of the century and the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the immigrant enclaves constituted a patchwork of mostly distinct, though occasionally overlapping, neighborhoods to the west of downtown. Japan Town was the farthest north of these neighborhoods, just to the south of Japan Town was Greek Town, followed by the Italian neighborhoods. Salt Lake City’s (predominantly Ashkenazi) Jewish residential hub was just to the east of that. In some ways, these groups were drawn together by common experience as a result of working in the same industries under the same labor agents and living in such proximity; but in many ways they also remained separated, barriers of language and culture made them cling to their own people. Likewise, during the early years, the white Mormon majority stayed out of these neighborhoods out of fear and distrust,\[^{58}\] it was easier, it seems to pretend the foreign workers were not there.

Each enclave – like each minority group – had a unique fate. Some left traces of the communities that were ultimately left behind or altered, some have almost disappeared entirely. The fate of each of the enclaves was dependent on a combination of changing racial attitudes of the white majority, which allowed some immigrant groups to climb the socioeconomic ladder, the efforts of city planners to dissemble the communities under the guise of urban redevelopment, and the

\[^{57}\] Ibid.
willingness or ability of the various groups to remain in their communities in the face of these policy and development changes.

**J-Town**

Japan town was— and to a certain extent still is— just west of downtown Salt Lake City. It was one of the largest and most successful racial or ethnic communities, second only to Greek town. Whatever their background, essentially all Japanese immigrants began their lives in America by working in agricultural fields or on railroad section gangs.\(^{59}\) The first Japanese immigrants to Utah, however, came as Mormon converts.\(^{60}\) They began arriving shortly after the first Mormon mission to Japan in 1901.\(^{61}\) These early immigrants were quickly followed by others who came for economic rather than religious reasons— to work in the sugar beet fields or to work as contract labor on the growing Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroads.\(^{62}\)

In 1902, Edward Diagoro Hashimoto established the E. D. Hashimoto Company at 163 West South Temple (just over a block west of the Mormon Temple, the northern point of center of the city).\(^{63}\) The Hashimoto company provided section gang workers to the Denver and Rio Grande and Western Pacific Railroads, as well as importing Japanese foods and clothing for those workers.\(^{64}\) For the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century, the railroads remained the largest employer of Japanese
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immigrants. Many worked as foremen, overseeing their own country-men as well as immigrants from other parts of the world.\textsuperscript{65} Japan town grew rapidly in the early 1900s, with over 400 Japanese workers living mainly in boarding houses on Salt Lake City’s west side.\textsuperscript{66} By 1907, Japan Town, or “J-Town,” was firmly established between South Temple and 300 South and between State Street to 700 West - a three by seven block neighborhood.\textsuperscript{67} The first Japanese school was established in this community, as was a Japanese Church of Christ in 1918.\textsuperscript{68}

The initial reaction of Utah’s white Mormons was favorable – they noted and admired similarities in the value systems of the Japanese.\textsuperscript{69} In the following decades, however, as the population of the Japanese in Utah increased, many of the white majority began to express the same fears that were being expressed nationally.\textsuperscript{70} Eventually, like in other parts of the United States, Japanese customers were barred from the nicer white restaurants and were required to sit in the balconies of theaters.\textsuperscript{71} Still, J-Town continued to grow; it had a fish market, restaurants, a newspaper office, several boarding houses where children could practice judo and kendo in the hallways, a dry goods store, a half block open-stall vegetable market (run by Italian as well as Japanese immigrants), and even a large public bath.\textsuperscript{72} J-Town was a significant commercial center, as well as a substantial community for Japanese
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immigrants and their families – it had its own markets, churches, and a school; nestled just to the west of central Salt Lake City.

Shortly after the establishment of Japan Town, Greeks and Italians came by the thousands. These newer immigrants learned section-gang work from the Japanese and replaced many of them as cheaper labor. As a result, more Japanese began going to work in the mines outside Salt Lake City. The Japanese were, as a rule, paid more than their Greek neighbors. There was little if any animosity between communities as a result however; in fact, the Greeks often spent their paydays gambling with their Japanese neighbors. Japan Town continued to expand until the Great Depression; as a result of the economic decline during the 1930s, jobs for nonwhites were cut dramatically. During this decade, approximately one thousand Japanese left the state – many of them moved to California. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, however, Japanese immigrants were taken from the coast – many of them back to Utah – and many put into internment camps. This relocation and imprisonment program ultimately tripled the Japanese population of Salt Lake City, keeping Japan Town well populated. After the end of World War II, the Japanese dispersed and assimilated fairly rapidly.

In 1969, Salt Lake City’s Japan Town received a fatal blow when the Salt Palace Convention Center was built right in the heart of the enclave. The Buddhist and Japanese Christian Churches are all that remain of the once prolific
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neighborhood. Now these two churches are obscured and overshadowed by the convention center.\textsuperscript{79} The center was built just to the east of Japan Town, indelibly separating Japan Town from downtown and eastern Salt Lake City. In the early millennium the Salt Palace was expanded, the additional components of the Salt Palace abutted the Japanese Christian and Buddhist Churches.\textsuperscript{80} The development of the area from the 1950s to today has all but erased J-Town from the map. While the two churches still stand and operate, you could easily live in Salt Lake City an entire lifetime and never see these relics of a once vibrant community hidden in the shadows of the convention center which surrounds them on two sides. The convention center makes the road the churches on virtually useless. Since the convention center blocks the road on the east side of the block, it makes the old J-Town streets invisible from the east, only accessible from the west, on a road which ends at the blank backside of the convention center.

J-Town, much like Plum Alley, became a victim of commercial and economic development in a way that they other enclaves did not. Both J-Town and Plum Alley were still contained businesses and residents, whereas the majority of Greek Town and Little Italy’s residents left as a result of increased wages and assimilation pressure – it was not necessary to have them removed. Plum Alley was completely demolished, the enclave removed from the city. J-Town, though not entirely torn down, has been effectively incapacitated – it now only a place people visit, not a place people live. Today those that identify themselves as Asian on the United States
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Census live all over the city, fairly evenly distributed throughout all neighborhoods with only one third living on the west side of the city.\textsuperscript{81}

\textbf{Greek Town}

Just south of J-Town, around Second South between Sixth and Third West, used to be a neighborhood called Greek Town. The area was spotted with Greek coffeehouses and Italian taverns.\textsuperscript{82} During the years before the first World War – during the peak of mine employment and railroad construction – Greeks and Italians constituted the most populous immigrant group, accounting for 11.1 percent of the Utah’s foreign-born population between 1910 and 1920.\textsuperscript{83}

Most Greeks came to Salt Lake City as contract labor, even though it had been made illegal after the deluge of Irish immigrants to the United States half a century earlier.\textsuperscript{84} Leonidas Skrilis was the local authorized labor agent for the Western Pacific and Denver Rio Grande railroads, the Utah Copper Company, and the coalmines outside Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{85} Skrilis had such influence that he is believed to be responsible for the statistic that the highest concentration of Greeks in the United States in 1910 were living in the Mountain States.\textsuperscript{86}

Greeks were brought to Salt Lake City as workers as well as strikebreakers. With a telephone call or a few telegrams, Skrilis could have hundreds of Greeks
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arriving in Salt Lake City’s rail yards or out of the city to distant mines, ready to work or take the place of striking laborers. In 1902 Skrilis brought in a contingent of Greeks to work on a railroad line being built across the Great Salt Lake, and in 1903 he produced a group of 25 Greek workers to break a coal strike in the mines outside Salt Lake City.

The newly arrived Greeks would step off the train into the rail yards which were surrounded by Greek Town. They would find Skrilis’s men in the Parthenon, Open Heart, and Hellenic coffeehouses. Skrilis’s men would be waiting for them with contracts written in English, which most immigrants did not speak or read; these contracts declared that the new workers would pay one dollar a month to Skrilis. The men working on the railroad lived and worked in tents and in railcars. The Greeks worked under Japanese foremen and slowly replaced them because they were cheaper; the Japanese ultimately fell entirely from favor after the attacks on Pearl Harbor.

In October 1905, at the intersection of Fourth South and Fourth West, the Greeks dedicated the Holy Trinity Church, a one-domed brick building that served the Greek, Serbian, Christian Albanian and Russian people. The Holy Trinity Church was the only Eastern Orthodox church in the Intermountain West for many years; during this time it was considered the mother church for Greek immigrants, a
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center of the religion in its own rite.\textsuperscript{94} Thus Salt Lake City became more than just the Mormon Zion, but also a religious and economic center for Greek immigrants – though undoubtedly, this additional layer of significance for the valley went generally unnoticed by the white majority. By 1910, the Greek population in Utah had neared five thousand and Greek Town had become a self-contained community of coffeehouses, hotels, boarding houses, bakeries, and a Greek-language newspaper.\textsuperscript{95} The rapid growth of the community necessitated building a larger cathedral; in 1925 the new Holy Trinity Church was built at Third West and Third South, where it still stands today as a unique example of Byzantine architecture in Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{96}

With the exception of the apprehension of industrial accidents which would create widows and orphans, Greek Town was a generally a place where Greek immigrants felt safe; their religious rituals and customs were virtually transplanted into their Salt Lake City neighborhood.\textsuperscript{97} The community isolated them from the rest of the city, which eased their transition and limited their contact with the unfamiliar.\textsuperscript{98} This psychological haven did not last indefinitely, however.

Anti-foreign sentiment reached a peak in the 1920s and Salt Lake City saw the birth of its very own Klu Klux Klan.\textsuperscript{99} The Klan paraded through the streets of Salt Lake, burned a cross on the northern foothills, and drove through Greek Town at high speeds during the night dragging loud clattering washtubs through the streets. Greeks, marked distinctly as other in the white Mormon city of Zion by their culture,
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language and religion were common targets of KKK activity. Though they were European, the Anglo-American majority did not consider them white. Though legally granted white status in 1924, it took many years before sentiment against “darker” populations would calm down enough to allow them to become socially white.\textsuperscript{100}

Additionally, though the Holy Trinity Church provided essential religious ceremonies and community support, those who claimed the Orthodox religion were discriminated against in jobs outside the mines and railroads.\textsuperscript{101} During this time, with the safety of their community already in jeopardy, and mines, mills and smelters working at full capacity, Greeks began to move out of their insular neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{102}

Because of the increased productivity, some Greeks could afford to move out of their industrial neighborhood and into middle-class neighborhoods on the east side of the city, others moved to mining towns outside Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{103} This increased wealth allowed them greater racial mobility, in escaping the lower class boundaries that marked them as economically nonwhite, they were also able to escape the geographical and ultimately the social markers that made them nonwhite.\textsuperscript{104}

With the market crash of 1929, many Greeks, especially those that worked in the mines outside the city, moved out of the state, many to California.\textsuperscript{105} A survey of Salt Lake City businesses conducted after the second World War, however, showed
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over ninety Greek-owned businesses downtown.\textsuperscript{106} Greek Town itself, however, is no longer the community it once was. The Holy Trinity Church still stands and operates at Third South and Third West, but the coffeehouses, restaurants and boarding houses which constituted the old Greek Town have disappeared. Though the Greek community is still strong, they are no longer concentrated in their historic neighborhood, they have dispersed into “better” neighborhoods in the east and southeast of the valley. Aside from the Holy Trinity Church, the only edifice that explicitly marks the historic neighborhood is a public transit stop called “Old Greek Town,” the stop is right behind the historic Rio Grande Western train station but the area is home to the local homeless shelter, urban blight, and some minor urban redevelopment projects.

\textbf{Little Italy}

The first seventy-four Italians in Utah settled in the agricultural land to the north of Salt Lake City around 1870.\textsuperscript{107} These early Italian immigrants came as a result of mid-nineteenth century Mormon missionary activity in Italy.\textsuperscript{108} These converts were, however, the exception, not the rule. The vast majority of Italians that came to Utah, came for employment at mines and railroads.\textsuperscript{109} Salt Lake City’s west side boarding house district formed a center for the Italian as well as the Greek immigrants; in 1900 there were 170 Italian immigrants in Salt Lake County and of
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those, 102 lived in Salt Lake City.\textsuperscript{110} In many ways, Little Italy was a component of Greek Town; there were far fewer Italians than Greeks and though they added their own cultural flavor to the area, the Italian people lived and worked among the Greeks in the area known as Greek Town.

Most of the Italian immigrants, like their Greek neighbors, were employed by the railroads; some Italians, however, owned saloons, grocery stores or tailor shops; Second South, in the heart of the west side immigrant district between J-Town and Greek Town, was alive with sights and sounds that reflected Italian life.\textsuperscript{111} Those that did not live in the city found work in the fertile agricultural lands be the Great Salt Lake, out past the far west reaches of the city.\textsuperscript{112}

Second South, between Sixth and Third West was spotted with Greek coffeehouses and Italian taverns.\textsuperscript{113} Also spotted along the streets were jails, just perforated metal boxes the size of a phone booth; the police were friendly enough to the immigrants but if they found someone drunk, they would put him in the perforated booth until the paddy wagon came to take them to jail until he “cooled off.”\textsuperscript{114} The community was fairly insular, without much interference from the white Mormons outside – the Italians did, however, take part in celebrations and parades in an effort to promote goodwill between Italian and non-Italian communities.\textsuperscript{115} In spite of these efforts, during the 1920s the Italians, living in the same community as the
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Greeks and Japanese, were subject to the same torment at the hands of the Klu Klux Klan. Additionally, national immigration legislation severely reduced the number of Italians entering the United States. During the war, Italians that had not obtained U.S. citizenship were subject to a curfew, they were not allowed to be outside their houses after nine at night. After World War II, Mormons began to more aggressively assert missionary programs and press the community for converts. After the war, Greeks Town and Little Italy disintegrated, their citizens leaving for better neighborhoods or moving out to mining towns.

**Jewish Community**

Unlike the Japanese, Greeks, and Italians, the Askenazi Jewish people that congregated in Salt Lake City did not come from any one country, though they were of predominantly Central and Eastern European stock. Even so, due to their otherness, they were subject to many of the same clustering pressures which created the enclaves previously described. In the first decades of the territory, there were only about twenty Jews in Utah territory; this is not surprising given the intense religious nature of the settlement. Utah’s Jewish residents, in comparison to Jewish people in the nation at large, were relatively protected from anti-Semitism and
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discrimination – Utahns generally accepted them as neighbors and business associates.\footnote{Ibid. 217}

The years between the first and second World Wars constituted they heyday of Salt Lake City’s Jewish population.\footnote{Jack Goodman, and Michael Walton, "Jewish Community: Preface," Missing Stories: An Oral History of Ethnic and Minority Groups in Utah, ed. Leslie G. Kelen and Eileen Hallet Stone (Salt Lake City: Utah State University Press, 2000). 131} Rather than working on the railroads or doing hard labor, Utah’s Jewish population was mostly involved in commercial enterprises. They set up shops along State Street and Main Street – two of the central downtown north-south streets.\footnote{Ibid. 133} An early synagogue was built on the west side of the city near where the new Jewish immigrants would settle.\footnote{Ed Eisen, interview by Leslie Kelen, "Ed Eisen, 64, Owner, American Barrel Company," Missing Stories: An Oral History of Ethnic and Minority Groups in Utah, 1996: 147.} Most of the new arrivals lived on Eight or Ninth South on the west side by the railroad tracks, others lived in the west part of central downtown, in alleyways or behind small shops.\footnote{Ibid; Jack Goodman and Michael Walton, 133} The area around Ninth South was sometimes referred to as the “ghetto” because the Jews from Russia, Poland, and Galicia all congregated in that neighborhood and none of them were particularly wealthy.\footnote{David Alder, interview by Leslie Kelen, "David Alder, 81, Insurance Agent," Missing Stories: An Oral History of Ethnic and Minority Groups in Utah, 1996: 177.} That isn’t to say that there were not wealthy Jewish residents in Salt Lake City, some like Samuel Newhouse who built the old Newhouse Hotel, were very successful; but they were relatively few and far between.\footnote{Ed Eisen, 147}

Just like the Greeks and Italians, Jewish residents were able to move into nicer neighborhoods, out of downtown and the west side. Jewish residents, as they assimilated, moved away from concentrated enclaves with relative ease, especially
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since, in terms of intruders they were seen as fairly mild given the preferred place of Jewish people in Mormon theology. Mormons accept the Old Testament and believe that Jews are God’s chosen people, additionally they believe that Jews will be returned to Jerusalem prior to Christ’s Second Coming.

Each of these immigrant groups came to Salt Lake City with different incentives and histories and with different intentions. They all, in spite of their differences, ended up gathering near the railroad depots. They gathered near their own communities for the sake of security of the familiar, and the white Mormon majority was content, for the most part, to have them contained in the industrial part of the city. If they had to be present in the city for the sake of industry, then at least they were kept near the railroads and factories, more a part of the machinery of industry than citizens of the city.

As attitudes and prejudices changed, however, some were permitted to climb the socioeconomic ranks and move into better neighborhoods. This sort of upward mobility was generally, as we shall see in the next section, only gained at the detriment of another group - if one group is allowed to rise, another must takes its place. What the flux in the racial geography of Salt Lake City demonstrates is not only changing ideas about what race is or who qualifies as racially “other” to the white Mormon majority, but the necessity of having an abject other in order to have the privileged majority. In order to maintain the privilege of the “better” side of the city, of the “inside” of society, there must necessarily be an “outside.” In order for the
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white majority to allow Greeks and Italians to become a part of the privileged class, there had to be another group to provide a contrast, another group to serve the role of the outsider, the abject, the unprivileged. These new outside groups – Blacks, Mexicans, and Pacific Islanders – are examined in the following section.

III. NEW WEST SIDE
Black, Mexican, and Pacific Islander Communities

In terms of contemporary racial segregation, the most profound victims are Blacks, Pacific Islanders, and Spanish-speaking populations. These three groups have spectacularly different histories in Utah. Some Blacks came in bondage to the Salt Lake Valley with the first Mormon settlers in 1847, but because of the Church’s views on Blacks, they did not establish a significant presence in the valley for more than a century. In spite of Utah territory being, before it belonged to the United States, a Mexican territory, Mexicans were the last minority group to establish a presence in the State. Pacific Islanders have come to the valley, in contrast to Blacks and Mexicans, as a result of missionary efforts of the LDS Church. This critical difference has affected their experience significantly, it does not mean, however, that they are immune from the challenges that face other minority groups in Salt Lake City.

Black Community

Though some Blacks traipsed across Utah territory as members of trapping parties, permanent Black settlement did not occur until the Mormon pioneers arrived
in the Great Salt Lake Valley.\textsuperscript{116} The 1850 Census indicates that there were fifty Blacks in Utah, twenty-four free and twenty-six slaves.\textsuperscript{133} By 1860 the number had increased to fifty-nine, with twenty-nine in bondage.\textsuperscript{134} It appears, according to Census data, that the majority of slave-owners did not emancipate their slaves until slavery was abolished in 1862.\textsuperscript{135} Life for Blacks in the western wilderness was not a life of happiness, many were subject to the same treatment accorded to Southern plantation slaves.\textsuperscript{136}

Undoubtedly, the Mormons felt anxiety regarding the presence of Blacks in what they believed to be the New Zion. Salt Lake City was a Mormon city in a Mormon state, and according to Mormons Blacks were not quite human – they did not have souls, they were not bound for heaven.\textsuperscript{137} Early Blacks often felt that they would have to leave the state in order to amount to anything because the prejudice was so severe and cruel as to impede any socioeconomic betterment.\textsuperscript{138}

Once emancipated many former slaves left the Salt Lake Valley; those that stayed either worked in the agricultural lands in the southeast of the city or in the Eighth LDS Ward, now called Central City, which was in the southern central portion
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\textsuperscript{136} An editorial in Salt Lake City’s Black newspaper, the \textit{Broad Ax}, recorded reminiscences of two Black pioneers, Ales Bankhead and his wife, “For we were assured that their lives in the then new wilderness, was far from being happy, and many of them were subjected to the same treatment that was accorded the plantation negroes of the South...They are both devout and strict Mormons.” Ibid. 122
\textsuperscript{138} Doris Steward Frye said in an interview, “When I say I would have died [if I stayed in Utah], what I mean is I would never have amounted to anything, because the whites here were so cruel to my race.” Ibid. 80-81
of the commercial district.\textsuperscript{139} Those that farmed lived in the vicinity of Twenty-third East between Thirty-third South and Thirty-ninth South, in the southern reaches of Salt Lake County.\textsuperscript{140} The expansion of regional railroads that followed the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, vastly increased the employment opportunities for Black workers.\textsuperscript{141}

In June of 1899, during the Spanish-American War, the federal government sent some Black soldiers to Salt Lake City’s Fort Douglas.\textsuperscript{142} Many of Salt Lake City’s white residents were not pleased with this development. Senator Frank J. Cannon and the \textit{Salt Lake Tribune}, did just about everything within their power to try to persuade Washington officials not to send Black troops to Fort Douglas.\textsuperscript{143}

Since the turn of the century, most of Utah’s Blacks have made their home in urban centers, predominantly Salt Lake City and Ogden (just north of Salt Lake City).\textsuperscript{144} The railroad was the most significant employer of Blacks between 1890 and 1940; most were porters or waiters for the railroads’ restaurant and hotel services but some worked in railroad roundhouses or on construction crews; others worked in mines.\textsuperscript{145} The work was often dirty and hard, it was work that Mexicans, Greeks, Italians, and Japanese people did because whites would not and did not have to.\textsuperscript{146}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{139} Ronald G. Coleman (1976), 123
\bibitem{141} Ronald G. Coleman (1976), 123
\bibitem{142} Ibid. 131
\bibitem{143} Ibid.
\bibitem{144} Ibid. 132
\bibitem{145} Ibid. 133
\end{thebibliography}
Because white restaurants and hotels barred service to Blacks, several Black-operated hotels, restaurants and clubs sprung up near the rail yards in order to serve the Blacks working on the railroads.\(^{147}\) There were a couple Black cafes that served as gathering and mingling places, they weren’t allowed anywhere else.\(^{148}\) These Black-operated accommodations would even serve famous Blacks who came to Salt Lake City, only to be denied service at white hotels and restaurants. Ella Fitzgerald and her entourage, for example, had to stay in a Black hotel on Salt Lake City’s west side because white hotels refused to take them.\(^{149}\)

An example of other attempts to segregate Blacks, Rubie Nathaniel remembers being sent two miles away to West Junior High School on the west side of the city, instead of the new junior high that was built just two blocks from her house on east side.\(^{150}\) William Price, another early Black resident of Salt Lake City, remembers boxing at the Rotary Boys Club in the mid twentieth century. The club was on First South between Fifth and Sixth West, it was built and sustained by members’ dues. About a third of the members, he remembers, were Italian, a tenth Hispanics, a few Greeks and the rest a mixture of Blacks and whites.\(^{151}\) By this time, Greeks and Italians were beginning to move either out of the state or into better neighborhoods, and Blacks and Hispanics were coming in to replace them.\(^{152}\)

\(^{147}\) Ronald G. Coleman (1976), 133
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\(^{152}\) Helen Papanikolas (1978), 119
The pressure to keep Blacks out of white areas was profound in the early twentieth century. In 1939, one thousand Salt Lake City residents signed a petition requesting that Blacks living in the valley be moved and restricted to a single residential area; the petition was presented to the city commissioners for approval. The petition was started by a white real estate agent, Sheldon Brewster; Brewster employed a local Black man in an attempt to get the Black community on board with the program. The Black community, however, rose up in protest and marched to the Capitol to show their indignation. Some asserted that the true aim of the proposition was to obtain land from the Blacks that farmed in the southeastern regions of the valley, those that had land and arrived at the legislature to petition the plan steadfastly pronounced that they would not sell, and would not move. The petition ultimately failed to receive the support of the city commission.

After the sequestering petition failed to pass, restrictive covenants were used to restrict residential opportunities for Blacks. Restrictive covenants are clauses in real estate deeds which place limitations on property ownership, in this case the clauses in question regulated those who can own the property in question based on the prospective owner’s race. Even though the U.S. Supreme Court ruled such restrictive clauses unconstitutional in 1948, deeds continued to include them. In the early
1960s housing discrimination was rampant in Salt Lake City; most of city’s Blacks were packed into half of Central City and near the West Side.\textsuperscript{160}

Charles Nabors, Assistant Dean for Minority Affairs at the University of Utah Medical School, recalls some of the historic changes accomplished in Salt Lake City during the 1960s. The most dramatic occurred in 1965, right after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed by the United States Congress – the Public Accommodations Act came before the Utah state legislature. It came down to the last four days – Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday – of the legislative session, and it didn’t look like the act was going to pass. On Thursday, a group of three or four Civil Rights advocates, including Nabors approached LDS Church officials and asked them to help get the law passed. The LDS leaders said they only got involved in politics on “moral” issues and refused to see the morality at issue with discrimination in public accommodations. So on Friday morning, Nabors put a picket line outside of the LDS church office building on South Temple; he called in the Associated Press and United Press International to have them cover the protest. The following Monday the Civil Rights Act was passed unanimously by the Utah House of Representatives. Again when Civil Rights Advocates wanted a fair housing law, they put a picket line in front of the church offices.\textsuperscript{161} Even after the protections granted by Fair Housing Act of
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1968, \(^\text{162}\) many Blacks continued to face problems when trying to rent or purchase homes in some predominantly white neighborhoods.\(^\text{163}\)

In 1978, Mormon Church leadership declared that “all worthy males” would be given the priesthood, ending their ban on Blacks obtaining the position.\(^\text{164}\) In 1986, a major change in the racial climate of Salt Lake City occurred again when the Utah legislature adopted Martin Luther King, Jr.’s birthday as a state holiday – the legislation which created the holiday was introduced by the second African-American to serve in the Utah House of Representatives, Terry Lee Williams.\(^\text{165}\) Williams succeeded in getting the law passed by pushing LDS Representatives, asserting that if Utah didn’t pass the legislation after most states had already passed similar legislation, it would reflect badly on the LDS Church.\(^\text{166}\) Williams, like Nabors, knew that the best way to affect change in Utah was touch a nerve in the Mormon mentality, because the Mormon Church strives to present itself in the best possible light.\(^\text{167}\)

Today Blacks account for approximately three and a half percent of Salt Lake City’s total population;\(^\text{168}\) and while it is possible to find Blacks in almost every neighborhood in the city, most of them live in Central City or on the West Side. Roughly half of Salt Lake City’s Black population lives on the West Side, with most

\(^{162}\) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968; the Fair Housing Act prohibits the discrimination of sale, rental, and financing of dwellings on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, or disability
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\(^{167}\) Ibid.

of the remaining portion living in the south-central neighborhoods near the West Side.\textsuperscript{169}

### Mexican Community

Even though the Spanish were the first to map and explore the region of present-day Utah, they – and descendants of Spanish colonists – were the last major group to establish a presence in the state.\textsuperscript{170} The first significant growth in the Spanish-speaking population occurred between 1910 and 1930 as a result of a marked increase in Mexican immigration.\textsuperscript{171} Mexicans came to the United States to fill low-wage jobs after World War I reduced the number of available European and Asiatic immigrant laborers.\textsuperscript{172} The instability caused by the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) also ushered Mexican immigrants into the United States.\textsuperscript{173}

In 1912, the first Mexican consul, a Japanese man named Hashimoto, was appointed in Salt Lake City in order to prepare for the massive influx of Mexican strikebreakers.\textsuperscript{174} Mexicans were brought in to break the strikes of European and Asian workers.\textsuperscript{175} Hashimoto’s duty was to bring in Mexicans to work in the mines, mills, smelters, and railroads; he sent most to work on section gangs on the railroads, often under Japanese foremen.\textsuperscript{176} As rule for this period, Mexicans always worked
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under other immigrant foremen, Mexicans were not given authoritative positions, they were only allowed to labor in the lowest of jobs.\textsuperscript{177} During this period of Mexican influx, \textit{La Cruz Azul}, the Mexican Blue Cross was established in Salt Lake City in order to provide services and support for the new immigrants.\textsuperscript{178}

Even though most Mexicans belong to the Roman Catholic Church, the first Mexican church established in Utah was, perhaps unsurprisingly, la Rama Mexicana – the Mexican branch of the Mormon Church.\textsuperscript{179} The Mexican Branch, the Lucero Ward, conducted all services in Spanish.\textsuperscript{180} Because the family unit is highly valued in Mexican culture as well as in the LDS Church, Mexican Mormons tended to emigrate in family units.\textsuperscript{181} Relatively few of the incoming Mexicans were Mexican Mormons coming to Salt Lake City in order to be close to the church, however; the majority of the them were single men, coming for low wage work.\textsuperscript{182}

The Catholic church of Salt Lake City, after having spent some years serving the Italian community on city’s west side, focused its energies on the growing Mexican population.\textsuperscript{183} In 1927, it established the Guadalupe Mission for the benefit of the Mexican immigrants; the mission provided the opportunity to hear sermons in Spanish, as well as a cultural safe-haven for the new immigrants.\textsuperscript{184} The Mexican community in Salt Lake City was able to grow in relative isolation from the outside,
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non-Mexican world; they had their jobs provided through Hashimoto, and their religious community centers, all in all they were kept in relative isolation. As much as Mexicans clung to the safety and familiarity of their own community, the white majority stereotyped the community viciously and provided additional social pressure to keep them segregated. Whites saw Mexicans as dirty, greasy, and generally unkempt; in a world of Anglo-American morals which associated personal hygiene with virtue and morality, these views of Mexicans further contributed to their isolation from white society.

This period of growth was short-lived, however. In 1929 the Great Depression took hold and the United States was faced with a crisis of employment. One solution to rapidly increasing unemployment, was to deport Mexican immigrants in order to free up jobs for whites and European immigrants. Between 1930 and 1940, an estimated 250,000 to 500,000 Mexican immigrants returned to Mexico from the United States, either voluntarily or through forced deportation – some who were deported were, in fact, citizens of the United States. For those that managed to stay in Salt Lake City during this period, the west side neighborhood was extremely close-knit – a close community that never seemed to get any bigger, it was always the same faces at the Guadalupe Mission and in the west side parks.

The neighborhood occupied much of Old Greek Town, the area surrounding the railroad tracks and depots. Most of the men worked on the railroad, and the
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families would congregate in an enclave near Sixth South and between Fifth and Sixth West. Some families lived in old wooden boxcars, no more than twenty feet away from the tracks. Others lived in duplexes and rooming houses across the street from the Rio Grande Western depot, next to the Guadalupe Mission. This area was mostly Mexican families and single Mexican workers – it was a tight cluster of people, a small community.

One decade after these mass deportations, World War II created great labor demands by simultaneously jumpstarting the U.S. economy and ushering much of the workforce into the military. In an effort to fill some of the labor shortages, the U.S. government started the “Bracero Program,” a program which recruited seasonal agricultural workers from Mexico. The “Bracero Program” brought in 4.6 million temporary workers from 1924 to 1964 until it was abandoned due in part to widespread publicity of abuse associated with the program. During this period of great influx, the Mexican neighborhood in Salt Lake City began to change – the small close-knit community began to expand, people started moving away.

If, however, Mexicans tried moving away to the better neighborhoods of Salt Lake City they would likely face a large amount of resistance. Real estate agents were generally unwilling to show houses in certain areas to Mexicans, and although
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restrictive covenants were illegal, many deeds still included them. While it would be possible to challenge these kinds of discrimination in court, and probably win, the sentiment alone that people were that adamant about keeping certain residents out was usually enough to keep them out.\(^\text{197}\) Even as late as the 1970s, minority residents were having a hard time, sometimes resorting to legal battles, to secure housing in traditionally white neighborhoods.\(^\text{198}\)

The changing demographics of the area were accompanied by changes in the shape of the neighborhood; the city began tearing down the old buildings and factories, forcing the community to move.\(^\text{199}\) In the decades that followed, Mexican workers were subject to the harsh ebb and flow of U.S. immigration policy and economic incentives.\(^\text{200}\) The community now, more spread out and less close-knit than it was in the days when people lived around the railroad tracks and everyone was so poor that there were no distinctions,\(^\text{201}\) is still predominantly on the west side of the city. What seems to have been lost in the steady increase in numbers and the expansion of the neighborhood, is the sense of closeness and security that the old community fostered.

Today Mexicans account for 17 percent of Salt Lake City’s total population, and 85 percent of those identifying as Hispanic or Latino with the remainder being

\(^{197}\) Epiefanio Gonzales, interview by Leslie Kelen, “Epiefanio Gonzales, 64, Farm Laborer, Artist, Sign Painter,” *Missing Stories: An Oral History of Ethnic and Minority Groups in Utah*, 1996:445-449. 447 Epiefanio recounts, “And when I returned from the service, it wasn’t much better. I tried buying a home up in the avenues, and the real estate man told me, ‘The area is restricted. No Mexicans are allowed.’ He said, ‘If you want to fight it, you could take it to court, and I’m pretty sure [in the end] they’ll let you live there. But I wouldn’t want to live in a place where people don’t want me.’ That what he said. And that’s what we grew up in, and it hurts.”
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mostly Puerto Rican. They live predominantly on Salt Lake City’s west side. Of those that identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino on the United States Census, more than three quarters of them live on the west side of Salt Lake; most of the remaining live in the neighborhoods south of downtown, adjacent to the west side – less than seven percent live in the east bench neighborhoods.

**Pacific Islander Community**

The first Mormon missionaries to travel to the Polynesian region of the Pacific Islands arrived on Tubai in 1843, though they had initially been aiming for Hawai‘i. This is the first non-English prosleyzing mission in the history of the LDS Church, occurring only thirteen years after the church’s founding and four years before Brigham Young led the pioneers into the Salt Lake Valley. This first, somewhat accidental mission, began a highly successful missionary program in Polynesia.

The first Tongan to emigrate to the United States is believed to have come as a result of Mormon prosleyzing, a convert traveling to Utah with a returning LDS missionary in 1924; a second is said to have followed in 1936. Though the Book of Mormon was not translated into Tongan until 1946, this translation was preceded by
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translations into Samoan in 1903 and Tahitian in 1904. Since these early missionary efforts, the Mormon Church has induced a steady stream of Polynesians into Utah; most have been converts, some have been extended families that followed for job opportunities. Their numbers have increased most significantly in more recent years, however, with an increase of 60 to 70 percent over the last decade or so. Today, these groups account for about two percent of Salt Lake City’s total population. Tongans and Samoans have been the most successful in terms of emigration, accounting for about two thirds of Utah’s Pacific Islander population. In contrast to the early Hawaiian emigrants and the ostracism they faced in Salt Lake City, and their later failed settlement at Iosepa in Skull Valley, the Polynesian communities seem, at least relatively, to be flourishing.

Utah is now the third state in the country, behind Hawai’i and Alaska, in terms of its per-capita share of residents with contemporary ancestral links to the Pacific isles of Tonga, Samoa, Tahiti, Guam, Fiji and Hawai’i as well as the Maori peoples of New Zealand. Salt Lake City and West Valley City (to the southwest of Salt Lake) have the fourth and second largest per-capita Pacific Islander populations in the nation respectively. As a result of these populations, a variety of social groups and associations maintain Polynesian traditions such as songs, ceremonies, and dances;
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additionally, Pacific Islander culinary staples such as taro and ufi roots are readily available in Salt Lake City and West Valley.\textsuperscript{215}  
Relative numbers and community groups are not everything however, and the Polynesian community faces many challenges in Zion. In addition to paying homage to the church, many families came to Utah in hopes of getting better jobs and a better education for their children but were ultimately disappointed. Approximately half of Utah’s Polynesian families fall below the poverty line.\textsuperscript{216} Many parents work long hours are low-paying jobs, often taking more than one job to make ends meet.\textsuperscript{217} Their children, with little at-home help from their parents, drop out of school at about twice the rate of Utah’s white students.\textsuperscript{218} Like the children of most immigrants, second generation Polynesian youth find themselves caught between two distinct cultures, that of their ancestral homeland and that of the state and country they live in, and have difficulty reconciling these differences, especially when parents must work so many hours in order to support their families.\textsuperscript{219} Many find themselves caught between the American culture which places a high value on individuality and individual expression which can be at odds with family-centric values of Polynesian ancestors.\textsuperscript{220} Polynesian youth, in addition to being overrepresented in poverty and drop out rate, are overrepresented in gangs.\textsuperscript{221}
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Because many of Salt Lake City’s Pacific Islanders have ties to the LDS Church they are privy to a support system that other minority groups are not. In 2011, in response to a 2009 study which indicated that Pacific Islander youth was more likely to use tobacco or marijuana or show up drunk to school, the LDS Church sponsored a workshop to help Pacific Islander parents learn about these problems and for ways to address these issues with their children. The workshop was sponsored by the LDS owned newspaper, with opening remarks and a prayer by Mark H. Willis, the former president of the LDS Honolulu mission.

Even with the additional support of the church, Pacific Islander families live in West Valley City or on the west side of Salt Lake City where housing is more affordable. In Salt Lake City, approximately 80 percent of the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander population lives on the west side of the city. Parents still find themselves working many hours at menial low-wage jobs. This economic and geographical segregation highlights the degree to which the Pacific Islander community is still on the outside of the city, on the fringes of the Church.

While there is definitely something to be said about keeping their homeland traditions and values, there is also something to be said about their overrepresentation in poverty. While communities to maintain tradition and atmospheres of home are important, the fact that these communities are in the poorest parts of the city are not insignificant. In many ways the tension between inside and outside for Pacific
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Islanders is much more difficult to navigate because unlike Blacks and Mexicans who came for jobs, Pacific Islanders generally came for a religious community and now find themselves caught between communities, making little money, and struggling to get their kids to finish school.

**CONCLUSION**

The Mormons, ever distrustful of outsiders, found themselves in a bind when capitalist pressures ushered non-Mormon, or what the Saints would call “Gentile,” immigrants and racial minorities into their city. While financial mechanisms and a geography of convenience encouraged these newcomers to settle on the west side of the city near the industries that employed them, the social and religious pressure to keep them there was strong as well. The Mormons had a vested interest in keeping their city devoid of deviant populations. The LDS ideology of a promised people and a promised land collided with the predominant racism of the United States in a profound way. Mormonism, in large part because of its origin as a distinctly American religion, is in itself a product of American culture. Mormonism is an echo of the United States’ Puritan past and an artifact of many aspects of American culture. In spite of any intention of the church to remain above or outside contemporary American politics or prejudice, it inevitably assumed many of them.

National definitions and hierarchies of racial others are constantly in flux, subject to the politics or social issues of the time. The creation of minority enclaves in Salt Lake City and their longevity reflect the point of collision between Anglo-American racism and LDS ideology. The fates of each enclave reflect differing
attitudes regarding each group. The Chinese and Japanese enclaves were torn down, new structures to serve the white majority put in their place. Old Greek Town and Little Italy were vacated by the Greeks and Italians – many leaving the city to find work in mining towns, others taking advantage of higher wages moving into the better east side neighborhoods. Blacks, Mexicans, and Pacific Islanders took their place in west side and central neighborhoods. The west side of the city has expanded since the early days of the city, low-income suburbs cropping up in the old agricultural lands. Today only 16 percent of Salt Lake City’s “white only” population live in this part of the city.\textsuperscript{225} It has become a neighborhood marked by being outside of the city, marked by the absence of the whiteness that pervades the rest of the city. On the West Side, about a third of the population is white, while east bench neighborhoods are about 80 percent white.\textsuperscript{226}

It is significant that the Chinese and Japanese neighborhoods which had grown to be such potent cultural centers – for a culture decidedly distinct from that of the white Mormon City of Zion – were obliterated while Old Greek Town merely became a space for the new racial others to inhabit. The Japanese and Chinese, like the European immigrants, live all over the city; but their diffusion was not instigated as voluntarily as it was for the European immigrants. It is interesting that the more culturally distinct neighborhoods faced partial demolition and construction prior to being voluntarily abandoned while other neighborhoods – though altered – changed over time as a result of shifting populations. Greek Town wasn’t torn down before the Greeks left, the Holy Trinity Church was not obscured by a massive convention
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center; but Greeks became white and Asian Americans did not. This, as well as the fate of Mexican immigrants, demonstrate the insufficiency of ethnicity as a category for understanding social and legal treatment of minorities. This is why I argue that the construction of a racial geography of Salt Lake City is a racial project\textsuperscript{227} – a series of actions by the white majority to segregate and mark certain groups as racially other by their residential geography regardless of what their legal classification is.

Since the entrance of minority groups to Salt Lake City, the west side of the city been a space reserved for these groups. The demographics of this part of the city shifted over time, but it was always home to those that didn’t fit in the city as a particular religious project. The Mormons constructed Salt Lake City with a very strong idea of inside and outside, the city was meant to be a haven as well as the fulfillment of a religious narrative.\textsuperscript{228} Faced with an inundation of labor to fuel the growing economy, the Mormon majority had to find a way to deal with the intruders that did not fit the sanctified vision of the city. Just as they had struggled to deal with the Ute peoples when they did not adhere to the proper religious narrative, the Mormons had to deal with the incoming Gentiles who not only threatened the religious purity of the city but the racial purity of it as well. Unlike the Utes who had the advantage of the Lamanite position, the new incomers of – at best – “swarthy” complexion, were merely marked by sin and held no special place in Mormon

\textsuperscript{227} I mean this is the sense of Omi and Winant’s racial formation theory which is discussed in the following chapter as well as the Introduction to this thesis. In essence I am pointing to Omi and Winant’s assertion that racial categories are produced by social, political, and economic actions and pressures rather than being inherent or inflexible.

theology.\(^{229}\) As the expanding industry and the demand for cheaper labor brought in less desirable, darker populations, the white Mormon majority granted the earlier and lighter populations a certain degree of class and geographical mobility.

The segregation of the city is a specifically othering project, a project which seeks to label deviant populations as outsiders by placing them in distinct neighborhoods. The project, though not always centered on racial groups, is a racializing project which both creates and reinforces races through segregated residential neighborhoods. This project operates economically, through class distinctions; members of undesirable groups find themselves unable to get high paying jobs and are thus trapped living in poorer neighborhoods. The historical and contemporary racial geography of Salt Lake City is a physical product of discriminatory social and economic practices. In sequestering minority populations into lower paying jobs, the city has also ensured that they live in more affordable neighborhoods, specifically on the west side of the city. Salt Lake City’s residential patterns map ideas about race and otherness in space, it demonstrates the way in which social realities become spatial realities.\(^{230}\) The following chapter delves into the legal methods through which this social and economic project was manufactured and reinforced. In examining city zoning and planning practices, I expose the anxieties surrounding these outsider groups and the legal practices which sought to continue the segregation. The laws are very much products of the social atmosphere in which they were created and thus function to protect the interests of those in power.


\(^{230}\) Martha Sonntag Bradley, 47
– in other words, to allocate resources in such a way that benefits those in power and keeps outsiders on the fringes.
In 1975 Assist Inc. submitted a proposal and feasibility study to the Salt Lake City Board of Commissioners to build a “Multi-Ethnic Center” which would entail the redevelopment of ten blocks in the west side of Salt Lake City’s downtown, in the heart of what had been Old Greek Town and J-Town. Back in the early years of the twentieth century, this area was a patchwork neighborhood of Japanese markets, Italian taverns, Greek coffeehouses, boarding houses, and various churches and religious centers. In the years since the Great Depression, the neighborhoods had been largely deserted—Italians and Greeks moving to better neighborhoods, other minority groups moving into neighborhoods farther to the west – leaving the old west side area to become decrepit and blighted. The plan claimed to create more than a mere “redevelopment project;” it purported to be invested in the rebuilding of “social communities.” The project aimed to incorporate minority groups – specifically Blacks, Asian Americans, Chicanos, and Greeks – back into the economic structure of the city. The Multi-Ethnic center was meant to be a place where these groups
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could prosper economically while retaining their culture and traditions.\textsuperscript{4} Assist Inc. was – and still is – a nonprofit community design center, founded in 1969, that provided architectural design and planning and development assistance to nonprofit and community groups.\textsuperscript{5}

The ten-block Multi Ethnic Center would include a nexus of shops, restaurants, landscaped paths and walkways, residences, and a home for the elderly.\textsuperscript{6} All the shops and restaurants were meant to have, according to the proposal, an “international flavor” and the residences were to be targeted to the ethnic and racial minority communities.\textsuperscript{7} As both an urban redevelopment enterprise and a project to expand affordable housing, it would be funded with a grant from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).\textsuperscript{8} Assist Inc. proposed the project as a remedy the white monopoly on the post World War II economy which had forced so many of Salt Lake City’s minorities into poverty and, in turn, the west side of the city where they lived into dilapidation.\textsuperscript{9} The impoverishment of West Side residents in combination with the decline of the railroad and industry era during the middle of the twentieth century had left the West Side in poor condition.\textsuperscript{10}

The proposal for the Multi Ethnic Center sought to create a space where being nonwhite was seen as an asset rather than as a socioeconomic liability; it aimed to create a community where being a minority lead directly to prosperity rather than
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discrimination.\textsuperscript{11} In other words, the aim of the project was to create an economic space where minority status could be easily converted into financial gains. The best way that could happen it seemed was to create a community which the white majority would support via touristic impulses.\textsuperscript{12} While in a sense the new center would revitalize the city’s downtown west side, it would do so on the terms of the white majority. The project would involve leveling dilapidated buildings that were seen as a “detriment” to the project, and the creation of shops and restaurants that the white majority could enjoy (specifically through consumption of food and commercial goods) and that the minority population could, in theory, own and operate. The project thus sought to uplift racial and ethnic minority groups via an appeal to white patronage and a capitalistic consumerism. The project would, as it was originally proposed, improve the economic position of these groups by commodifying their history and culture and selling it to the white majority. In other words, economic empowerment was working hand in hand with submitting and serving the interests of the white majority. The project’s grander sociopolitical implications were complex merely within the proposal itself; the full array of its impact will never be known however. The project ran into significant trouble after winning the approval of the City Planning Commission in 1975.\textsuperscript{13}

The Salt Palace Convention Center – the same building responsible for the downfall of Japan Town – owned a substantial portion of the requisite land and had some concerns about turning over the property.\textsuperscript{14} The project threatened to encroach
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on parking and potential expansion space that the Salt Palace thought might be essential should it decide to expand and invite larger conventions.\textsuperscript{15} However, even when the Planning Commission budget was cut back, the Multi Ethnic Center remained a favorite and retained large support from the Commission and the community.\textsuperscript{16} In spite of its support, conflicts with the Salt Palace continued. Two years later, in April of 1977, the project still maintained its lofty ten-block ambitions, but was still trapped in negotiations with the Salt Palace for the land it needed.\textsuperscript{17}

By October of 1977, the Salt Palace still had not made any deals with the Multi Ethnic Center. The Salt Palace, out of concerns with its own business, said that the deal would have to wait until it had settled some of its own internal problems.\textsuperscript{18} At this point the project was still meant to be a commercial mall as well as a senior housing facility.\textsuperscript{19} While HUD had already granted just over $2.3 million toward the project, the land for the ambitious ten-block renovation was still needed.\textsuperscript{20} Most specifically, the corporation in charge of the project wanted the Salt Palace to sell the land directly to its west for a residential high rise; but the Salt Palace board members continued to express concerns about the ability to expand exhibition space and maintain ample parking.\textsuperscript{21}

Two years later, in August of 1979, the deal had finally been closed for the land required to build the residential high rise and the rest of the project had been
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\textsuperscript{18} “Palace to Delay Ethnic Action.” \textit{Salt Lake Tribune}, page 15, October 5, 1977.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
more or less abandoned. The plan became merely a 142-unit senior citizen and assisted living housing development. The scale of the project, now dramatically reduced, still made an attempt to retain the socioeconomically uplifting principles of the original ten-block commercial development; the architects who collaborated on the design included William Louie, Richard Chong, Kazuo Matubayashi, Gordon Hashimoto, Taka Kida and Tony Serratto. Outside of using racial minority architects and designating the high rise as an assisted living center for the ethnic elderly, the project had lost most of its lofty ambitions to negotiations, time, and changing attitudes. Rather than revitalizing the entire West Side, the project had been dwindled down to one high rise residential unit. At the time of the groundbreaking, the multi-ethnic was the first major construction project in decades for the west side of Salt Lake City’s downtown area.

The Multi-Ethnic high-rise, which still stands today, represents the complications of the city planning and development process as well as the ambivalence of Salt Lake City residents and politicians surrounding the minority populations. The building is all that is left of what was to be a great tribute to and recovery for Salt Lake City’s poor minority population. The project in its original form would have taken up ten west side city blocks – a very large portion of the city – and given it back, in a new redeveloped package, to those that historically lived there. The project would have granted minority populations the region of the city they had
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traditionally been sequestered in and provided them with the means to transform the
dilapidated city blocks and gain some socioeconomic mobility in such a way that
would appeal to the white majority. The commercial centers and restaurants would
surely be a draw for the white LDS citizens of Salt Lake City, a veritable permanent
world fair on the west side of the city. Additionally, all the various racial and ethnic
minorities would be further encouraged to remain in “their” part of the city. They
would all be clumped together in one nonthreatening community which would
economically and organizationally benefit the white population at least as much as the
minority population, if not more. The project would undoubtedly never been
approved by the City Planning Commission if it had not been appealing to the white
majority.

The final project, a single residential high-rise, granted the majority the
philanthropic satisfaction of doing something for the communities that had been so
mistreated in the past, but left the West Side unmarked by its racial and ethnic
history. Rather than turning a part of the city over to these communities, the city
granted them a single building. While the original project may have seemed appealing
to whites, the final project was unquestionably more satisfying – it required less
monetary support and investment than the original project, it seemed like an adequate
piecemeal offering – enough to alleviate any white guilt, but not enough to allow that
part of the city to be permanently and explicitly marked by minorities. The language
of the original proposal consistently appeals to a white guilt sentiment which urges
the planning commission to give something back to uplift the community of racial
and ethnic minorities which was exploited for decades. In accepting the plan, the
commission likely bought into this sentiment, but downsizing the plan to a single building points to the incentive to do just enough to satisfy the sentiment of the proposal without sacrificing too many of their own interests in keeping Salt Lake City’s West Side open for other uses. The single building meant the rest of the West Side could still be reclaimed and redeveloped – reincorporated into the rest of central city. The original grandeur of the Multi Ethnic Center and its subsequent failure present an interesting and illustrative narration of the challenges of city planning, the limits of exactly what the majority is willing to give, the strategies by which plans get implemented and whether or not they are successful, and finally how government allocation of resources affects those human beings with little or no political power.

This chapter evaluates the planning process and other residential legal strategies – both formally and informally – and how they operate. The planning process illustrates various tensions and anxieties of the majority as human planners allow these concerns to be mapped into space. Herein I examine how the planning process is used to promote a white majoritarian agenda. There are three significant components to legalized residential segregation: zoning laws, the planning process, and real estate practices. Zoning laws are the actual laws that determine what kinds of buildings can be built where and sometimes who can live in which parts of the city. Over time, racial zoning has fallen to an increasingly liberal judicial attitude, and thus any racially significant zoning laws must be extremely inexplicit. The planning process is an ongoing operation that creates goals and development plans for different neighborhoods and communities, these practices are less formal and harder to enforce but have greater flexibility in terms of legality. Real estate practices operate on a
more individual level and can be highly informal but highly effective. I use real estate practices to refer to everything from restrictive covenants in housing deeds, \textsuperscript{27} to the individual policies of real estate agents – for example, refusing to show houses in white neighborhoods to minority buyers. All three of these processes are discussed in a general and theoretical form in the first section of this chapter.

The first section of this chapter explains how the various forms of residential planning and segregation operate, the legality of these practices and their effectiveness. The section gives a historical look at the evolution of planning and zoning practices in the United States. This historical account provides the context within which planning and zoning became popular tools for organizing cities around racial lines in the United States and how this urban planning fad permeated into the legal structure of Salt Lake City. Additionally the first section will put these practices in the context of legal constructions of race and the law as an instrument for racial construction. This section uses a variety of literature to explicate the ways that spatially organizing human bodies by race, creating a racially coded geography, maps identities to places. In other words, as spaces are created for certain kinds of people, those people are in turned marked by inhabiting those spaces. This background in the history of planning and its effects on creating identities provides an essential framework for understanding how they apply specifically to Salt Lake City which was already laden with theological significance as the capitol of the Mormon religion and the “City of God.”

\textsuperscript{27} A restrictive covenant could explicitly deny ownership of property to an individual based on their race; although they were declared unconstitutional, they continued to operate for many years afterwards.
The second section of this chapter discusses how the three planning processes – zoning laws, planning processes, and real estate practices – operated in Salt Lake City specifically. This section will provide a brief account of how planning flourishes and evolves in Salt Lake City and the implications of the city’s zoning laws and planning practices. This section will take the general history established in the first section and contextualize it within Salt Lake City, accounting for the specific spatial and organizational concerns and ideological tensions present in the city and how those unique concerns affected zoning.

The final section of this chapter will bring together the theoretical and the practical; the third section examines Salt Lake City’s laws in the context of racial formation projects and the spatial politics of identity. In other words, the third section explains how exactly Salt Lake City’s laws and less formal planning practices have created a dichotomous city in which neighborhoods are racially marked, and thus identities formed in response to the geography of the city. This section aims to demonstrate the intentional organization of the city and the consequences of this organization in terms of the identity formation of the city’s residents as well as the production of the city’s identity as a whole. In order to develop these ideas, the last section goes through each of the racial and ethnic groups and enclaves discussed in the second chapter and discusses how their unique identities were enrooted in their spaces. In other words, the last section describes the intentions of zoning to create a certain image for the city, the degree to which the production of that image has been successful and the consequences of this image for the individuals living there.
One of the key ideas of this chapter is the way in which racial categories are defined through social, political – and in this case, legal – mechanisms.\textsuperscript{28} The term, “ethnicity,” therefore falls out of the discourse somewhat. I argue that the way Greeks, Italians and Ashkenazi Jews, for example, were separated geographically the same way Japanese, Chinese and other nonwhite groups were, marks them as racially other. Though ostensibly white, these groups were separated geographically and economically in the same way that racial minorities were from the white majority, marking them as racially “other.” Of course, this assertion is complicated because, as the previous chapter shows, ultimately these ostensibly white groups are allowed to traverse racial and economic boundaries and live on the white (east) side of the city. I argue, however, that the presence of this mobility simply demonstrates the way racial categories are made and remade to fit the social and political atmosphere of the time. Thus regardless of how populations are allowed to move, I argue that their presence in certain locations (and the degree to which they have a choice in those locations) constitutes a process by which race is created through geography.

I. LEGAL GEOGRAPHIES

The main concern of this chapter is discussing the relationship between laws and space – specifically, how laws have been used in Salt Lake City to construct and maintain a racial geography which organizes the city into white (east) and nonwhite (west) sides. In addition to understanding how laws have succeeded in this regard, it is also critical to comprehend the full consequences of these practices. More than

\textsuperscript{28} Michael Omi and Howard Winant first posited this framework for considering racial categories; for more information see: Michael Omi, and Howard Winant, \textit{Racial Formation in the United States}, (New York: Routledge, 1994), or the discussion of this work in the introduction to this thesis.
segregation being economically inequitable, it has significant effects on the creation of identities. In other words, in addition to certain spaces being marked by race, racial groups are in turn marked by space – made tangible by geographical position.

In placing minorities physically in an “inferior” part of the city (i.e. neighborhoods marked by lower value in the economic sense), the white majority simultaneously places them in a lower social position. As the white majority quarantines these racially nonwhite bods in distinct locations, the identities of these groups are likewise cemented through this geographical marking.

As complex as this process may seem, the literature in this section will elucidate the processes by which this identity construction occurs. This section first discusses the various ways that spaces are given identities and how those geographical identities in turn mark those that inhabit those spaces; then the section examines the degree to which law generally constructs and reinforces identities; finally the chapter looks at how land-use, planning, and real estate laws define spaces and how these definitions contribute to geographical group identities.

**Place-Making**

The first significant process that must be discussed is the conversion of “unmarked” (or more accurately, illegible) space into place. While spaces are essentially never unmarked, they are often illegible to groups that are unfamiliar with
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them; for example, the New World appeared unmarked by white settlers in spite of the significance it held for the Indigenous peoples. New populations, subpopulations, settlers and other groups often try to mark this illegible land with symbols and stories that hold significance for them, thus making the land legible and significant on their own terms. In cities where natural spaces have already been manipulated into urban places, new populations and groups may further mark these spaces; the transformation of buildings and streets into a particular “lived world that draws together territory, culture, history, and individual perceptions.” Karin Aguilar San-Juan has named this process “place-making.” Aguilar San-Juan, in her book *Little Saigons: Staying Vietnamese in America* juxtaposes two Vietnamese-American communities in Boston and Orange County in order to explore the effects of space and “place-making” on identity formation. She identifies three practices which make up the greater “place-making” project: territorializing, regulating, and symbolization. These three processes provide a useful lens through which to understand how zoning and city planning creates place and thus place-based identities out of space.

The first process, territorializing, consists of establishing the scale, boundaries, and the general image and shape the space will take; in other words territorializing divides and organizes space into regions which can be prescribed purposes and meanings. Regulating instates rules and ordinances in order to define who belongs or does not belong in certain territories; it is a hegemonic activity that
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can be formal (legally manufactured and enforced) or informal (social or economic) and aims to control populations within various spaces.\textsuperscript{34} This thesis, and this section in particular, are most concerned with the regulatory techniques of place-making. The final process, symbolization is the process through which populations adorn spaces with symbols such as certain buildings and monuments. Groups use these edifices attach meanings and memories to spaces.\textsuperscript{35}

The failed Multi-Ethnic center discussed at the opening of this chapter is an example of a predominantly white nonprofit group’s efforts to symbolize the western portion of the city. The original plan sought to create a large commercial complex which explicitly marked a ten-block portion of the West Side with the memory and history of its minority populations. Attempts to mark places can come from within those spaces (communities that inhabit the spaces in question) or from outside (groups with more power imposing ideas of place on certain regions to assert authority or undermine other attempts to mark place). Thus the process of place-making is undoubtedly engaged with the power dynamics of a place in question – in this case Salt Lake City – and how much the group in power has invested in the place (and sub-places within that place). One of the aims of this chapter is to identify the ways in which laws are implicated in these three processes.

Sherene Razak, a scholar concerned with race and the legal construction of space, argues that we understand place through spatial and legal practices.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, Razak asserts that we actively live and experience a given space
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through the images and symbols we associate with it—such as the symbols of race and class that define certain neighborhoods. These symbols can be perpetuated by buildings and businesses in certain districts as well as populations. Razak investigates how place becomes race through legal means – the way that place-making practices are also race-making processes.

This chapter is similarly invested in the way race is spatially produced by white majority interests as expressed through the planning and zoning process. Aguilar San-Juan uses the term “racialization,” to refer to the way that racial categories are “socially, historically, and spatially produced, negotiated, and challenged.” The chapter is invested in the ways place-making and racialization are related – that is, the ways in which the process of imbuing places with meaning can include geographical racializations of these territories, how places can represent races and thus project these racial identities onto their residents. The core of regulation is the way that regulatory practices determine what kind of people belong in each place. These processes are essentially always instituted by (and to protect the interests of) the white majority.

Social scientists Eric Avila and Mark Rose, for example, have discussed how zoning and the organization of the American city has contributed to a new paradigm of containment. This paradigm was a product of the post World War II industrial urbanism which lead planners in the United States to strive to create interlocking single-use spaces, the goal being to spatially separate the activities of
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work, transport, shelter, and leisure.\textsuperscript{40} This kind of containment extended to efforts to contain racial and economic groups – according to Avila and Rose, racial and economic disparities were thus built into the design of every city.\textsuperscript{41} In this way, spatial organization made race by marking it geographically, creating a tangible indicator.\textsuperscript{42} This place-based organization made specific groups easier to mentally categorize and locate by keeping them separated; in this way, groups could be racially mentally mapped.

Aguilar San-Juan also asserts that this sort of segregation lead to a response from those spatially separated groups. In response to geographical containment and place-making projects, minority groups often invest in community-building.\textsuperscript{43} Once a place has been prescribed or designated for certain classes of people, these groups react by building community identities and support structures. These structures in turn further mark their places of origin and the residents of those places.\textsuperscript{44} The populations are thus implicated in the identity of that place, they are a part of what gives a place meaning but they are also affected by the identity of place. In short, the relationship between a place and the people that inhabit a place is one of interpellation and negotiation.
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The History of Planning in the United States

When cities and towns started to utilize planning and zoning in the early twentieth century, it launched a land use and planning revolution in the United States.\(^{45}\) Zoning laws organized municipalities into land use zones; these zones determined what kinds of uses land and property can be put to within the borders of the zones. The first municipal zoning ordinance was put into effect in Los Angeles in 1908; other cities followed suit and began to institute their own zoning laws. In Los Angeles, the purpose of zoning was to keep industry from expanding into residential neighborhoods.\(^{46}\) The proliferation of zoning laws lead to questions regarding their constitutionality, which subsequently lead to legal challenges that ultimately made their way to the U.S. Supreme Court.\(^{47}\) At issue was whether cities had the authority to determine what kinds of business and residences could be built where, thus restricting opportunities for some industries and businesses. Furthermore, certain social reformers saw zoning as a tool to slow the spread of slums and undesirable neighborhoods into more affluent regions.\(^{48}\) Thus zoning became, what Charles Haar, an acclaimed legal scholar and professor at Harvard Law School, termed, a “socio-legislative phenomenon;”\(^{49}\) this phenomenon was marked by, according to Yale Rabin, a shift from improving blighted urban environments to protecting property values and excluding undesirable residents from certain neighborhoods. As the motivation behind zoning became transcended economic to social ones, the
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constitutionality of it became even more questionable; especially once zoning ordinances began to regulate the ability of people to own property according to race.

In the summer of 1915, the Supreme Court of Virginia heard two cases dealing with racial zoning ordinances: Hopkins v. City of Richmond and Coleman v. Town of Ashland. Both municipalities had recently passed zoning ordinances which prohibited Blacks from living in areas which had a higher percentage of white residents than Black residents; both cases were instances of Black people violating said ordinances by attempting to rent or own (and occupy) property in neighborhoods which were predominantly white.50 The state supreme court upheld both the ordinances in question, asserting that the only way they could be unconstitutional was if they prohibited Blacks from moving into or enjoying the use of properties they had owned at the time the ordinances were enacted; the court said that the parts of the ordinances which allowed for that scenario were henceforth inoperative, but that the racialized zoning of the city and town were constitutional.51

In 1917 however, residents of Kentucky challenged a similar ordinance in the Federal Supreme Court. In Buchanan v Warley, the ordinance under question was one from Louisville, Kentucky, which likewise prohibited Blacks from living on residential blocks where the majority of residents were white.52 Buchanan, a white man, sold a house to Warley, a Black man, but since eight of the ten residents on the block were white, Warley was not legally permitted to live there and Buchanan
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accordingly refused to complete the sale. 53 In response Warley sued Buchanan, citing and challenging the ordinance. 54 The Supreme Court struck down the ordinance, asserting that it violated the Fourteenth Amendment’s protection of freedom of contract. 55 While the Court acknowledged that the state had significant interest in using its police power to promote the health, safety and wellbeing of its residents, state laws could not stand in opposition to federal laws. 56 Specifically, the Court argued that the Civil Rights Act of 1866 assured “to the colored race the enjoyment of all the civil rights…enjoyed by white persons,” and that protection included the right to make private contracts. 57

After Buchanan made explicit racial zoning ordinances illegal, cities turned to more tacit forms of legally enforcing residential segregation. One such tactic was “expulsive zoning.” Expulsive zoning was the practice of using land-use regulations and zoning in order to allow disruptive incompatible uses (such as factories or heavy industries) to penetrate minority neighborhoods in order to reduce the property values in those neighborhoods and undermine their stability. 58 Another significant trend that came out of the post-Buchanan era was the hiring of planning professionals to create legally defensible, effective but subtle, racial zoning plans. 59 Even though racial zoning consistently failed to withstand legal challenges after 1917, land use
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regulation and comprehensive citywide planning proved to be effective tools for shaping the urban social landscape.\(^{60}\)

Urban development via the implementation of master plans and the practice of “racially informed” zoning was a significant contributor to the creation of the racially bifurcated cities we see today.\(^{61}\) Planning Commissions would provide municipal governments with data which allowed the city officials and representatives to monitor and adjust land use trends based on social measures while avoiding being explicit regarding racial regulations in the actual laws.\(^{62}\) Additionally in 1926, the general constitutionality of zoning came under attack – the question being whether it was within the states’ powers to define land use and thus restrict business and economic opportunities in those zones. The Supreme Court addressed these concerns in the case *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.* The Court ruled that the speculative damages claimed by Ambler Realty were not sufficient to garner an injunction of the village’s police power (i.e. the power to act in the interest of the wellbeing of the state’s residents).\(^{63}\) As formal ordinances and zoning laws came under repeated judicial scrutiny, neighborhood planning, highway and road construction, private deed restrictions, and racially-influenced individual real estate practices began to play a more significant role in the establishment and maintenance of residential segregation.\(^{64}\)

\(^{60}\) Ibid.

\(^{61}\) Ibid.

\(^{62}\) Ibid.


\(^{64}\) Christopher Silver
Restrictive covenants were highly a effective tool for the white majority to instigate racial segregation. Restrictive covenants were clauses in private property deeds which regulated ownership and use of property; specifically of interest are the racial covenants which established that certain properties could be owned or occupied by whites only. In 1926 the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed the case Corrigan v. Buckley, a case that challenged the constitutionality of white only restrictive covenants. The Supreme Court refused to hear the case, claiming constitutional amendments were only relevant to state action, not private action and thus there was no basis upon which to challenge private restrictive covenants. In refusing to hear the case, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of restrictive covenants by simply refusing to acknowledge any legal way to challenge them.

Then, in 1948, another restrictive covenant case came before the U.S. Supreme Court. The case, Shelley v. Kraemer, involved a white couple (the Kraemers) suing a Black couple (the Shelleys) for moving into the Kraemers’ neighborhood which had restrictive covenants in place to prevent Blacks from living there. The Supreme Court held that, standing alone, restrictive covenants violate no laws or rights; any state action to enforce them, however, was in violation of the fourteenth amendment. In effect this made restrictive covenants illegal by making them unenforceable by state actors. In other words, they could exist as private agreements but could not be enforced, thus they were stripped of any legal
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significance (but, critically, not social significance). Therefore, as an agreement between private parties racial covenants could stand, but they could not withstand legal challenges. In spite of being unenforceable, racial covenants remained popular means to keep Blacks and other minorities out of white neighborhoods.\(^{68}\) Generally, minorities would not have the means or inclination to challenge these clauses; lawsuits were expensive, and even if they won it would not change the social atmosphere that engendered the restrictive covenant agreements – they would be rewarded by living in a neighborhood where their fellow residents did not want them.

These private, unenforceable contracts were dealt a mortal blow by the Federal Government twenty years after *Shelley*. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 put an end to such practices, making discrimination concerning the sale, rental or financing of any housing based on race illegal.\(^{69}\) Title VIII, also known as the Fair Housing Act (of 1968) provided a legal remedy to those private forms of discrimination which had heretofore eluded the law. The practices, for example, of refusing real estate loans to minorities which might enable them to afford better housing, or refusing to show houses in certain neighborhoods to minorities, were thus explicitly illegal and far easier to remedy.

Zoning practices, though subject to fairly rigid judicial scrutiny, can still be used to control how neighborhoods develop and who is likely to live there. Expulsive zoning, for example, still operates today – some neighborhoods are subject to greater
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encroachment from industry; these neighborhoods – as we will see with Salt Lake City – are chosen conspicuously, to say the least. In addition to allowing incompatible uses to enter certain areas, zoning determines what kinds of housing are permissible in neighborhoods. One of the most common methods of keeping neighborhoods economically segregated is density zoning. Density zoning determines maximum and minimum lot sizes for residential developments as well as whether dwellings may be single family only or multifamily units. Prohibiting multifamily units in a neighborhoods virtually guarantees that lower-earning families and individuals will not be able to afford moving in. Racial segregation will follow this kind of economic segregation as long as higher incomes are negatively correlated with minority status. In this way, a practice which purports to be economic “organization” can in fact be a highly effective tool for racial segregation. Policy efforts which aim to concentrate poverty in single locations and which aggravate economic inequality result in an increased isolation of poor minority households.

In 1977, the U.S. Supreme Court heard a case that addressed the concerns that zoning might negatively affect lower income and minority groups. In the case, Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Corp., a housing development corporation sought to build racially integrated, multi-family, low– and moderate– income housing. The area the corporation wished to build the project was, however,
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zoned for single family units only.\textsuperscript{74} The village refused to grant the corporation approval for their development, citing its incompatibility with the zoning.\textsuperscript{75} The corporation then sued the village on behalf of the Black plaintiffs (potential homeowners) who stood to suffer direct injuries as a result of the village’s refusal.\textsuperscript{76} The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the zoning ordinance, arguing that without proof of intent or purpose on behalf of the municipal government or legislation to be racially discriminatory the laws were constitutional.\textsuperscript{77} While the court acknowledged that minorities could be injured by these practices, density zoning laws were a permissible exercise of the village’s police power if there was no proof of intent to discriminate. This meant that zoning that harms or segregates racial minorities could continue—and does—so long as it didn’t do so explicitly.

Some scholars have hypothesized that, in spite of all these planning and zoning efforts, segregation is slowly coming to an end. Using information from the 2010 Census, Edward Glaeser and Jacob Vigdor estimate that only 20 percent of Blacks lived in what could be termed a “ghetto” neighborhood.\textsuperscript{78} Glaeser and Vigdor argue that the years between 1910 and 1960 were the most challenging for Blacks seeking to integrate.\textsuperscript{79} They faced exclusionary zoning, restrictive deed covenants, discrimination on the part of landlords and real estate agents as well as mortgage lenders public housing authorities.\textsuperscript{80} Still, as of 2010, the Black/white dissimilarity between different neighborhoods had declined to its lowest level in a century and the
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isolation of Black neighborhoods had reached its lowest point in 90 years. However, while residential segregation of Blacks appears to be declining, it is on the rise for Latino and Asian populations. Some scholars hypothesize that the cause may be the recent wave of immigration combined with a greater desire among new immigrants to live in isolated communities rather than integrated ones. In either case, residential segregation is not distinct; furthermore its creation and maintenance through legal means is worthy of study regardless of its prevalence now in juxtaposition with the past. In order to better study and understand the full implications of these practices as they engage with the construction of human categories, it is necessary to also investigate how laws themselves create notions of racial categories and the rights associated with those categories.

**Critical Race Theory**

In order to understand the full spectrum of consequences that result from this legacy of segregation, the full powers of law and property must be appreciated. First, it is important to note that property as a legal concept is inherently loaded with social implications. Property and property rights themselves are not naturally occurring events to which the government is a stranger, “but rather a socially created proposition in which the government participates.” In other words, property rights do not simply exist in the world, they are manufactured to balance protection of individuals and their interests in property, with the interests of the larger community. It is helpful to consider that the right to own property is the right to use, enjoy and
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keep others from using or enjoying the owned item in question. Property rights are in
other words, a system of privileges, and like any system of privileges, giving rights to
one individual necessarily takes them away from another. In its most abstract form,
property rights constitute a zero sum game, where ownership for one party excludes
ownership for the other. In reality of course, the law is not that simple; this
abstraction is, however, useful for understanding the more far-reaching consequences
of racialized residential segregation.

Abstractly speaking, if someone owns property, they have the right to full and
private use of that property – more specifically, the right to exclude others from using
that same piece of property. However, as the law operates there are sometimes limits
to degree to which property rights are all-encompassing. Regardless of these limits it
is sufficient to think of property rights as zero sum, in other words giving whites the
privilege to own property on the east side of the city – near the mountains and far
away from industry – denies that same privilege to nonwhites. Racial covenants are
an explicit case of giving white residents property rights while denying them to
nonwhites. The very idea of property and ownership creates a system where these
privileges can be allocated inequitably, creating distinctions among people based on
how much and what kind of property rights they have.

In her landmark work, “Whiteness as Property,” Cheryl Harris investigates the
way property rights have created a legal system in which whiteness itself is a form of
property as a result of the rights it commands. Harris argues that over time the law
has come to embody as well as legitimize the benefits that white citizens collect based
solely on their whiteness. While Harris concedes that the legal system has ostensibly
and formally ended the most prevalent forms of race discrimination, but she further asserts that this purported egalitarianism only serves to hide discrimination that is pervasive in American society. Whiteness as a status, argues Harris, is accompanied by a set of assumptions and privileges in a way that is rarely apparent, but has been historically protected and legitimated by the law. Laws in the United States have historically protected white(men)’s access to resources while obstructing access to those same resources for Blacks and Native Americans. Being white (and male) in the United States automatically afforded certain benefits, such as the right to vote, own property, hold political office, preference for employment over racial minorities, and so on. In other words, simply by being born into the dominant, majority group meant being guaranteed certain advantages over those who were not. The white majority in turn, put in place a legal structure to protect these rights (by denying them to outsiders – nonwhites). In essence, a substantial amount of law and policy was put in place to protect these white interests and the privileges guaranteed to whites for no other reason besides their whiteness. The superior status of whites was something whites were highly invested in protecting, so they used the system of law and government they had control over to create a legal structure which would grant whites privileges at the expense of nonwhites, operating in the interest of increasing the power and protection of the white majority.

This is apparent in city planning and zoning policy— those that had the ability to make the plans and were whites (generally males) in positions of political and social authority. The real property interests of whites could be threatened by the
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encroaching presence of nonwhite residents. In creating ordinances, master plans, and maintaining racialized private real estate practice, white neighborhoods and white property were protected. White privilege (the inherent benefits afforded to whites simply for being white) is the central cause of exploitation and discrimination; racial zoning and racialized real estate practices are consequences of efforts to protect this white privilege – in this case the privilege to live in racially homogenous neighborhoods in the better parts of town.

Furthermore, this project of legally segregating cities results in an inequitable distribution of resources. More than just relegating minorities to the parts of town that have lower property values and are closer in proximity to industrial areas, residential segregation results in a variety of other socioeconomic disparities. Access to most standard goods and services, for example, differ by neighborhoods. Access to jobs, education, financial resources such as banks, as well as higher-end leisure and recreation sites. Researchers have shown that in segregated communities, if the majority of the population does not achieve a high level of education and makes little money, the progeny of that community are significantly more likely to follow the same course. Additionally, employers are known to create “mental maps” of cities, attributing types of workers and skills to residents of certain areas. These mental maps make it difficult for residents of these neighborhoods to achieve any sort of socioeconomic upward mobility. In short, institutional structures engender
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geographic-based discrimination. Thus the legal methods of maintaining racial segregation are tools to protect the interests and opportunities associated with whiteness while denying them to others.

II. SALT LAKE CITY’S LEGAL SPACES

As previously discussed, legal creation and maintenance of space falls into three categories: planning, zoning, and private practices. Planning and zoning occur on a governmental level, while private acts – such as discrimination on the part of real estate agents and individual real estate contracts – occur on a person-to-person basis. These three factors are explored in this section in the specific context of Salt Lake City. Planning and Zoning and their evolution are examined first, followed by a brief description on the kinds of private discrimination that occurred historically in the city. This is because, while the powers of the city to zone are extensive, due to the legal history explored in the previous section, they could not explicitly enforce any racial segregation. Private contracts and restrictive covenants, in contrast, were maintained as a legal way to determine where minorities could live until 1948. Explicit racial zoning laws were declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court in 1917, a year before the first steps toward official and governmental city planning were even taking place in Utah.
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The more nuanced and complicated tactics of zoning and planning are discussed first in this section in order to provide a broader context within which private actions can be understood. We will see that restrictive covenants were an effective and far reaching mechanism for racial segregation that operate within a city that was already set up to segregate. For the time that they were enacted, restrictive covenants picked up the slack, successfully regulating residential areas when zoning and planning – subject to harsher judicial scrutiny – failed.

The Incentive to Zone

The purpose of zoning was to keep incompatible land uses from existing in the same area – for example, to keep homes and schools away from trade and industry, and thus protect the wellbeing of citizens.\textsuperscript{95} Zoning was a way to organize the city in such a way that protected the morals and health of the city's residents and avoid disorder and confusion.\textsuperscript{96} It kept houses away from industrial areas and schools (and therefore children) away from commercial centers and shady characters. But planning was not only for the sake of safety and organization, it was also deeply invested in the production of a certain image.

In 1939, the Utah State Planning Board published a preliminary plan for the Salt Lake City-Ogden Region.\textsuperscript{97,98} The State wanted to emphasize the importance of Salt Lake City as the capitol of the Mormon religion. According to the board, the
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region had obligations to systematic planning out of respect to the church.\textsuperscript{99} Salt Lake City as a population center, religious center, and a state capitol had certain responsibilities and commitments to comprehensive planning and zoning.\textsuperscript{100} The history and evolution of planning and zoning in Salt Lake City is rife with anxiety surrounding these obligations – this section investigates planning and zoning laws and practices and how they reflect Salt Lake City’s apprehension regarding its image and reputation. Zoning laws allow a city to determine what the city will look like – the very shape it will take; as this section will demonstrate, the city government has substantial control over how buildings can be built and where.

Zoning laws and ordinances did not go unchallenged, there have been several cases challenging zones and requesting changes. These cases are, however, almost never ruled in the favor of the citizens requesting change. The courts generally side with the city, saying that the city has the authority to zone in the interest of promoting the wellbeing of its citizens. Unless the plaintiff can show that the zoning is arbitrary or capricious – which is extremely difficult to establish – the court will rule in the favor of the city’s authority to zone.\textsuperscript{101}

Planning as a practice happens on several levels. There are state plans and county plans, but also city plans. Cities, through state ordinances, have the majority of planning power, but the state itself also has an interest in how the cities are planned. Plans themselves are not legally enforceable, they are guidelines and recommendations; so while the are important in that they demonstrate the goals and
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desires of city officials – and sometimes the communities themselves – the do not in and of themselves determine the development of the city. Zoning laws are legally enforceable and explicitly regulate what kinds of buildings and developments can be built where and what properties they must have. Understanding that the two are closely related – often the commissions which publish master plans for the city and those that zone the city are the same – is essential to understanding the implications of each kind of document. The laws are significant in their enforceability, but they primarily demonstrate how the city is organized and only regulate land use. The master plans, though unenforceable, go hand in hand with the zoning ordinances and explicate the goals of the community, the image the community is meant to produce.

Preliminary Steps

In 1918, The Salt Lake City Commission brought a man named George E. Kessler, a nationally reputed city planner, from Missouri to assist in the creation of a city plan. Bringing planning experts to city’s was extremely common after 1917 – when the U.S. Supreme Court decided in Buchanan v. Warley that explicit racial zoning was unconstitutional. Although there is no explicit legal evidence that the city commissioners were seeking a racially driven city plan, zoning at this time in the United States was often invested in racial organization, and furthermore, in the first decades of the twentieth century, many immigrants and racial minorities were coming
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to Salt Lake City to work on railroads and in mines.\textsuperscript{104} So while it is impossible to say definitively that the city commissioners were seeking assistance for purely racialist reasons, given the contemporaneous national atmosphere and the sudden influx of racially and ethnically “other” groups into the valley, it is very likely that racial and ethnic organization was a concern if not a priority for the city commissioners.

With Kessler’s help, the city commissioners hoped to, “obtain a systematic plan to govern the future growth and development of its various civic activities.”\textsuperscript{105} The purpose of bringing Kessler to the city was, according to City Commission, to organize industrial and residential growth and to create the necessary geographical distinctions to keep the city from developing chaotically and avoid “the attendant evil and confusion” of such disorderly growth.\textsuperscript{106} Of particular concern was the “haphazard” development already prevalent on the city’s west side.\textsuperscript{107} The Commission was confident that every citizen of the city would “welcome the adoption of a definite plan.”\textsuperscript{108}

However, the public did not show as much interest as the Commission would have liked. In an effort to garner more public interest, the Commission advertised community meetings, urging citizens that the “preservation of respective real estate values” was an essential aspect of the planning process.\textsuperscript{109} Furthermore, the Commission asserted that zoning ordinances would, “prohibit the establishment of
certain classes of commercial business in residential sections so as to prevent the
‘blighting’ of the district for home purposes.”

In other words, the City Commission tried to entice the majoritarian community to participate in the zoning process by asserting that such ordinances would protect their property interests and their neighborhoods from being invaded by certain undesirable businesses. If nothing else, it is clear that the Commission was highly invested in keeping different classes geographically segregated – and class during this time, and especially in this city was inextricably tethered to race and ethnicity.

Kessler’s preliminary report on Salt Lake City, emphasized that it was an overview of the city’s development up until that point and by no means comprehensive but a document to guide the City Commissioners in the development of a systematic and complete city plan. Kessler recommended that the commissioners study the reasons that the city had become a population and activity center, and discover the best way to organize these activities so that people and products could be distributed economically and effectively. Kessler praised the “wonderful foresight” of the city’s founders, claiming that they chose a region which could easily support a very large population and expand easily. He also praised the construction of the railroad lines which ran on the western side of central business
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district and went on to make recommendations on transportation, highways, and zoning.\textsuperscript{115}

Kessler recommended that the expansion of the railroads should be contained to avoid unnecessary encroachment on residential or commercial land. In his opinion, the blocks between Second West and Eighth West should be sufficient to allow the railroads to expand without impinging on the central business district; he emphasized that under no circumstances should the railroads be allowed to develop farther east than Second South – this meant that railroad companies would only be permitted to build tracks farther to the west of existing ones, expanding farther outside of the city toward agricultural land.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, he recommended that the city be weary of the expansion of the warehouse and industrial buildings in the west area near the railroad tracks. He warned that the natural tendency of these areas was to grow, and such growth could abut or invade the commercial districts which would inevitably create conditions detrimental for business development and force it to shift farther eastward.\textsuperscript{117} Kessler’s report emphasized the importance of forcing the industrial and railroad areas to move westward, rather than allowing the commercial district to be forced east. Geographically this made sense because the lands to west were less valuable, expansive, and flat while the land to the east was covered by commercial blocks, residential blocks, and eventually the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains. Not only did the region to the west of Salt Lake have more mileage but less challenging terrain – it also had fewer wealthy or influential inhabitants or commercial businesses.
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In the section of the report labeled, “Zoning,” Kessler recommended creating zones for residential and commercial centers as well as for industry and railroads.\(^{118}\) While Kessler provided a detailed and generous outline for the zoning boundaries for the business district, he did not offer specific boundaries for residential zones.\(^{119}\) Instead, he advised that two distinct kinds of residential districts be made: one zoning class for “single detached houses” and another for “those containing more than one family.”\(^{120}\) In order to residentially zone the city properly, Kessler recommended a detailed study of each residential block of the city in order to determine which class of neighborhood should be permitted to exist in which part of the city.\(^{121}\)

Finally, Kessler recommended the creation of an independent municipal commission, complete with a legal advisor, to direct the zoning and planning of the city.\(^{122}\) Members should, according to Kessler, be appointed by the Mayor, represent the “very best citizenship of the community,” and be unpaid.\(^{123}\) Notably, this is the form the Planning Commission still holds today.

**Early Zoning (1924-1930)**

At the time of Kessler’s report the constitutionality of zoning had yet to be firmly established, and would not be for another eight years in 1926. Regardless, the Salt Lake City Board of Commissioners and the City Planning Commission began to work towards a comprehensive zoning plan in 1924.\(^{124}\) However, the municipal
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The government stressed that in order to ensure the effectiveness of any zoning plans, the Utah State Legislature had to pass a statute to grant municipalities the authority to zone and enforce their zoning; similar laws had already been passed in many states.\textsuperscript{125} The state legislature passed such a law, The Zoning Act of 1925, later that same year.\textsuperscript{126}

In 1926, the U.S. Supreme Court decided the case \textit{Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.} establishing the constitutionality of zoning by municipalities and clearing the way for the Planning Commission to legally zone the entirety of the city.\textsuperscript{127} A series of committee and public meetings were held from May 1925 to September 1927, during which regional plans were consolidated into a single city plan.\textsuperscript{128} In June 1927 – just three months before the city plan was entirely consolidated – Salt Lake City passed an ordinance officially creating the Salt Lake City Planning and Zoning Commission (even though a provisional commission had been acting for at least two years).\textsuperscript{129}

By August of 1927, just two months after becoming an official entity but after two years of meetings, the Planning Commission had zoned the city into seven zoning classes: Residential A, Residential B, Residential B2, Residential C, Commercial, Industrial, and Unrestricted.\textsuperscript{130} Residential A was the most restricted, with only single
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family detached dwellings, churches, schools, libraries and farming activities allowed; each of the subsequent residential zones were progressively less restricted, allowing more diverse kinds of businesses and one- or two- or multi-family dwellings.131

Five months later, the Planning Commission had zoned the entire city and created a Board of Adjustment to hear grievances and recommend adjustments to the zoning plan.132 In this way, citizens who had been harmed by the zoning (by losing the ability to build a business in one area or believing their neighborhood to be zoned incorrectly etc.) could present their case to the Board of Adjustment; the board would then use its discretion to endorse (or not endorse) an alteration to the City Planning Commission.133 Adjustments would only be endorsed if zoning had resulted in unnecessary hardship.134 By 1930, several changes had already been made to the city plan after the two year “trial period” of the comprehensive City Plan demonstrated the need for a few necessary but relatively minor changes.135

In 1931, the Department of Commerce prepared a bill and presented it to the state legislature which aimed to give municipalities the power to regulate the
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subdivision of land and create regional planning commissions. Subdivisions are areas of land which are subdivided in ways that are more easily developed, such as housing subdivisions in which large portions of land are broken into individual lots and each lot could then be sold independently of the others by the developer. This law enabled the city to accept or deny subdivision plans. This more or less left it up to the City Commissioners’ discretion to refuse subdivisions which were undesirably platted. In other words, the municipal government has a substantial amount of control over what kind of subdivisions could be built and what they would be allowed to look like. The Board of Commissioners stressed an interest in maintaining order in all subdivisions rather than allowing them to be divided and sold haphazardly. The municipal government therefore had control over, not only what could be built where through their zoning powers, but also the shape that those buildings or developments could take.

Planning and Public Interest (1930s-1950s)

In 1935 a Salt Lake City and County Planning Report regarding low-rent public housing discusses the problem of “slums” in Salt Lake City. It refers to them as “nests” and “arks,” and describes all examples as dilapidated buildings filled with densely packed minorities. The report claims that a conservative estimate based upon a survey of real property indicates that one-fourth of the city’s urban housing
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needed to be demolished and rebuilt on a no-profit basis.\textsuperscript{141} In other words, housing near the urban center, in neighborhoods like Greek Town and J-Town was disintegrating. Furthermore, some minority and low-income families at this time were living in railcars on abandoned train tracks.\textsuperscript{142} Low-rent public housing was thus mainly targeted at removing densely packed minorities in housing near downtown. The language of the report is highly racist, specifically labeling slums as high-density racial enclaves.\textsuperscript{143} The concerns of the Planning Department were targeted primarily at the intersection of lower class and minority statuses. This particular intersection provided a unique intersection of threats against the integrity of the city: the presence of poverty and minority groups threatened the integrity of Salt Lake City as the capitol of the Mormon Church, as the paradigmatic “city of God.” The presence of the poor reflected poorly on the image of perfection the Church and city strove to maintain; furthermore the presence of nonbelievers and minority groups – especially those with darker skin that had been marked by sin – undermined the religious purity of the city.

Less than a decade later, in 1943, the Planning Commission published an updated City Plan. By this time, poor housing was definitively concentrated to the west of the city.\textsuperscript{144} Additionally, the report claimed that single-family zoning in these poor areas was under threat of deterioration because of the presence of two-family
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structures as well as adjacent commercial, industrial or multi-family dwellings.\textsuperscript{145} The report also boasts, however, that Salt Lake City has a smaller population in two-family and multi-family neighborhoods (about nine percent) than almost any city of comparable size in the country.\textsuperscript{146} Notwithstanding this point of pride, one multi-family area was of special concern: the “narrow, less desirable apartment house strip” which occupies transitional space between the main business district and the railroad and industrial area in the west, the result of which was a “spotty and unstable condition.”\textsuperscript{147}

This, as the 1943 City Plan describes, “spotty” section of multifamily housing was the Old Greek Town and J-Town area – though by this time the Greeks had largely vacated the area and Blacks, Mexican immigrants and other low wage workers were moving in.\textsuperscript{148} The 1943 City Plan concludes, with a note of anxiety, that the space available for additional residential developments was “definitely limited,” and that it would be necessary to improve the west side of the city to offer more desirable residential opportunities.\textsuperscript{149} Additionally, the city needed to, according to the Planning Commission, prioritize the “rehabilitation” – or reclamation – of existing low value residential blocks near the city’s downtown.\textsuperscript{150} In other words, the new City Plan demonstrated substantial apprehension regarding the areas which had

been occupied by low-wage minority workers, and – with the assurance that
residential space was limited – advocated revitalizing and improving the poor
neighborhoods. This sort of project is loaded of course, because revitalizing and
redeveloping poor neighborhoods often means making them unaffordable for the
populations that already live there.151 In other words, by making poor neighborhoods
more affluent, it forces the poorer residents to look elsewhere for homes.

In 1953, in order to convince the Salt Lake City community of the importance
of zoning, the Planning Commission published a pamphlet called, “A Choice for Salt
Lake City: Planning or Community Hash”152 The cover depicted nefarious cartoon
chefs throwing incompatible buildings (i.e. houses and factories) into a pot and letting
it all cook together.153 The pamphlet offered residents a simple choice: to live in a
“thrown-together ‘hash-like’ community,” or to live in a “pleasant, efficient
neighborhood created and protected by planning.”154 The pamphlet goes on to assert
that the purpose of planning and zoning is to promote “good neighborhoods,”
“harmony in community life,” and the “achievement of a wholesome
environment.”155 Finally the pamphlet, in a highly propagandistic manner, states that
“there are a few people out of step with the interests of the majority,” who either “do
not understand planning,” or “wish to promote their own individual interests without
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consideration of their neighborhoods.” The pamphlet asserts that the cooperation of all residents is necessary in order to build communities worthy of pride.

The language throughout the pamphlet is extremely coded. The publication encourages Salt Lake City residents to think of zoning – and support it – as an act which creates a “wholesome” and environment, and protects their wellbeing. The question then becomes, of course, from what do the residents of Salt Lake City need protecting from? Certainly the threat of having a factory next to a citizen’s house is reason enough for alarm, but in the 1950s there were certainly other social anxieties. The intermingling of different economic classes for example, or arguably more fearful, racially integrated neighborhoods. The use of the cartoon chef on the front of the pamphlet, throwing various things into a giant boiling cauldron in order to create, “community hash,” seems to be a direct reference to the myth of the American “Melting Pot.” This myth was the postulation that many heterogeneous communities (or racial groups) would mix together to create one homogeneous community. Inherent in this scheme is racial as well as cultural mixing to produce people of a single (but not pure) race. The pamphlet thus immediately implies a sense that planning will protect Salt Lake City from any such racial mixing.

**Separation of East and West (1967-1990)**

The Salt Lake City Master Plan of 1967 noted the importance of the LDS Church in the physical development of the city, claiming its activities had an
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For the sake of organization, the Planning Commission had, in its various updates, divided the city into seven distinct communities, each with their own Master Plan to guide them. The communities created in 1967 are by and large the communities still used today: the Northwest, Westside, Capitol Hill, Central City, Avenues, East Bench, and Sugarhouse. The purpose of the master plans is to guide the development process, not necessarily to legally enforce certain types of development – unlike land use ordinances and zoning. Master Plans are community-based goals whereas zoning laws legally determine what kind of buildings could or could not be built.

The 1967 Master Plan notes some major differences between the communities on the west side of the city (Northwest and West Side) and those to the east. The Northwest community – to the northwest of downtown – would see an increase in high-density housing as well as industrial activity to the far west of the city, near the airport. The West Side community – directly to the south of the Northwest community and immediately west of downtown – should see an increase in single-family units, with high density units near commercial centers and community facilities. The Plan also notes several significant problems facing the West Side community after World War II: substandard curb and gutter construction, deterioration of some structures and urban blight, and the presence of railroad tracks in residential areas. The Master Plan recommends taking steps toward addressing
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these problems and improving the residential area. The Plan also insists, however, that the remaining agricultural land to the west of these neighborhoods should be zoned for industrial use to allow new industrial activities.165

East side neighborhoods, in contrast are more often zoned for single family detached houses, and have city roads or foothills for boundaries rather than railroad tracks or industrial zones.166 There were two large high-density housing areas planned for Salt Lake City – one to the southeast of the city, and the other on the west side. The one to the east was bounded only by streets and small community commercial centers. It’s boundaries are thus only determined by the Planning Commission’s recommendations rather than any existing geographical or urban barriers. The west side neighborhoods, in contrast are limited in their ability to expand and they don’t blend seamlessly into the rest of the city. In fact, the way the 1967 Master Plan describes the city and recommends its future development, the west side neighborhoods are stuck between new industrial areas and old, dilapidated industrial areas and railroad tracks. Furthermore The Northwest and West Side Communities are trapped, industrial space encroaching to the west, but unable to expand to the east because of downtown; a community outside the city, trapped and enclosed by undesirable and incompatible developments. Additionally, when interstate highways were being planned through Salt Lake City, years were spent choosing the right location. Planning began in 1959 and the roads were completed in 1964.167

Ultimately, they followed the path of the railroads. Those that cut north-south with on
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and off ramps to downtown, cut just to the west of the old rail yards, creating yet another barrier separating the west side neighborhoods from the rest of the city.  

This is an example of “expulsive zoning,” as discussed in the previous section. These zoning practices which allowed industrial land use to encroach on low-income residential and built highways through or near the same neighborhoods threatened the stability of those neighborhoods and vastly reduced the property values. While this may not have directly enforced racial segregation, it certainly encouraged the polarization of the upper- and lower-class neighborhoods. This increased polarization, since the upper and middle classes were predominantly white, was essentially as good as active racial segregation.

In 1982, the Salt Lake City Division of Planning and Zoning updated the City Plan once again. The Commission noted that, under some loophole, they were able to redirect federal funds from blight-stricken and minority areas to the development of east side neighborhoods. Due to a sudden reversal in policy, the City was able to begin planning and implementing new projects for these areas. In 1988, the Salt Lake City Division of Planning and Zoning released an Economic Status Report. The

---

168 Ezra C. Knowlton, 654, 648, 581
169 Christopher Silver
171 Utah State Archives and Records Service, Salt Lake City (Utah) Planning and Zoning City Plan, Series 4937 (1982: 11)
172 Ibid. The Planning Report explains, “Until the 1979-1980 planning year the use of CDBG [Community Development Bock Grant] funds for planning was limited to areas having a concentration of blight, low income or minority residents. This policy, as interpreted by the Office of Coordination (OPC), kept the Department from conducting the Sugarhouse and Eastbench Community plans. Because of this policy planning priorities centered on CDBG eligible planning activities supporting the redevelopment of intercity neighborhoods. In response to an inquiry made by the Planning Department in June 1978, concerning OPC’s interpretation, HUD informed the City that all advanced planning activities which were eligible under the 701 program were eligible for CDBG funds. This reversal of OPC policy has allowed for the future scheduling of the following additional planning projects funded by the CDBG.”
report cited a substantial decrease in population in the neighborhoods surrounding downtown, some of which have become completely nonresidential. The Report claims that this is due to an increase in rent for these units as well as a decrease in employment. The area, once a thriving industrial center, had fallen to the pressures of international competition – the mining and steel industries had either moved out of the city or became defunct altogether. This lack of employment vacated the neighborhoods surrounding the old smelters and mills and contributed to an over-all decrease in Salt Lake City’s population. As a result of this population decrease, the Salt Lake Planning Commission recommended a change in housing policy, to revitalize and diversify the offerings for low-income housing as well as to implement neighborhood-targeted programs for redevelopment.

Increasing Control (1955-Present)

While planning efforts have been changing in response to shifting populations and policies, zoning ordinances have changed as well. The evolution of Salt Lake City’s zoning ordinances have been marked by a drastic increase in the varieties of zones. By 1955, the number of use districts had more than doubled from the original seven to fifteen. The number of residential zones increased from four to six, allowing for a greater diversity in types of housing, number of families per dwelling, and size regulations. The remaining districts were Agricultural, Limited Business, Limited
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Commercial, Low-Density Commercial, General Business, Light Industrial, Intermediate Industrial, Heavy Industrial, and Trailer Courts.\textsuperscript{178}

In 1964, the Planning Commission added yet another type of residential zone. In 1969, another kind of Light Industrial zone was added which prohibited auto-wrecking or the storage and/or burning of various “junk” objects.\textsuperscript{179} In 1974, the commission added three more residential districts, a research district (for the labs at the University of Utah), and a new commercial district.\textsuperscript{180} In 1982, the commission added another nine districts.\textsuperscript{181} By 1995, the total number of districts was 19: six types of commercial districts, two types of manufacturing districts (light and heavy), three types of downtown districts, eleven special purpose districts (including airport, research park, public lands, open space, mobile homes, and others), and eight kinds of overlay districts (overlay districts existed on top of other districts, adding additional regulations – such as historical preservation, transitional, flight path, conservancy).\textsuperscript{182}

Today, there are 19 residential districts, nine business districts, two commercial districts, four downtown districts, one gateway district,\textsuperscript{183} and 17 special purpose districts with 12 overlay districts.\textsuperscript{184} This increase in specificity may have been as a result of inadequacy of the zones for serving the community, or because the Planning Commission wanted more control over the city’s development. Current
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zoning maps are intricate gradients of colors and patterns, it is clear than an effort has been made to blend zones together so that the different spaces of the city transition smoothly into each other. With increasing distance from downtown, the residential areas become less dense, requiring more setback from the street, fewer families per dwelling, and larger lots. Though the West Side is now largely zoned the same as many parts of the east side neighborhood, it still has the unique obstacle of being located in between industrial and manufacturing zones and the highways and old rail yards. The east side neighborhoods also have the distinct advantage of proximity to the foothills, and thus the more lavish neighborhoods. There are no high-priced neighborhoods on the west side of the city. This lack of affluence in the west further enforces the socioeconomic differences between the two sides of the city, creating an unbalanced division of neighborhood types.

The city was originally zoned so that each of the communities could be relatively self-sustaining. They were not meant to be crossed by any large thoroughfares and they were meant to have their own schools, recreational centers, parks, and shopping centers. That way, outside from for occupational reasons (such as working in an office downtown), residents would not have to leave their regions for any quotidian reason. This was marketed by the Planning Commission as a design of efficiency and a way to foster a sense of a small community in a large city.
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Another effect of this design, however, is the creation of insular places; areas which create their own identities and are given identities by others due to a lack of cohesion of one community with another. In keeping the traffic of everyday activities local, the city created fairly distinct regions. While on the east side, their may be cause to traverse other neighborhoods to get downtown, or to the parks and trails in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains, there is almost no reason for a resident of the east side to go west. Likewise, West Side residents may move within the West Side and toward downtown, but there is little incentive to go farther east. Furthermore, where east side neighborhoods have undeveloped mountains as their outer borders, the West Side residents have industrial space. This further affects both the land value on the West Side as well as the way the area is perceived; it still seems like neighborhood for low-wage laborers.

**Restrictive Covenants (1900-1950)**

Strictly speaking, restrictive covenants in Salt Lake City predated any legalized zoning activity. At the turn of the twentieth century, Salt Lake City’s coal burning and smelting industries were operating at full capacity, polluting the air and bringing in minorities to work long hours for low wages. The presence of minority workers as well as the air pollution proved unappealing to the white middle-class, and they began to move farther outside the city into homogeneous suburbs. As
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developers sought to profit off these outbound population trends, they began to buy up massive tracts of land and build subdivisions. These subdivisions immediately created class distinctions and separation; east side subdivisions drew in middle-class professionals while west side suburbs catered to working-class laborers working in the industrial yards and factories near the commercial district downtown.

In 1909, the real estate developers Kimball & Richards Land Merchants, platted Highland Park, a subdivision to the south east of downtown; it was one of the largest to date with 2,519 housing lots in its first plat. Highland Park was also one of the first developments to instigate restrictive covenants to protect the white homogeneity of the subdivision. Restrictive covenants did not become popular until the 1920s, until then the middle and upper classes of Salt Lake City had been dominated by whites. It wasn’t until immigrants and minorities began moving to Salt Lake City in large numbers, some of them making enough money to afford middle-class housing, that real estate developers and agents found it necessary to make explicit the racial restrictions of neighborhoods. Housing deeds in east side suburbs would often contain clauses that prohibited nonwhite residents from purchasing or renting homes.

Even after *Shelley v. Kraemer* made racially discriminatory restrictive covenants unenforceable in 1948, other kinds of restrictive covenants (which often related to finance rather than race) prohibited most minorities from moving by
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economic means.\textsuperscript{198} The prices for just the land to build a house on in these subdivisions could rage between $125 and $270 with minimum building costs of $1,800.\textsuperscript{199} Additionally, many east side subdivisions required homes to be built of brick and other more expensive materials, as opposed to cheaper frame houses.\textsuperscript{200} Most of the houses built during this time on the west side were frame houses and cost about half as much to construct as their east-side brick counterparts, implying that the working-class community could not afford to build in brick, and thus could not afford to purchase brick homes on the east side.\textsuperscript{201}

Occasionally, deeds would still include racial discriminatory restrictive covenants, even though they were legally unenforceable; due to the relatively low social and political leverage afforded to minorities, it was difficult for them to challenge these clauses.\textsuperscript{202} Additionally, even if minorities did challenge them and ultimately win the right to live in the neighborhood, they would be living in a place where they were not wanted.\textsuperscript{203} At least if they stayed in their West Side neighborhoods, they may not feel so aggressively resisted by their immediate environment.

Even once the legal means by which explicit segregation was enforced had been deconstructed, the social structure that created it still stood. These social pressure kept minorities out of east side neighborhoods even after they could afford to purchase homes in them. The laws were more than just the rules and regulations, they
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were a reflection of a social atmosphere – an atmosphere that sought to create racially distinct spaces; in other words, the laws acted as place making mechanisms, marking parts of the city by race and class and thus designating places for individuals based on race. Though some ethnic groups (such as Ashkenazi Jews, Greeks, and Italians) ultimately achieved white status, they were initially viewed as nonwhite; thus the organizational project of putting these groups on the West Side still constituted a racial project. The West Side was always a place for nonwhites and racial others, therefore the white majority placing these groups on the West Side through economic, social and legal measures constitutes a racial project where the white majority assigns racial minority status through geography.

III. THE SPATIAL POLITICS OF IDENTITY

The City Commission’s efforts to bring George E. Kessler to help them zone Salt Lake City were rooted in a particular spatial anxiety; the commission was specifically concerned about the city’s organization in the face of relatively sudden industrial and commercial expansion. The commissioners cited the need to develop a plan to separate residential and industrial growth and ordered development as rationale for bringing Kessler. Kessler’s report did precisely what the commission expected it to, it recommended a strict organization of the city to preserve what order remained from the Mormon’s original plat.
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Salt Lake City was originally planned and designed to be the New Zion. As a sacred city, theological ideas influenced and informed decisions regarding urban planning and development. The city’s original intended shape corroded when the railroads brought industry, commerce, and outsiders. The outsiders undermined the theological and racial purity of the city and industry and commercial businesses undermined the egalitarian plat of the city. Agricultural blocks were regionally replaced with factories, train depots, and a dense commercial district. In this way, capitalism and industry infected the City of Zion in both demographic and spatial terms. Salt Lake City responded to this variation with laws and regulations to keep outsiders sequestered and industry contained.

These efforts to organize and restore some semblance of order to the city resulted in a social divide which split Salt Lake City into east and west sides, separating and reinforcing differences between race and economic class. In other words, these attempts to organize the city, gave shape to spaces and identities to places. In zoning Salt Lake City, the municipal government created a system by which regions were marked explicitly by what kind of structures were allowed and, implicitly, by who was allowed or could afford to live where. Additionally, the social pressures behind these laws were able to reinforce the racial segregation wherever legal measures fell short. This section examines the consequences of these social pressures – and the laws those pressures produced – in terms of Salt Lake City’s historical and contemporary racial geography. In order to address both the historical
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and contemporary repercussions, this section engages with the racial and ethnic enclaves discussed in the second chapter in order to contextualize the theories and the legal histories explicated in the first two sections of this chapter.

Religion and Exclusion: Utes, Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders

Long before zoning and planning became legal ideas, the Utes, Goshutes, and Shoshone Indians engaged in a spatial conflict with the Mormon pioneers. The indigenous peoples of the Salt Lake Valley found themselves at odds with the narrative that the Mormon settlers sought to carry out. The Saints had certain expectations of their Lamanites brethren; they were supposed to join hands with the Mormons, adopt their quotidian and spiritual lifestyle, and assist the Saints in constructing the City of Zion. When the local Indigenous peoples showed little interest in abandoning their traditions in the interest of the New Jerusalem, the Saints removed them from the territory. The Mormons settled on Indigenous territory, and forced them to the fringes of Deseret. This is the first example of the Mormons’ expulsive tendencies. In the interest of preserving the religious integrity of their paradigmatic religious capitol, the Saints expelled the Indigenous peoples from its boundaries.

The Native Hawaiian converts that were brought to Salt Lake City by missionaries in the 1880s faced similar exclusionary pressures. In 1889, the Church leadership felt it necessary to move the Kanaka Maoli outside the city because the

---

211 Recall that according to the Book of Mormon, indigenous Americans are the sole survivors of the (extended) biblical narrative; as such they are spiritual kin to the Mormon Saints.
212 See: Ned Blackhawk, Ronald W. Walker, D.W. Meinig, and Jared Farmer
social ostracism became so pervasive. The religious ties of the Kanaka Maoli to the Salt Lake City community were not strong enough to overcome the race-based and stereotypical fears of the white Mormons. Though Mormon missionaries brought this group to the city, the Mormon residents of Salt Lake City ultimately expelled the Kanaka Maoli because they threatened the city’s white homogeneity.

The Utes and other Indigenous peoples along with the Kanaka Maoli present examples of the exclusionary impulses present in Salt Lake City before planning and zoning were institutionalized. When the Church and the city were dealing with the Indigenous peoples and the Kanaka Maoli, the Church still had control over the city. By the time other groups of interest came to the city, the non-Mormon population had increased substantially; additionally, capitalist and industrial interests had gained a significant amount of influence. As the Saints’ lost the level of control they had once enjoyed, their ability to eradicate undesirable populations was substantially diminished; thus when immigrant labor – such as the early Chinese and Japanese railroad laborers – arrived in the city, they were not so easily removed and the Saints had to resort to other methods to retain the purity of their city. Though some of the Chinese immigrants arrived in Salt Lake City around the same time as the Kanaka Maoli converts, their economic role granted them some security as did Plum Alley’s role as an illicit destination for white men pursuing vices such as gambling and opium. Unlike the Kanaka Maoli, the Chinese laborers were under the jurisdiction
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of labor agents, not the LDS Church. Furthermore, the Chinese offered things that the Kanaka Maoli didn’t: cheap labor and an outlet for vice — the Hawaiian converts on the other hand, tried to incorporate themselves into the Mormon community, ostensibly offering only racial diversity which, as a general rule during this time period was not appreciated by the white majority.

In the 1930s, Mormon missionaries brought the first Polynesians to Salt Lake City, much like they had brought the Native Hawaiians five decades earlier. Very few Pacific Islander converts came to Salt Lake City until much more recently however — most within the last few decades.\(^{218}\) These more recent emigrants, unlike the Native Hawaiians before them, have not been ostracized from the city. They have, however, been forced — either economically or socially or both — to the west side of the city and below the poverty line.\(^{219}\) Though the Pacific Islander community is substantial and in some regards (socially) thriving, it is still struggling economically. While Pacific Islanders have not been forced to leave the region in the way Utes or the Kanaka Maoli were, they have not been fully integrated into the city either.

There are two significant consequences of the definitive sequestering of the Pacific Islanders on the West Side. First, it is possible that Pacific Islanders were not pushed out of the city in the same way that Utes and Native Hawaiians were because by the time they arrived en masse, there were already a substantial number of other


racial and ethnic minority populations in the city. Perhaps by this time the white
Mormon majority had given up on keeping minorities out of their city; or perhaps
they accepted the loss of control that came with the capitalist impulses of the time as
well as the influx of businesses and businessmen. In any case, by the time Pacific
Islanders came to the city in great numbers, there was already a marked place for
them to inhabit – namely the West Side.

The second point of interest has to do with the strength of the economically
(and racially) coded segregation of the city. Even if the white Mormon community
would welcome the Pacific Islander converts into their neighborhoods with open arms
and tolerance if not celebration, the economic lines upon which the city is separated
are so severe as to render that sort of mixing largely impossible. This demonstrates
the strength and thoroughness of the economic planning and zoning – even
communities that the white Mormon majority might accept cannot be accepted
because they cannot escape the rigid economic, social, and legal structures that whites
created to place minorities on the West Side to begin with. This means that, to a
certain extent, even if these communities could be integrated without social blowback
(implying that the wider white and Mormon community has become more accepting),
the structures that have been put in place are too strong and have been prioritized over
this integration to such an extent that the integration is not possible. If the city broke
down these economic barriers, then any lower class groups could move in to east side
neighborhoods, rather than just those with the approval of the majority – perhaps it is
safer then, to keep all the groups separate.
Acceptability and Location: Chinese and Japanese Enclaves

Chinese immigrants established Plum Alley decades before Japanese immigrants flourished in J-Town – the two enclaves, however, faced similar pressures and ultimately suffered comparable fates. Arguably their fates differed as a result of racial attitudes as well as geographical location. Comparing the two enclaves and their respective demises yields significant insight into the pressures – social and legal – that created the legally maintained racial geography that exists in Salt Lake City today.

Before zoning had even be implemented in the city, white residents had attempted to zone Plum Alley as a Chinese-only district, thus legally separating it (and its residents) from the rest of the city.\(^{220}\) Though these attempts were never successful, they were early manifestations of the same social pressures which lead to other zoning ordinances. Extricating the Chinese from the city was not an option for the white majority – be it because labor economics which brought them to the city kept them there, or because the white majority enjoyed taking advantage of their enclave as a place to visit – so rather than forcing them out of the city, the white majority kept them heavily segregated.\(^{221}\) The Chinese were heavily policed outside of Plum Alley, often arrested simply for leaving the neighborhood for any reason besides labor.\(^{222}\)

While Plum Alley still stood in downtown Salt Lake City, it was a definitive place marked by the presence of the Chinese and Chinese culture. The Chinese were secluded in their enclave, it was the only place Chinese culture could survive in the
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Mormon “City of God.” Furthermore, their bodies were so strictly regulated by social and police pressure that Plum Alley became marked as a space where Chinese bodies were allowed – which stood in stark contrast to the rest of the city where they were not. Furthermore, Plum Alley began to represent its inhabitants – the overcrowding of male residents – with few per-capita hygienic resources – along with the gambling and opium dens, marked the space as physically and morally impure.\(^\text{223}\) In this way, the place began to represent the people, governing white majority conceptions of Chinese immigrants.

After World War II, shifts in American racial attitudes lead to changes in immigration legislation which allowed a greater number of Chinese immigrants to enter the United States.\(^\text{224}\) This same shift in social attitudes allowed Chinese immigrants to leave Plum Alley, especially second and third generation Chinese who had grown especially accustomed to the culture of Salt Lake City. By 1952 Plum Alley was razed and replaced with a parking structure.\(^\text{225}\) While the Chinese had been allotted the freedom to move about the city, almost as if they were white, they lost the spatial anchor which held their community together.\(^\text{226}\) Though Plum Alley has been demolished, and the Chinese granted permission to live in white neighborhoods, they provide an early example of how social pressure and racial anxiety governed spatial identities, turned spaces into occupied places, and labeled people by their prescribed
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location in the city. While the Japanese were not as strictly regulated as the Chinese, their enclave was similarly effected by urban development.

Prior to World War II racial attitudes toward the Japanese were not as hostile as those toward the Chinese. It undoubtedly helped that – although the majority of Japanese immigrants came to Utah as railroad laborers – the first handful came as Mormon converts.\(^{227}\) Initially the Mormons reacted to these new immigrants with approval, noting the similarities between their values and customs.\(^{228}\) The labor agent Daigoro Hashimoto brought many Japanese laborers to the city around the turn of the twentieth century – often they worked as foremen on the railroad, managing other racial minorities.\(^{229}\) As the community grew, these attitudes predictably shifted and the white majority began to exclude Japanese immigrants from restaurants and theaters.\(^{230}\) Japanese bodies, like Chinese bodies, thus became marked and regulated. Their race offered them a relatively safe place in Japan Town but few other places in the city. During World War II the Japanese population of Utah and the entire United States (even those that were citizens) faced extreme discrimination and suspicion – many were moved into internment camps for the duration of the war.\(^{231}\) After World War II, the Japanese population dispersed and assimilated rather quickly, finding it safer presumably to acclimate and blend in rather than assert cultural independence in
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the wake of World War II. Even still, Japan Town flourished as a cultural and commercial center until the late 1960s.

When Japan Town was in its heyday, it was marked by several geographical features. It was near downtown, but also close to the railroads, warehouses and factories. Its residents were, in comparison to the white population, quite poor. Japan Town was home to a vast vegetable market, two Japanese churches, and various other community resources. The area was distinctly marked by the Japanese presence. The markets, public baths and religious establishments marked the area with a Japanese culture. Japan Town was made into a place for Japanese immigrants not only by the presence of Japanese residents, but by the edifices and community structures those residents built. Thus Japan Town became a community, a presence, an enclave in the city which represented Japanese life and provided a place for Japanese workers in Salt Lake City. This area of the city was therefore a visible location, a detectable place marked by a Japanese presence. This presence was a threat to the egalitarian, homogeneous whiteness and Mormon-ness of the city, and was therefore, like Plum Alley, scrubbed off the map.

When the Salt Palace Convention Center was built in 1969, it ostensibly cut Japan Town out of the city, especially with subsequent expansions to the center.

Due to the center’s location, if you stand on the east (white) side of Salt Lake City and look to the west toward where Japan Town’s historical location, the Salt Palace
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completely obscures the view of where the enclave once flourished. Unlike Plum Alley, Japan Town occupied a space on the West Side, which had been marked by deviations from the original plan for the City of Zion since the railroads arrived. Perhaps that is why remnants of Japan Town were allowed to remain after being successfully removed from view. The Salt Palace was thus a construction which moved Japan Town into obscurity, visible only from the West Side, a place already marked as “other.” Whereas, from the east, it is easily ignored, maintaining at least the illusion of the city as it was meant to be. The east side thus becomes a separate world in which Japan Town and Plum Alley have been eradicated, at the very least ostensibly, creating the impression that Zion is still “pure.”

Transitional Groups: Greeks, Italians, and Jews

The Greeks, Italians, and Jews established their enclaves after zoning had been introduced to the city. In contrast to the Japanese and Chinese, they were able to leave their neighborhoods due largely to class mobility. The Greeks and Italians came to Salt Lake City much in the same way that the Japanese had, through labor agents. By 1910, the Greek population in Utah had reached a peak of five thousand and Greek Town had become a self-sustained community of coffeehouses, hotels, boarding houses and bakeries. In 1925, the Greek Orthodox residents built the Holy Trinity Church, making Greek Town a religious center for Orthodox Greeks in the intermountain west. Nestled between Greek Town and Japan Town was a street full
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of saloons, grocery stores, and tailor shops owned by Italians.\textsuperscript{238} And to the east of both of these, was a small community of – largely Ashkenazi – Jewish immigrants who owned small stores and businesses.\textsuperscript{239}

All three of these areas were marked culturally in much the same way that Japan Town and Plum Alley had been. Each neighborhood was distinctly marked by a lower socioeconomic class, as well as various cultural and religious buildings. The communities were shaped by their populations as well as the actual configuration of the neighborhoods, the buildings that were there and what each of those buildings represented. The distinctiveness of each of these enclaves represented their difference from other communities, most significantly their difference from the white Mormon majority community. Ultimately, however, their religious and cultural otherness was passed over for racial similarity. As Anglo-American society accepted Italians, Greeks, and Ashkenazi Jews as white, these attitudes were reflected in Salt Lake City. The burgeoning whiteness of these groups was propelled by the contrasting darkness of Blacks and incoming Mexicans.\textsuperscript{240}

As Jews, Greeks, and Italians gained a whitened status, they were simultaneously granted some economic mobility, granting them entrance into the middle, and sometimes upper, classes. This meant they could afford to move out of their high density neighborhoods into medium or low density neighborhoods; they could afford to live in subdivisions that were contracted specifically for brick dwellings rather than frame dwellings; as restrictive covenants grew increasingly
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invested in keeping Blacks and Mexicans out of middle class neighborhoods, Italians, Greeks, and Jews found they would be accepted as tenants or owners. These groups were allowed to become geographically whitened through economic upward mobility granted to them by a societal recognition of whiteness. The eventual geographic mobility achieved by these groups reveals the economic mechanisms through which zoning operates. Additionally, since class boundaries often operate on racial terms as well, economically restrictive zoning was highly effective at keeping nonwhites out of middle and upper class neighborhoods. As groups were granted, if not “white” then “more white” status, they were able to achieve some degree of economic mobility, which translated into geographic mobility – the ability to traverse zoning laws and housing contracts and obtain a place in white neighborhoods.

Those that currently live on the West Side – Blacks, Mexicans, and Pacific Islanders – have faced many of the same racially loaded economic policies that kept Greeks, Italians, and Jews on the West Side for so many years. However, these groups, for a variety of reasons, have not been permitted to assimilate in the same way that others have. The results of this inability to assimilate differ by group, in part because of the social and cultural mark that some were able to leave on the city and some were not. Blacks, for example, have left a substantially different legacy than Mexicans and Pacific Islanders. These spatial reputations and histories are a result of national attitudes as well as population size and community resources.
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Contemporary West Side: Blacks

Blacks have faced substantial discrimination in Utah since their arrival as slaves with the first pioneers. In the early years, around the turn of the twentieth century, Blacks faced segregation in public accommodations just as they did elsewhere in the United States. The only hotels and restaurants that would serve them were on the west side, near the railroads – since most of Salt Lake City’s Blacks worked for the railroads or in the mines. In 1939, white residents, lead by a real estate developer, presented a petition with one thousand signatures to the City Commission to have Blacks moved into a single residential area. Though the petition was unsuccessful, the social pressure to keep Blacks segregated and contained was very present and relatively effective in and of itself.

Blacks today still largely occupy the area of central city that they have lived in for decades. Though restrictive covenants are no longer used, for decades they were highly successful in keeping Blacks out of middle class subdivisions. Despite the illegality of racial zoning, economic zoning has likewise been highly successful in keeping Black residents out of east side neighborhoods. But perhaps, most significantly, the social pressure behind these ordinances, rooted in the prejudice of the nation as well as LDS Church has kept a lot of Blacks out of Salt Lake City
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altogether. Most of Salt Lake City is marked by a lack of racial diversity, especially regarding Blacks. Communities and cities are marked just as much by what is present, as by what is absent; Blacks are largely absent, and present in high density only in a relatively small portion of the city.\textsuperscript{246} So while Greek, Italian, Jewish, Japanese, and Chinese residents created spaces marked by certain structures and cultures, Blacks have, in their relatively small numbers, had a hard time marking Salt Lake City at all. That isn’t to say that their presence hasn’t been noted, and that important Blacks in Salt Lake City haven’t accomplished great things – it simply means that they have not had the same impact on the shape of Salt Lake City and its distinct places that other, more populous groups have had.

**Contemporary West Side: Mexicans and Pacific Islanders**

Mexican and Pacific Islander immigrants to Salt Lake City face the same economic barriers to geographic mobility that Greeks, Italians and Jews once faced. Both groups have left distinct cultural marks on the west side of the city. Both groups have established a number of restaurants, groceries, and community centers. Both groups have also faced substantial trouble moving out of the West Side. As late as the 1970s, real estate agents were refusing to show houses in certain east side neighborhoods to Mexicans, and many home owners refused to sell or rent to them.\textsuperscript{247} While these discriminatory actions could be challenged in court under *Shelley v. Kraemer* – the 1948 case which ruled such action unenforceable – the exclusionary
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sentiment was generally enough on its own to keep prospective Mexican residents out of homogenously white neighborhoods.  

Pacific Islanders on the other hand arrived in Salt Lake City ostensibly with the support of the Church. While the LDS Church has made an effort to assist the Pacific Islander community in acquiring citizenship, and achieving higher education (and thus economic mobility), Pacific Islanders remain firmly rooted in their West Side community. Pacific Islanders remain on the West Side both because most cannot afford to move and because their community is so strongly rooted in the stores, community centers and population of the West Side. Pacific Islanders have made a place for themselves and their culture on the west side of the city. Economic barriers as well as incentives to remain inside a community that reminds them of home have kept them on the West Side.

One of the consequences of this West Side community is, however, that the presence of Pacific Islanders and Mexicans on one side of the city and not the other creates a spatial dichotomy in which residents become defined by their regions. In other words, places become mentally present in the minds of city residents, marking certain people as belonging in one place or another. This means that Pacific Islanders, Blacks, and Mexicans are seen as belonging to the West Side or central city and not belonging to the east side. Seeing a member of one of these groups on the east side of the city becomes a novelty, a paradox, or a cause for alarm. Since the West
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Side developed naturally as an industrial center, and was subsequently planned and zoned in such a way as to keep it close to industrial complexes and provide low income housing for those who worked in those industries, it is also marked as an area of lower financial value, home to those who cannot afford “better.”

IV. CONCLUSION

The fates visited on the minority enclaves at the hands of the white majority differ as a result of varying degrees of otherness, the size of the population, the location of the enclaves, and the contemporaneous economic and social pressures. Social and religious attitudes regarding race collided to produce a unique set of economic – and subsequently legal – pressures that pushed minorities to the west side of the city. Mormon theology suggested that Utes and Native Hawaiian converts should have been incorporated into the city – but the Ute’s didn’t submit to coexistence on the Saints’ terms and the Mormons could not overcome racially charged stereotypes and welcome Native Hawaiian converts into the city. Pacific Islanders similarly, in spite of their more recent mass emigration, remain on the outside of the city, relegated by economic barriers to the West Side. Chinese and Japanese enclaves were developed out of existence. While the Chinese subsisted for so long due to the highly concentrated and contained population and the provision of a center for vice for the white majority.

The Japanese enclave, though not fully demolished, has been substantially dismantled and obscured by the Salt Palace Convention center. These developments serve the white majority by scrubbing the evidence of racially subversive populations.
In contrast, contemporaneous groups such as the Greeks, Italians, and Ashkenazi Jews were allowed to join the white neighborhoods as they, in contrast to other (darker) minorities, were seen as acceptable neighbors for white people. Those neighborhoods, as a result, were abandoned by their populations rather than redeveloped in order to force those groups into new neighborhoods. In contrast, Blacks and Mexicans never achieved the same status and thus have not participated in the same kind of geographic mobility. Likewise, while today all people of European heritage are considered white, Blacks are not. Mexicans occupy a complex space where they are marked legally as ethnically different, but are treated socially, economically – and specifically in this case – geographically as racially other. The positions of these populations and their degree of visibility have been manipulated over time through economics and law in order to suit the attitudes of the white majority. The West Side thus become marked by a history of populations that didn’t fit within the paradigmatic Salt Lake City as it was envisioned by the majority at any given moment.

The West Side, as a place, is defined by its population and its historical and contemporary role in the city. These definitions become conflated in the minds of citizens, creating ideas regarding who people are and what their race is based on where they live. It is a cyclical process, a self-reinforcing system in which people are classified geographically (which is economically and racially coded). Racial and ethnic communities then build places which in turn give these geographies a tangible identity, these identities reinforce ideas about certain individuals fitting within certain places. Since the West Side is marked as “other,” “outside,” and low-income (which
in American capitalist society is often extrapolated to mean “less than” in a social sense as well), its residents become likewise marked.

Though the contemporary zoning of the West Side does not vary substantially from most of the residential zoning on the east side, other factors keep the value of West Side property lower than that on the east side. The City Commission planned and zoned West Side community historically so that it remained bordered by railroads (and later highways) and industrial developments. These boundaries along with the community’s location in a lower portion of the valley – as opposed to east side neighborhoods which tend to be in the foothills of the Wasatch mountains – instigated lower property values in these areas. So while contemporary zoning for medium to high density housing is almost evenly distributed between the two sides of the city, the location of those units as well as the history subdivisions on the respective sides yields an economically divided city. The houses built a century ago are still standing, and they are still brick structures (and thus more expensive) on the east side, and frame structures on the West Side. In a country, where financial success is negatively correlated with minority status, it is difficult for minorities to gain the economic mobility necessary to move to more expensive, whiter, neighborhoods.

Furthermore, the entrenched social pressures which have been producing the socioeconomic dichotomy since before the twentieth century, still operate and keep West Side residents firmly rooted in place. So despite more equitable contemporary zoning patterns, the social pressures which undergirded restrictive covenants and produced racially charged language in planning documents, still exist today. These social pressures continue to operate to keep minority groups separate from the
relatively homogenously white Salt Lake City. Even if white residents have become more accepting and open in the last few decades, the precedent of racial segregation is difficult to break. Venturing out of a community which provides some level of comfort and sameness in order to live among people who look different and have different values is frightening.

The history of zoning, planning, and real estate practice, has so consistently sequestered minorities to the west of the city in order to maintain a particular image, that the image, however corrupted it has become, is still a powerful one. Though Salt Lake City is far from racially, ethnically, or religiously pure, it has a potent history underlying its organization, one that still percolates to the surface of city as a mapped space and pushes outsiders to the west, behind the railroad tracks and on the other side of the highways and seeks to maintain a certain level of homogeny on the inside. Thus while contemporary zoning and planning may appear equitable across racial and – to a certain extent – economic lines, the history of planning and zoning in Salt Lake City is so enmeshed in racist fears and anxieties that discriminatory practices from half a century ago are still in effect today, though indirectly, through a dichotomy which remains in place simply because it has existed for so long. The east/west split remains surreptitiously stagnated in spite of contemporary evidence which, taken without its historical context, would suggest egalitarian geographies.
CONCLUSION

Cecilia Parera has described Salt Lake City as an “urban palimpsest,” a city that reveals “layers of different generations’ configuration of space.” This thesis attempts to reveal those layers and the social pressures – and resulting legal policies – that caused these temporal reconfigurations of space. In addition to describing each of the various layers of spatial construction, the three chapters together also reveal the forces that altered those spaces. I argue that each iteration of spatial (re-)configuration is inextricably linked to all preceding processes and that each iteration negotiates between historical and contemporary pressures, creating a unique mapping of social, religious, and economic forces in space. Furthermore, I argue that the law plays a critical role as the arbiter of these spatial constructions. Finally I suggest that examining the historical and legal mechanisms that manipulate and define space reveals the power of such practices and that – while Salt Lake City has its own specific set of anxieties and histories – explicating the way these spaces have been constructed in Salt Lake City demonstrates generally how one facet of racial discrimination operates in the United States.

1 As of 2005 Parera was a research associate at the College of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Utah from which she graduated in 2003 as M. Arch with a National Medal of AIA for Outstanding Academic Performance. In 2000 she received her Professional Degree, Architect and Urban Planner, from the Facultad de Arquitectura, Diseño y Urbanismo, Universidad Nacional del Litoral (Argentina). Her paper on Mormon town planning was published in the History of Urban Planning in 2005.
The first chapter explored the Salt Lake Valley before the Mormon pioneers arrived, and the history of the LDS Church before the Saints migrated to Utah. This provides the canvas upon which the second two chapters build, just as the valley itself was the canvas upon which the Mormon’s built the city of Zion. The Mormon’s, with their distinctly Puritan-American and settler colonial heritage, came into the valley with certain notions and disrupted the spatial organization and narrative that was already being played out by the local Indigenous peoples. Of course, the Mormons were not the first to disrupt the order of the area – the Spanish before them had introduced horses and the slave trade to southern Utah. The disruption that the Mormons brought was far grander in scale, however. Unlike the Spanish and mountaineers before them, Mormons sought more than trade and adventure – they were on the path to godhead, striving to build the “City of God” in the American wilderness.

Mormonism is in many ways an echo of Puritanism, and Salt Lake City is similarly an echo of John Winthrop’s “city upon a hill.” The similarities of these projects reveals the degree to which attitudes and models are inherited from previous generations. While Mormonism was a new a religion with additions to the traditional Christian narrative, the religion itself – as well as their migration into the wilderness – were extremely similar to the Puritan history of America. The Mormon religious text, while full of newer narratives, keeps the Old and New Testaments intact. Additionally the journey into the wilderness to realize the ambition of building a paradigmatic city and reclaiming God’s land for the righteous, is also in essence, the same as the historical Puritan objectives in colonial America. To a degree, this demonstrates how
deeply the ideas of believing land can be divinely granted are rooted in American history. In this way, the Mormon project in the Salt Lake Valley goes back to the beginning of settler colonialism in the United States. In other words, the sentiments that engendered Salt Lake City as a religious project are not unique to this single city, they are rooted in the very history of this country. Though Salt Lake City as it was envisioned by the Mormons was decorated with LDS-specific anxieties and desires, it was not an entirely unique project – it was implicated in a distinctly Euro-American, Puritan settler colonial past.

The Saints did amplify one aspect of their settler colonial past: the fear of the unknown other. Due to persistent persecution at the hands of non-Mormons, the Saints carried with them a high degree of self-consciousness and fear of outsiders. The Saints fled the United States in order to be free of religious discrimination. Believing themselves to be spiritually indigenous to the territory (being followers of the true faith and America being God’s promised land), Mormon ambitions were grand, as embodied by their proposed State of Deseret. Those ambitions were not fulfilled as originally planned however, and due to actions of the federal government, Salt Lake City became the primary center for embodying a paradigm that had once stretched across several of today’s states.

As the world capital of the Mormon religion, the LDS Church had high expectations for how Salt Lake City would look and who would live there. These expectations were challenged when the railroads brought non-Mormon racial and ethnic minorities into the city. These minorities encountered the same hostility they would be greeted with in most American cities, with the additional charge of the
Saints’ aggravated fear of outsiders and their religious expectations for Salt Lake City.

I argue that, in the construction of Salt Lake City the religious aspects of the envisioned paradigmatic Zion became less influential than the racial concerns. Though they began as a united concern, as racial categories shifted and more non-Mormon whites moved to the city, it became more important to keep racial minorities out of the city than non-Mormons. As capitalist influence spread in the city and the number of non-Mormon businessmen increased, white Gentiles were seen as more permissible (and more powerful) than nonwhite Gentiles. This shift from the impulse to separate all outsiders to just the nonwhite outsider can be seen through several examples from the second chapter. First, the acceptance of Ashkenazi Jews into white neighborhoods along with Greeks and Italians. Jews became considered white socially and residentially at about the same time as Greeks and Italians, suggesting that their religious otherness became less of a concern than the racial otherness of Blacks and Mexicans.³

Furthermore, the position of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders in the contemporary city similarly illustrate the supremacy of race over religion. Rather than being racially white and religiously other (like Ashkenazi Jews), these groups were and are converts – a part of the religious majority – but racially nonwhite. Both of these groups have faced some degree of social or geographic ostracism. Pacific Islanders were allowed to stay in the city because by the time they constituted a significant presence, there was a designated space for racial minorities in the city. Still, their inability to assimilate into the east side of the city illustrates the hierarchy

of race and religion in the city. Additionally, the presence of non-Mormon whites on
the east side corroborates this hierarchy. With regard to the integrity of Salt Lake City
as paradigmatic Zion, it appears that the racial constitution of the city overshadowed
the pressure for religious purity. As it turns out, for all the Saints’ fears regarding
Gentiles when they arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, they ultimately deemed white
non-Mormons less threatening than nonwhites regardless of church membership. In
this way, Salt Lake City represents Euro-American settler colonial attitudes as much,
if not more than Mormon theology.

This hierarchy of values follows from the first racial conflict of the valley –
that of the Mormon settlers and their Lamanite brethren. Since the Indigenous
population did not fit precisely into the theological narrative the Saints had set out for
them, and because they were racially other, the Saints removed the Indigenous
peoples from the region. This started the trend of placing racial otherness above strict
religious concerns. Each human threat to the religious or racial integrity of Salt Lake
City was treated with ostracism, removal, or both. Utes and other Indigenous peoples
as well as Native Hawaiian converts were removed from the city. Indigenous peoples
were removed because they did not ascribe to the narrative the Saints’ had prescribed
for them. The Native Hawaiians were removed because of social ostracism rooted in
race-based stereotypes regarding their health and hygiene. After these initial
expulsions, the railroads brought a plethora of non-Mormons, specifically immigrant
and racial minority groups, into the city. As these populations grew, the blocks
surrounding the railroads on the west side of the city became the space the white
majority permitted these minority groups to inhabit.
The negotiation between assertions of sovereignty and placating economic and governmental pressures in order to achieve the desired independence (explored in the first chapter) is also present in the legal structures that created the racial geography of Salt Lake City. Just as the railroad was a product of oscillating between a desire for economic power in order to gain sovereignty weighed against the costs of keeping Salt Lake City isolated from the Gentile nation, the racial geography is a product of the need for labor to support the burgeoning capitalist economy against the desire to keep the integrity of Zion intact. The labor was necessary to fuel the economic power of the city, but the presence of the labor was unwelcome so the white majority created bureaucratic mechanisms for organizing and separating them geographically.

White majority-controlled and instigated social and economic pressures clustered the racial and ethnic minorities on the West Side. Treatment and placement of enclaves varied by race and ethnic group but they were all subject to similar division and containment forces which kept them in specific minority neighborhoods and out of the east side. The social and economic advantages of living in enclaves with people of the same nationality or at least the same economic status were also strong incentives for keeping neighborhoods segregated.

The white majority controlled residential selection by instigating real estate practices which discriminated against home buyers or renters based on race. Additionally, the government created master plans and zoning ordinances which ensured that the more impoverished residents would continue to inhabit the west side of the city. Private actors, such as real estate developers, reinforced these practices by
encouraging or requiring homes on the east side to be built out of brick which were unaffordable for the lower classes. During this time period, because of economic discrimination against racial minorities, segregating by economic class would be almost as effective as segregating by racial group. Where these real estate and legal practices failed, social pressure would often be sufficient to keep minorities out of East Side neighborhoods.

These laws, real estate practices, and social policies reflect the settler colonial and religious attitudes that the city was founded on. They are the continuation of the ideas that were present when the LDS pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. The same settler colonial and religious principles that induced and justified Mormon claims to indigeneity in the Salt Lake Valley lead to the laws that kept the city segregated over a century later. The legal structure which pushes racial minorities to the west side of the city functions as an assertion of the Mormons’ superiority and thus their position as the true and rightful possessors of the land. Though the city has grown in size and demographic diversity, there has still been a concerted effort to keep some semblance of the original religious image of the city intact. The racial geography of the city articulates a spatial representation of who exactly is in charge and thus whose land and property constitutes the city. In pushing the racial minorities to the fringes of the city, the white majority marks their claim to superiority in space and makes clear the power distribution of the city. Thus this particular racial geography reflects white Mormon majority attempts to assert their authority over a city and a demographic that has become increasingly unwieldy.
The racial and structural layout of the city – with minorities and lower class whites on the West Side, the LDS Temple in the center of the business district near the capitol, and middle and upper class whites to the east – suggests a very specific distribution of power. The proximity of the capitol and Temple create a relatively small region in which edifices that represent power are concentrated. Furthermore, the residential neighborhoods which abut this region are predominantly white middle to upper class neighborhoods. Minority- and lower-class- heavy neighborhoods, on the other hand, are separated from this region by the central business district, defunct railroads, redeveloped industrial complexes, and a freeway. These barriers represent the separation of racial minorities from, not only the whiter neighborhoods, but the seats of power in the region. This separation was deliberately created through various real estate and city planning practices because it benefited those in power.

Those with influence in the government – often those with money or those with authority in the LDS Church – could keep unwanted residents development away from themselves and their kind. The distribution of people, resources, as well as road and building developments thus maps who and what is considered undesirable and by whom. West Side residents – whose land is valued less and who live in neighborhoods that are considered unsafe and are farther from commercial centers and high-valued real estate – are marked by their geographical location as inferior, as undesirable as the land they occupy. This marking of the West Side and privileging of the East Side articulates the distribution of power in such a way that maps social positions of influence into the space of the city. The legal creation and maintenance
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of this mapping is an assertion of white power over nonwhites, and thus a continuation of the assertion of white indigeneity and supremacy.

The urge to legally and geographically assert white indigeneity as well as white supremacy are rooted in the settler colonial impulse explored in the first chapter. Settler colonialism seeks to assert white indigeneity and creates the impulse to eradicate the native population in order to eliminate the indigenous alternative. Mormonism as descendent of a particular Puritan settler colonial history inherited and perpetuated this impulse. Mormonism asserts white spiritual indigeneity in America and thus declares its believers as indigenous in a new way alongside the actual Indigenous peoples of America. This declaration attempts to peacefully (or at least without mass killings) usurp the Indigenous people’s indigeneity. While Mormons claimed the Indigenous peoples as brethren (the Lamanites), they also proclaimed that the whiteness of Mormons was a demarcation of their righteousness and that the darker-skinned Lamanites were tainted with sin. Thus, in following with its settler colonial history Mormons profess a stronger indigeneity due to their position as the “righteous.” Since the New World was discovered, the righteous were given dominion over the land occupied by the “primitive,” “uncivilized,” and critically “unchristian” native. When the Indigenous peoples of the Salt Lake Valley did not adhere to the narrative the white Mormons had laid out for them, the Saints took to more traditional settler colonial forms of removal – namely homicide and displacement. The Mormons were always invested in usurping the indigenous position, but it took an affront to their theological narrative for them to resort to elimination rather than brotherhood.
While Mormons were acting upon the impulse to eradicate the Indigenous population, Mormon theological ambitions for the city of Zion engendered the drive to exclude the non-Mormon other. Mormons use the same social, economic, and legal mechanisms that they used to rid the city of Indigenous (and Native Hawaiian) peoples to remove other outsider groups from the city. The Saints aimed to create a paradigmatic “City of God,” in the Salt Lake Valley, and as such the city could not host any subpopulation that undermined that goal. This was a religious as well as a white supremacist impulse. The Mormons’ investment in the city’s whiteness went hand in hand with their anxieties surrounding the production of the New Zion. Part and parcel with the project of Salt Lake City, was the insistence that the LDS religion (and thus the Mormons themselves) were indigenous to the land the city was built on. In the interest of maintain the purity of the city, non-Mormons (especially racial minorities) had to be excluded. Over time, the Saints’ placed a higher value on the image of the city rather than its theological purity – in geographically privileging whiteness, the Mormons not only adhered to national attitudes of white supremacy but also produced a city that could at least masquerade as the theological paradigm it purported to be. Additionally, with the increase of white Gentiles in the city, racial and ethnic minorities easily became the common enemy – or at least the common abject other – making action toward geographically isolating racial and ethnic minorities easier to accomplish as the Mormons lost the absolute control over the government they had once enjoyed. The compulsion to produce a city which appeared predominantly white (and pure) instigated social and economic pressures which were embodied by zoning laws and city planning.
These social, economic, religious and racial pressures have been written into the shape of Salt Lake City through careful planning and social structures. Though the racial segregation is not as rigid as it once was, it remains significant; it need not be strict in order for its pattern to be mapped into residents of the city. Certain elements have marked the city indefinitely as a dichotomous space. The presence of the Holy Trinity Church in the old West Side neighborhood, for example, forever marks that neighborhood with its particular Greek past. The presence of the Japanese Church of Christ and the Buddhist Church have the same effect. Even as these neighborhoods were abandoned by their constituents, they remain marked by their history. Each community produces artifacts of their presence, indefinitely marking the west side of the city with a certain otherness that transgresses the original visions of Salt Lake City. Contemporary economic and racial discrepancies between neighborhoods likewise produce a certain kind of geographic marking. The city has thus been marked by its history even while it is continuously being re-marked by its present. The very platting of the city goes back to the original plans for Salt Lake City as an egalitarian agricultural center. This egalitarianism was of course disrupted by capitalism and a non-Mormon labor supply. Regardless, the wide streets and rectilinear pattern remained intact – it was the particular buildings and populations that were altered. Thus at each level of the city – its design, its buildings, its population – there is a generation of social and economic pressures illustrated. These
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layers of history constitute the palimpsest that Parera describes; a palimpsest, I have argued, that illustrates a particular settler colonial and theological history.

In spite of its malleability over time, this rewriting of the land and the space of the city consistently represents as well as produces racial classes and hierarchies. Since the white majority definitively designated the West Side as a place for racial others – even as racial categories and white priorities shifted – residential location likewise became a racialized indicator. The creation of racialized places thus engenders a self-reinforcing feedback loop whereby the white majority designates certain places as racially other and creates bureaucratic structures to reinforce these designations and people both mark and are marked by the places they inhabit. Just as West Side implied racially other by its designation, racially other implied West Side. Thus Salt Lake City became a city where race and racial ideologies have been consistently, and continue to be, mapped in space. This mapping, I argue, is rooted in the uniquely settler colonial and Puritan history of the United States as well as the LDS religion.

Even in the most subversive of American groups – as the Mormons were in their early years – the settler colonial tradition flourishes. In this way, the construction and growth of Salt Lake City’s racial geography represent may be applied to many cities in the United States in spite of its unique religious history – though its particular past makes it, I believe, a more compelling site to study. In spite of how much the Saints themselves were marked as outsiders and as much as they resisted ties to the United States as they migrated into the wilderness, they are still

---

9 Cecilia Parera, 171
10 Martha Sonntag Bradley, 56
implicated, as is their religious capital, in Euro-American history. Regardless of all its uniqueness, Salt Lake City is, at its heart, a paradigmatic American city – if not the paradigmatic Zion it was intended to be. While Salt Lake City’s particular racial geography was produced by myriad specific geographical, economic, religious, and racial pressures, at its core it is a product of an essentially American past. Thus, revealing the particular structures and intricacies of Salt Lake City’s racial geography, I am revealing pressures which have existed in the United States since the first Anglo-European settlers arrived in the burgeoning New World colonies. This intensely specific topic is, in actuality, a national history as played out in a singular location, albeit with some unique nuances. Salt Lake City, for all its reputational oddities and idiosyncrasies, is a distinctly American city and its racial geography a product distinctly American pressures, anxieties, and desires.
Disclaimer: Community areas are based on personal testimonies and borders are not exact; they are meant to provide a rough idea of the size and locations of these enclaves.
Contemporary West Side

African American Communities

Hispanic Communities

Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander Communities

Sources: ESRI Basemap, Salt Lake City Census 2010 Atlas
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