



Amy Brown Lyman in the 1910s about the time she began her involvement in Relief Society social work. Photograph courtesy LDS Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

From Home Service to Social Service: Amy Brown Lyman and the Development of Social Work in the LDS Church

Dave Hall

The Church of Jesus Christ of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints enjoys a reputation for taking care of its own through a comprehensive welfare plan that follows principles rooted in the earliest days of the Mormon experience and articulated over decades of pioneering. However, some of the modern manifestations of this program include a network of social services that have origins in a later period, particularly that of the Progressive Era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This was a time when the new discipline of sociology developed along with the profession of social work. It was also a time when many Americans, including Latter-day Saints, joined together to institute a variety of reforms intended to mitigate the negative consequences of social change. As events proved, the Relief Society of the LDS Church was especially active in this endeavor, as it orchestrated the lobbying efforts of Mormon women in behalf of a variety of measures aimed at community betterment. As it did so, the Relief Society became a key player in the drive to modernize relief practices in both church and community in Utah and throughout the West. Perhaps surprisingly, the Society's participation in this process was accelerated by America's entry into the first World War.

The war came at a time when the Church had already moved away from its earlier goal of building a semi-independent commonwealth in the West, and had instead sought to aggressively assimilate into the mainstream of Ameri-

Dave Hall (dhall@fullerton.edu) teaches history at California State University, Fullerton, and Cerritos Community College. He received his BA from the University of California, Los Angeles, his MA from Brigham Young University, and his PHD from the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is also the author of a biography on Amy Brown Lyman that is forthcoming from USU Press.

can society. Twenty years previously, during the Spanish-American War, LDS Church leaders had urged members to demonstrate their patriotism through support of the war effort. The same had been the case when the United States entered the European conflict in April 1917. At that time Church leaders encouraged members to accept calls to military or government service and threw the full energies of the Church organizations into drives to purchase government bonds and to grow and store wheat, vegetables, and other commodities to free up surpluses for wartime needs. The Relief Society was in the forefront of much of this as it rallied behind Clarissa Williams, first counselor in the General Relief Society presidency, who had been appointed by Utah Governor Simon Bamberger to head the Utah Council of National Defense's Women's Committee.¹ At the advice of general leaders, local Relief Societies carried out aggressive campaigns not only to participate in bond drives and to promote home gardening and canning, but also organized themselves into special Red Cross auxiliaries, where they sewed bed linens and rolled bandages for wounded soldiers. While this work contributed significantly to the war effort and helped earn the Society and the Church national praise and recognition, of equal significance were the ties formed to the social work community.

The latter began in the spring of 1917 when federal officials asked the Red Cross to organize and train a national corps of social work volunteers to assist servicemen and their families with financial and emotional needs. On the one hand, government leaders and social workers were concerned that many families would be left in disarray as wage earners and heads of households were called into military service. At the same time, they feared that postwar adjustments, particularly for disabled veterans, might overwhelm the abilities of families to cope. In both these circumstances, positive intervention, government officials and social workers believed, would aid families in preserving their economic and emotional stability.²

Over the years, scholars have pointed out a number of benefits that grew out of these "Home Service" activities, as they came to be known. Perhaps most important was their role in helping to destigmatize family and child welfare work. In the public mind, the developing field of social work had previously been associated only with charity cases—a group often perceived as undeserving of assistance. Now, through this war-related effort, it became linked to the well-being of servicemen and their families, who, as a group, were widely viewed as "deserving." In consequence, the profession and the aid it rendered gained in stature. As social workers began to organize volunteers through the auspices of the Red Cross, the instructions they offered their recruits reveal how this destigmatization took place: "The work of civilian relief is not to be considered as charity," rather, it was to be seen "as legitimate aid" to families who had given husbands or sons for the safety of the nation.³

Even as this program contributed to the prestige enjoyed by social work practitioners, the profession itself was serving as a conduit to enhance the status of women in the public sphere. Those who came of age in the latter nineteenth-century numbered among the best educated generation to that point, but they enjoyed few avenues through which to utilize their newly won knowledge. Under the circumstance, many women turned toward charity work, drawing on social perceptions of their “natural” roles as nurturers to legitimize their efforts to influence developments in a changing society. Consequently, many rose to prominence in the new discipline of sociology and dominated the profession of social work. One scholar of the period has demarcated this era as the beginning of a “female dominion” in reform.⁴

Mormon women were participants in, and benefitted from, this process, having already taken their first tentative steps toward public health work before the war broke out. The Society’s leaders saw potential in Home Service activities to expand the agenda of women of the faith by providing them with an opportunity to advance to the forefront of a movement to improve charitable practices. But the adoption of Home Service work was not without controversy, neither in the Mormon community, nor nationally among social work professionals. In the Relief Society, some of the organization’s leaders saw the work as a step away from divinely inspired practices of years past, one that threatened to marginalize older women in the organization.⁵ On the national scene, an altogether different conflict emerged when some social work professionals anticipated long-term gains to accrue to the prestige of social work as a result of this plan, while others, less sanguine in their expectations, saw the massive influx of hastily trained volunteers expected under the Home Service work as counterproductive to efforts to promote higher professional standards, even as it diluted the limited resources available for charity work.⁶

Not seen at the time and little noted today, the Red Cross work was a catalyst for the expansion of modern social work practices and standards. While this occurred across the nation, it was especially important in places like Utah, which had previously been isolated from modern currents in the profession. The experience of Relief Society women provides a useful case study of how this program resulted in modernization of the charitable practices of private organizations like the LDS Church, and through them, public agencies as well. A key figure carrying forth the work in the Relief Society was the general secretary, Amy Brown Lyman.

A decade and a half previously, during a summer session at the University of Chicago, Lyman had enrolled in a class on sociology which led her to the noted social settlement Hull House and placed her in contact with its famous founder, Jane Addams. This experience, which she later described as having “lifted a curtain” from her mind, sparked a life-long interest in the use of

efficient methods to assist the disadvantaged.⁷ Called to the Relief Society General Board in 1909, she was called as the general secretary four years later. While setting her apart to that position, LDS Church President Joseph F. Smith charged her to follow her interest by studying ways to modernize the Church's charity work.⁸

At that time, the Relief Society faced a crisis in its membership. Younger women stayed away in droves because they felt its programs—a legacy of earlier efforts aimed at self-sufficiency—were largely irrelevant to their own lives.⁹ Lyman was part of a new cohort of leaders who sought to update the agenda of the Society to enhance its appeal to a generation facing the challenges that came with assimilation into the national mainstream. One product of this revamped agenda was a new official publication, the *Relief Society Magazine*, which carried lessons for a centralized curriculum aimed at younger women.¹⁰ This created a useful conduit for information and instruction as Lyman and others in the leadership began to steer the organization into public health work, including such efforts as assisting private groups and public agencies in providing pure milk to disadvantaged young children in Salt Lake during the hot summer months.¹¹ The Society also began to participate in new federal programs to survey and address larger issues of infant and maternal health.¹²

Lyman took a lead in these cooperative activities through Salt Lake City's private and public charities even as she pioneered efforts to reshape Church welfare practices. For instance, in 1916 she served as vice-chair of the Social Advisory Committee (SAC), composed of representatives from the priesthood and Church auxiliary organizations.¹³ A primary focus of the SAC was so-called preventative social work which aimed to steer LDS youth away from vice and delinquency by providing them with wholesome alternatives. But over time, particularly after the development of the Home Service work, the SAC began to move toward remedial social work as it advocated assistance and counseling to families and individuals in need.

It was in this context that the war-related work arose, which led to the next phase for the Relief Society and the Church in their adoption of modern methods to help those in need. This began with Lyman's initiation into the cadre of Red Cross social workers in June 1917, when, as a member of Utah's delegation, she joined volunteers and community leaders from across the nation in attendance at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Social Work in Pittsburgh.¹⁴ At the conference, Red Cross leaders announced plans for a series of regional conventions where volunteers were to receive training on the proper use of up-to-date social work techniques. Most important among these new methods was casework, which focused not merely on rendering aid for the short-term, but sought to assist those in need to develop the skills and

abilities that would enable them to become self-reliant. A pioneer of this approach was Mary Richmond. Representing an important strand in the fabric of Progressive reform, for more than three decades she had worked tirelessly to improve the effectiveness of her profession by convincing social workers to view their charges not as the undeserving poor out to cheat the system but as “clients” in need of counseling and services in order to get back on their feet. By 1917, her methods had been largely accepted by her peers. Her book *Social Diagnosis*, published that year, codified the procedures social workers were expected to follow in investigating the roots of dependency and determining what resources, including medical and psychological care, should be utilized to help clients help themselves. It was she who had coined the term “Home Service,” in reference to the Red Cross war work, and, along with another noted social worker, Karl De Schweinitz, wrote the manuals used to teach basic techniques to Red Cross volunteers. Lyman became acquainted with both Richmond and De Schweinitz at subsequent meetings of the National Conference and relied heavily on their writings when formulating her own social work philosophy.¹⁵

This meeting marked a turning point in the development of social welfare work in Utah, where public relief agencies, if they existed at all, were tiny, backward, and inefficient. Even the LDS Church, which remained the dominant charitable organization in the state with programs and resources far more extensive than those of other private or public agencies, relied on an antiquated and increasingly inefficient system created in the territorial era.¹⁶ Lyman’s experience at the National Conference was no doubt representative of many of the delegates drawn there by the Red Cross work. Often ignorant of many facets in the profession when they arrived (or like her, simply eager to learn more about this rapidly changing field), by the time they left, most had become strong advocates for comprehensive training in modern methods. Upon her return to Utah she summed up such feelings when she told reporters, “I think delegations from all social institutions throughout the country should be sent to these yearly gatherings,” adding, “there is so much good that can be obtained from the ideas put forth.”¹⁷

After reporting to Relief Society and Church leaders, Lyman secured their support for the next phase of the Red Cross work. In late October, she traveled with Relief Society first counselor Clarissa Williams to Denver, where they joined over five thousand delegates in attendance at a three-day overview of the Home Service work.¹⁸ After a brief trip back to Salt Lake City (where she left her husband in charge of domestic affairs), Lyman returned to Denver to participate in a six-week social service institute hosted by the University of Colorado. Under the direction of the Denver Bureau of Charities and Correction, it provided intensive training to a much smaller group through a

combination of academic instruction and field work. In addition to Lyman, five other Utah delegates attended, all women, three of whom were from the Relief Society—Cora Kasius from Ogden, Mary L. Hendrickson from Logan, and Annie D. Palmer from Provo. Like Lyman, each was expected to assume responsibility for the war work in their communities upon their return, and all ultimately played prominent roles in the development of social work in the Relief Society and the state.¹⁹

Directing this institute was Gertrude Vaile, head of the Denver Charities for five years before her recent move to the leadership of civilian relief work in the Red Cross's Mountain Division. A graduate of Vassar and the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy as well as a veteran of the United Charities of Chicago and the Russell Sage Foundation (the latter known for its promotion of social reform), Vaile was well-connected to the vanguard of the social work profession. Upon her arrival in Colorado she had taken the unprecedented step of incorporating casework into the practices of the Denver Bureau. This represented the first time any public charitable agency had adopted such modern methods, an accomplishment that earned her national prominence in social work circles.²⁰ Florence Hutsinpillar, a protégée and friend of Vaile's, headed the Denver office after Vaile assumed her Red Cross responsibilities and, like her, worked closely with the volunteers.

During the institute, the Utah women impressed both Vaile and Hutsinpillar with their seriousness and ability. Lyman in particular stood out. At this first session, seeds were sown for a fast and long-lasting friendship among the three women, one that had important consequences for social work in Utah. In later years as she developed the Relief Society's own social service agency, Lyman repeatedly availed herself of the two women's advice and assistance.²¹

After completion of her time in Denver, Lyman returned to Salt Lake City where she again joined the other Relief Society representatives in reporting to Church leaders. Joseph F. Smith, in particular, carefully examined the literature they brought back and displayed a keen interest in their work. This was not a sudden development. Before her trip to Denver, for example, he had set Lyman apart as an official delegate and indicated that he considered her efforts a sacred trust.²² After the women reported to him, each went on to assume responsibility for the Red Cross work in their respective communities. Lyman served as chair of the Family Consultation Committee of the Salt Lake Red Cross, as well as supervisor for the work involving Latter-day Saint families, dividing her time between the Relief Society offices and those of the Red Cross as she struggled to handle an increasingly heavy load of requests for aid from the families of Mormon servicemen.²³

As Lyman focused on new responsibilities, President Smith closely followed her activities and made plans of his own. In the middle of March, he called her to his office for a lengthy discussion concerning the modern methods she was using. At that time, Smith expressed his feelings that it would be to the advantage of the Church to adopt these techniques. "If there was anything in the Church that needed improvement," he concluded, "it was the charity work." To bring this about, he offered to provide funding for a modern social service department to be administered by Lyman through the auspices of the Relief Society.²⁴

Smith's concern for charity work was rooted in his recognition that the existing system had become woefully inadequate to deal with the realities of the West's increasingly urban environment. Developed by Relief Society and priesthood leaders in the small, relatively stable communities typical of Utah's territorial period, and dependent upon the intimate knowledge local leaders possessed concerning their charges, as large numbers of Latter-day Saints migrated to cities and larger towns in search of employment, such techniques were rendered impractical.²⁵ Bishops and Relief Society presidents who ministered to increasing numbers of often transient newcomers with whom they were unfamiliar found it daunting to assist even so-called "worthy" members, especially in light of the limited resources of cash and commodities available for the task. Such problems were particularly acute in the three largest urban centers where in-migration was the heaviest—Salt Lake City, which by 1910 had swelled in population to nearly 100,000, and Ogden and Provo, which between them counted around 35,000 residents.²⁶

President Smith, well aware of these demographic changes and their ramifications, had supported much of the cooperation that had already begun to take place between the Church and groups in the larger community in the interest of coordinating efforts to address demands for aid.²⁷ But he was taken aback when he read an article in a nationally influential social work magazine, *The Survey*, which praised Salt Lake City's Mormon bishops for their willingness to turn to the local Charity Organization Society for routine investigation of families seeking aid and for assistance with difficult cases.²⁸ Like other Mormons, Smith took pride in the Church's heritage of self-reliance, and was disturbed by the news that local leaders had to look to outsiders for help in resolving confidential matters regarding Church members. If the bishops needed an agency to clear cases or deal with complicated situations, he concluded, then the Church ought to provide it and the Relief Society ought to administer it.²⁹ It was here, through the decision made by Joseph F. Smith, that it became clear that the Relief Society's participation in the Home Service work was to have consequences that lasted well beyond the end of the war.

Though agreeing with President Smith's assessment and eager to move forward, Lyman sensed her own lack of preparation and informed him that she needed more training before she could undertake such a step; in particular, she wanted to return to Denver for more supervised work. Indeed, the idea of the still inexperienced Lyman heading a social service department after just six weeks of formal training was the very thing many social work professionals had feared might result as a consequence of the Red Cross Home Service work. But her response belied their argument that the war work was thus counter-productive. Rather than simply shying away from the challenge, or worse yet, blundering in unready, Lyman recognized her weakness and saw the solution in further preparation.³⁰ If the Red Cross work had stimulated the desire of Joseph F. Smith to open the door to the use of modern social work methods by the Church, it was Lyman, through this decision, who ensured that practitioners in the Relief Society who entered in would seek to attain ever higher standards of proficiency.³¹ On the national level, those behind the Home Service work had hoped that the wartime upgrading of social services would leave a lasting legacy after the conflict was over. In the Relief Society's case, the decisions of Joseph F. Smith and Amy Brown Lyman ensured that this envisioned legacy became a reality.

In the meantime, however, the Red Cross work soon grew so demanding that Lyman received permission from Church leaders to employ an assistant, Beth Bradford, a young stenographer in the Relief Society offices chosen because of her intelligence and interest in the work. Lyman and Bradford continued for six months to divide their time between the Red Cross and the Relief Society offices, taking a small first step toward forming an independent social agency when they created a confidential registry of families receiving aid, which they used to coordinate their efforts to prevent duplication of aid (known as "clearing cases") with other charitable organizations in the county. Soon after her employment, Bradford was sent to Denver to receive training at a second social service institute. Upon completion of the course, she accompanied Lyman to Kansas City, where the pair joined another large Utah delegation attending the 1918 meeting of the National Conference of Social Work. There, they were apprised of the status of the war work and exposed to the reform agenda social workers expected to pursue in the post-war period.³²

In November, 1918, after renewed prodding from Smith, Lyman pulled herself away from her responsibilities to return to Denver for another six weeks of training.³³ By then, the worldwide flu epidemic, which cost more American lives than the war, had sickened several of the Denver workers and left the office seriously understaffed.³⁴ But this misfortune worked to Lyman's advantage. Hutsinpillar gave her far greater responsibility than planned, in-

cluding supervision of office and field work in one of the districts.³⁵ Impressed with Lyman's abilities, Hutsinpillar and Vaile judged her a "natural," whose intelligence and temperament allowed her to grasp the fundamentals of the work quickly. In their view, this more than compensated for her comparative lack of formal training. As a social worker, Lyman was to gain the reputation of being compassionate but clear-headed, an ability that enabled her to find the way to the root of any situation. Though she continued to learn and develop her technique, these six weeks at Denver essentially marked the completion of Lyman's apprenticeship as she began to sense her readiness to carry out Smith's vision for Mormon charity work.³⁶

Not long after her arrival in Denver, the belligerent powers signed the armistice ending the Great War, an event that sent Americans into the streets in celebration. But a week later, these celebrations were muted among Latter-day Saints when President Joseph F. Smith succumbed to influenza. With his passing, the plans he and Lyman made for Church charity work were called into question. Smith's successor, Heber J. Grant, was a successful businessman, who, as president, was very concerned about the Church's shaky finances. Under his leadership, all requests for Church funds were subject to careful scrutiny, a policy that forced Lyman to scale back the initial plans she and President Smith had laid out. Nevertheless she unveiled a more modest Relief Society Social Service Department in January, 1919, and over time, President Grant proved a strong supporter of most of her efforts.³⁷

Deteriorating economic conditions in Utah, combined with a lack of public resources, made the department's services more important by the day. Much of the nation experienced an economic downturn in the postwar period, but like other western states heavily dependent on mining and agriculture, Utah lagged in its recovery and remained economically depressed throughout the 1920s. This exacerbated an already chronic unemployment problem, caused primarily by streams of young people who had fled the countryside to compete for scarce jobs in the city.³⁸ For Lyman, all this produced a rapid and steady increase in her Church-centered social welfare activities even as her responsibilities with Red Cross's civilian relief program continued into the postwar period. The Social Service Department soon took on additional commitments, which added to her workload. Revealing both the lack of public agencies in the area at the time and the inadequacy of previous Church social welfare practices, these included the department's assumption of responsibility for LDS families requiring services at the Community Clinic, the Salt Lake County Charity Department, the county hospital, the city and county courts, the county jail, the police, the Salvation Army, the Traveler's Aid Society, and the YWCA. Under Lyman's lead, the Social Service Department also offered the assistance of an employment bureau and an adoption agency. Most of

these services were restricted to clearing cases or counseling, with little rendered in direct aid in the form of cash or commodities. In fact, that which the department did provide was generally limited to bare essentials, and then only in cases involving transients or in emergencies where bishops or local Relief Society presidents—who continued to be responsible for the bulk of LDS relief needs—could not be reached. Only in rare and difficult cases referred by local Church leaders would department personnel organize long-term relief in cooperation with relatives, the county, and ward bishops.³⁹

To meet these demands, Lyman gradually increased the department's staff, eventually employing half a dozen caseworkers. However, this modest expansion of personnel continued to lag behind the ever-accelerating pace of the department's workload. Making matters worse, a dearth of trained social workers in Utah forced Lyman to scramble to meet even minimum staffing needs. Many of her early employees had some college education but, like Bradford, were otherwise qualified only by an interest in the field and a disposition compatible to the work. Lyman herself not only took responsibility to train these apprentices in the rudiments, she encouraged them to seek additional education through more established channels. No doubt influenced by the advice of Vaile and Hutsinpillar, Lyman saw that her social workers followed a path which combined applied experience and formal study. For a profession still coming of age in standards and requirements, this was not atypical for the era. Beth Bradford's experience illustrates how this worked.

In October 1919, Lyman sent Bradford to New York City for an apprenticeship with the Red Cross. From there, assisted by a Red Cross scholarship, she attended the Boston School of Social Work for six months, with the expectation that she would return to the Relief Society's employ at the conclusion of her study. Unfortunately for Lyman, in what would not be an uncommon occurrence among the young Mormon women drawn to the department, once trained, Bradford married her fiancé, an officer in the army, and departed with him to the Philippines, leaving behind her social work career.⁴⁰

Despite this disappointment, Lyman followed a similar course with other workers. She sought to provide them with practical experience through apprenticeships at social settlements, like Lillian Wald's Henry Street Settlement or Mary Simkovitch's Greenwich House in New York City, while allowing them to earn academic credentials through extended periods of study at such institutions as the New York School of Philanthropy and the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago.⁴¹ Lyman's department benefitted tremendously from this exchange. In addition, she contributed some of her own skilled workers—a few of whom rose to prominence—to public and private agencies, not only in Utah and other western states but even in New York City and Washington DC.⁴²

As an administrator in charge of building the Relief Society's agency, Lyman could be tough and demanding as she sought the highest standards from her workers. She had a brusque manner that was sometimes "off-putting," and she was not one to beat around the bush when something was wrong. Yet her employees often expressed not just admiration, but real affection for her, explained in large measure because of the unbridled concern she showed for their welfare and their personal development. She used her keen powers of perception to sense their needs and potential and challenged them to do more than they thought they could. She mothered those who needed it and encouraged all to make more of themselves and used her connections with social work leaders to facilitate their growth.⁴³

In addition to drawing upon links to the larger community of social workers to train her staff, Lyman used her network of contacts to build up social welfare work in Utah's public agencies. To provide for long-term personnel needs in her own department, as well as in the public and private sectors of the larger community, she worked closely with Arthur L. Beeley, head of the new school of social work at the University of Utah.⁴⁴ She also continued to encourage Church and civic leaders to attend meetings of the National Conference of Social Work and even arranged for their visits to the Denver Charities to witness first-hand how a modern office operated. Knowing how limited the Church's resources were as she confronted a large and increasing need for services, she became a tireless advocate for the increase in public sector aid. Reflecting on her efforts in this regard, Lyman later noted: "It has been the constant aim of the Relief Society to point out to the County its responsibility in caring for its indigent families."⁴⁵ Lyman also availed herself of opportunities to improve charity practices at the local level by immersing the rank and file of the Relief Society in the rudiments of modern social work. But here she encountered impediments to her plans. Some on the general board strongly resisted the adoption of modern methods, none more so than Susa Young Gates.

Gates had represented a formidable presence in the Relief Society offices since her call to the board in 1913, even as her editorship of the *Relief Society Magazine* had placed her in a position to influence the organization's priorities and practices. The fact that she was strong-willed was not unusual for members of the board, but even among this group of powerful women she stood out for her determination to have her own way. As general secretary, Lyman interacted regularly with Gates and generally deferred to her. "Aunt Susie," as she was often called, had an office at Relief Society headquarters in the Bishop's Building on the opposite end of a long hallway from Lyman's. It was not unusual for her to step out of her door and call loudly, "Aimee!" as if she were calling in the cows. At such times Lyman would trot down the hall,

notebook in hand, to see what was needed. Outwardly, the women interacted well with one another, and they would continue to do so even after they were privately locked in a determined struggle over the fate of the organization.⁴⁶

Gates was concerned in particular that modernization would marginalize older women less able to adapt to the rigorous standards Lyman was advocating and was fearful that the spiritual side of the work would be lost in a quest for “scientific” expertise.⁴⁷ In expressing such anxieties, she spoke not only for LDS women who might be adversely affected by Lyman’s plans, but for an entire generation of American charity workers—those of the so-called “lady bountiful” tradition, who had come to perform charity work out of compassion for the poor but were finding their efforts increasingly irrelevant amidst the rising tide of professionalism. For Gates, an especially troubling development was an experiment in the Utah Stake that seemed to establish a precedent for the full professionalization of all Church charity work. In a move that again revealed the lack of adequate public services as well as the still fluid lines separating Church and state in the 1910s, stake Relief Society president Inez Knight Allen, together with counselor Annie Palmer, a veteran of Home Service training at Denver, organized a community welfare department. Following the lead of the Red Cross, they established an institute for sixty stake and ward charity workers and gathered commodities and funds which, with the aid of local bishops and Relief Society women, they distributed to both Mormon and non-Mormon families in need.⁴⁸

The Relief Society General Board encouraged the Utah Stake effort, as did local and general priesthood leaders, and all followed its progress closely. If this experiment had been taken as a prototype for future LDS charity work, it would have represented a realization of Gates’s worst fears. Adding to her alarm was an address delivered by Lyman about this time to the Colorado Conference of Social Work on the topic “Permeating an Established Relief Agency with Modern Case Work Methods.” In light of these threats to the status quo, Gates worked tirelessly behind the scenes to prevent the techniques used in Utah Stake from becoming a template for further innovation. She even went so far as to solicit letters of support for her position from prominent national figures involved in charitable activities. Though advised by first counselor Clarissa Williams to let the matter alone, she sought repeatedly to sway both the general board and the president of the Church to her point of view.⁴⁹

In an attempt to resolve this brewing conflict before it completely boiled over, a special committee of the Relief Society board was called to look into the matter. However, unable to find a resolution, they referred Lyman and Gates to President Grant.⁵⁰ The meeting with Grant must have been memorable. Lyman was convinced of the superiority of her plans and believed further that she was carrying out the commission of the late Joseph F. Smith. Gates

was equally sure that she was saving the soul of the Relief Society by holding on to its traditional methods. It might have seemed a case of the irresistible force meeting the immovable object as both of these strong-willed figures remained resolute in their positions. Grant, unable to forge a compromise, referred them back to the board, where the matter was left to cool.⁵¹

Whether Gates and Lyman ever worked out a formal understanding is unclear, but the Utah Stake example was not followed by the entire Church. Perhaps this was due to Gates's concerns, but doubtless there were practical and philosophical reasons as well. On the one hand, since the statehood struggle and the Reed Smoot hearings, the Church had been sensitive about violating the church-state divide. Perhaps more practically, given the difficulty of adequately funding the central social service offices in Salt Lake, a Church-wide effort on the pattern of Utah Stake would have been financially unfeasible.⁵² Whatever the reasons, instead of mimicking the Utah Stake's broad program, Lyman limited her efforts to the development of specialized services provided by professionals working out of the Relief Society offices, primarily for assistance of the Salt Lake stakes.

Yet this hardly represented an unqualified victory for Gates. With the support of the majority of the board, Lyman organized a program to put charity efforts in the wards and stakes under the supervision of special aids intensively trained in the fundamentals of modern social work technique and prepared to recognize when the resources of a central agency were required. At Lyman's recommendation the board also commissioned a series of lessons for the *Relief Society Magazine* which provided the rank and file of the organization with an introduction to the basic aims and methods of social welfare work. In a similar vein, Williams, Lyman, and other like-minded members of the board presided over extensive discussions of social work topics at Relief Society conferences. For example, in October 1919, Lyman delivered "a scholarly and exhaustive talk" in which she defined terms such as *casework* and explained the value of preventive and corrective social work even as she emphasized the need to strike at the roots of dependency by seeking reforms in the larger society.⁵³

As moves to carry these plans forward began to take shape, Gates was able to do little but watch with dismay. In time, she came to see this shift in charity work as a part of a move to push her out of the organization to make way for those, like Lyman, whose influence was on the rise. In the fall of 1921, she submitted her resignation to Heber J. Grant and told him to use it when he felt best. She was released early in 1922, although her interest and involvement in the affairs of the Relief Society did not end. Yet, even after her departure, the modern techniques Lyman was using remained a source of con-

tention for some on the board, although the work continued to move forward, largely unhindered.⁵⁴

In the meantime, Lyman had already held the first of what came to be known as Social Service Institutes. It took place in 1920 during a six-week summer session at Brigham Young University as part of a larger effort to better train the leaders of the Church's auxiliaries. Sessions included course work in such areas as social and recreational leadership, teacher training, and from Lyman's perspective, most important, charity and relief work.⁵⁵ Representatives from sixty-five stakes attended the latter sessions, which were supervised by Lyman. She was assisted by Annie Palmer and Inez Allen of the Utah Stake, John Swenson of BYU, Arthur Beeley from the University of Utah, and T. B. Beatty from the state board of health. The curriculum included readings and lectures on sociology supplemented by field trips to the state mental hospital, the state industrial school, the Salt Lake Community Clinic, Salt Lake City's own social settlement, Neighborhood House, and the Salt Lake County Hospital and Infirmary.⁵⁶ In a highlight, Lyman arranged for a series of lectures by nationally prominent social worker and reformer Edward T. Devine, whom she had met the previous year at the National Conference of Social Work in Atlantic City. Devine had pioneered the idea of summer schools for charity workers and, because of his position as head of the Russell Sage Foundation and director of civilian relief for the Red Cross, was among the most influential figures of the day in national social work circles. Lyman and Devine established a close friendship, and he traveled to Utah several times over the next few years to aid Lyman in her efforts. In this first visit, he drew his lectures from his book *The Normal Life*, a popular introduction to practical social work written in highly accessible style. Lyman felt it ideally suited for initiating women of the organization into the rudiments of the field. To prepare the Relief Society for Devine's lectures, she had arranged to have these same principles discussed at length during the Relief Society's conference the preceding April.⁵⁷

Upon their return home, graduates of the school continued to study methodology while gaining first hand experience in the field. They also organized their own institutes with the assistance of educators and officials through which local Relief Society women and community leaders were taught what had been learned over the summer. By the fall of 1920, Lyman was already receiving reports detailing the results of these conferences. In a regular column she authored in the *Relief Society Magazine* she noted with pride the interest demonstrated by the large numbers in attendance, including high school educators, "state officials, doctors, and juvenile court judges, and probation officers."⁵⁸



The Relief Society Employment Bureau in the 1920s. Photograph courtesy Vera White Pohlman.

She soon supplemented these local efforts with additional institutes she organized herself in communities throughout Utah and the West. In October 1921, assisted by Annie Palmer and Red Cross veteran Cora Kasius, she conducted a two-week session serving 350–400 women representing several stakes in Salt Lake County. During the remainder of the year and continuing through 1921, she held a series of two-day seminars in stakes stretching from southern Utah up into Idaho, attended by an average of fifty ward and stake leaders. Beginning in January 1922, she taught a class for twenty-six women which met weekly for three months in the Salt Lake Stake.

Because leaders in Mormonism's lay clerical structure often shifted responsibilities, in subsequent years she saw to it that additional training was provided periodically to prepare new leaders for their responsibilities, including additional sessions at BYU in the summer of 1922, and at the University of Utah in 1923, at which Devine again participated. By 1928, forty-three social service institutes, ranging from two days to six weeks, had been held in communities throughout Utah and Idaho, where over 2,900 students were introduced to the practical application of the casework method.⁵⁹ The graduates of the institutes, or *social service aids*, as they came to be called, represented

a veritable army of para-professionals devoted to advancing the use of modern methods in Relief Society charitable work.⁶⁰

The general board continued to supplement these formal courses of study with an impressive array of lessons and articles in the *Relief Society Magazine*. Treating such topics as health and nutrition, public education, family life, and delinquency, they began with a study of the community and then moved on to a several-year treatment of family dynamics using such texts as Devine's *The Normal Life*, and Karl DeSchweinitz's *The Art of Helping People Out of Trouble*. Relief Society leaders encouraged women to use these methods when managing problems within their own homes and when seeking to improve conditions in their communities.⁶¹

Statistics reveal that these innovations had the effect of strengthening the appeal of the organization to younger women. A sharp spike in membership growth that began when the Relief Society started its move into social welfare work continued through the 1920s. At the same time, as Relief Society women played an increasingly visible role in community charitable activities, their influence—and that of their leaders—grew. Lyman was soon to serve as vice-chair of the Utah State Welfare Commission and became a founding member and eventual president of the Utah State Conference of Social Work.⁶² In addition, as word of the Relief Society's accomplishments in social welfare work was passed along by such figures as Devine and Vaile, its activities drew the attention and praise of national social work leaders. In July 1921, an editor of *The Survey* even invited Lyman to report on Relief Society activities for the journal—recognition on a national scale of what Mormon women had been able to achieve⁶³

But Lyman knew that such acknowledgment, while undoubtedly gratifying to her and other women of the organization, was less important than the fact that through these activities a corps of women was armed with the tools to significantly improve the lives of individuals and families in communities throughout the West. Gratifying as well was the knowledge that for the first time since the suffrage struggle in the run up to statehood a quarter-century before, the full resources of the Relief Society were again united in common cause. The results were spectacular. Though certainly all were not experts, the vast body of the organization became well-informed advocates of modern social work techniques, not only in the Church, but in the community at large. As a result, Relief Society women began again to exercise noticeable influence in the affairs of their towns and cities. Commenting in Relief Society conference on the growing assertiveness that resulted from this heightened consciousness of social issues, Clarissa Williams observed that reports coming back to the board indicated that "Relief Society women everywhere are being regarded as powers in local communities. . . . as it is proper," she noted,

“they should be.”⁶⁴ At a time when other American women in clubs and associations were organizing in the interest of community betterment, Mormon women had thus joined them as an especially cohesive body.

As impressive in retrospect was the way the Relief Society was able to do something most social welfare organizations were not able to do, namely, bridge the chasm between “Lady Bountiful” and the professional social worker. While a few like Susa Gates remained unreconciled to change, most women of the faith found a role in the new system. Those skilled in spiritually oriented compassionate service were not marginalized, but utilized in cases of temporary hardship. On the other hand, they were trained to know when to draw upon the services of professionals and trained paraprofessionals who were able to assist in more difficult cases and when long-term assistance was needed. In turn, trained specialists coordinated Church efforts with those of the larger community in order to make the most efficient use of always scarce relief funds. As a result of this broad and multilevel participation in social welfare work, the needs of the community were met more effectively than either a professional agency (with its limited staff and funding) or a lay volunteer force could have managed alone.

In sum, the Home Service work initiated during the first World War opened the door to significant changes in the charitable work of the Relief Society, the LDS Church, and public agencies in Utah and other areas of the Mountain West. While so doing, it provided a venue for collective action on the part of Mormon women as carried out through the auspices of the Relief Society, helping them find a new role for themselves in community affairs during the early decades of the twentieth century.

Notes

1. Jill Mulvay Derr, Janath Russell Cannon and Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, *Women of Covenant: The Story of Relief Society* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 207.

2. “The Red Cross Civilian Relief Plan,” and “The Task of Civilian War Relief,” *The Survey* 38 (May 19, 1917): 162–64, 164–65.

3. Amy Brown Lyman, “The Red Cross Conference in Denver,” *Relief Society Magazine* 4, no. 12 (December 1917): 687. See also James Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 161; Phyllis Atwood Watts, “Casework Above the Poverty Line: The Influence of Home Service Work in World War I on Social Work,” *Social Service Review* 38 (September 1964): 314.

4. Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890–1935* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1991).

5. Janath Russell Cannon and Jill Mulvay Derr, “Resolving Differences/Achieving Unity: Lessons from the History of Relief Society,” in Mary E. Stovall and Carol Cornwall Madsen, eds., *As Women of Faith: Talks Selected from the BYU Women’s Conferences* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989), 128–31.

6. The failure of Red Cross social work volunteers might have served the cause of professionals by pointedly revealing the need for social work agencies with adequately trained staffs. For the mixed responses to the Red Cross home service work see Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1965), 44, 151; John F. McClymer, "The War as a Professional Opportunity: Mobilization and the Myth of Reconstruction, 1917-19," in *War and Welfare: Social Engineering in America, 1890-1925* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1980), 153-91.

7. Amy Kathryn Lyman Engar, Interview, conducted by David Hall, 1990.

8. Amy Brown Lyman, *In Retrospect: Autobiography of Amy Brown Lyman* (Salt Lake City: General Board of Relief Society, 1945), 42-3.

9. *Women of Covenant*, 156-57; Carol Cornwall Madsen, "A Mormon Woman in Victorian America," (PhD dissertation, University of Utah, 1985), 360.

10. Lyman, *In Retrospect*, 53-55; *Women of Covenant*, 190-92.

11. Leah D. Widtsoe, "The Story of a Gifted Lady," *Relief Society Magazine* 32, no. 4 (March 1945): 154; "General Relief Society Conference," *Woman's Exponent* 41, no. 11 (November 1913): 77.

12. Relief Society Minutes, January 20, February 3, 1916, as cited in Madsen, "A Mormon Woman in Victorian America," 395; Relief Society Circular Letter, February 18, 1916, Relief Society Circular Letter File, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

13. Thomas G. Alexander, "Between Revivalism and the Social Gospel: The Latter-day Saint Social Advisory Committee, 1916-1922," *BYU Studies* 23, no. 1 (Winter 1983), 19-39; William J. Deeney to Mrs. Richard R. Lyman, April 27, 1916, Amy Brown Lyman Papers, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

14. *First Biennial Report of the State Department of Public Welfare, July 1, 1936-June 30, 1938, With supplementary date January 1935 through December, 1938 and a Review of Public Aid in Utah Prior to Establishment of the State Department of Public Welfare in May, 1935* (Salt Lake City: State of Utah, 1939), 1. In addition to Lyman, Utah's delegation included Rebecca Nibley from the Relief Society, and W. J. Deeney, of Salt Lake's Charity Organization Society, charity workers Evelyn Moyle and Julia Mansfield, and E. S. Hinckley of the state industrial school. Nibley had the added advantage of being the wife of the LDS Church's presiding bishop, Charles Nibley, the priesthood leader in charge of charity efforts. "Mrs. Lyman, Delegate, Reports Proceedings Pittsburg [sic.] Convention," *Deseret News*, June 19, 1917; and Amy Brown Lyman, "Social Service Work in the Relief Society, 1917-1928, Including a Brief History of the Relief Society Social Service Department and Brief Mention of Other Relief Society and Community Social Service Activities," 3, Lyman Papers, Perry Special Collections. For the Pittsburgh discussion of the Home Service work see Eugene T. Lies, "Red Cross Work Among Families of Soldiers and Sailors," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work at the Forty-Forth Annual Session held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 6-13, 1917* (Chicago: National Conference of Social Work), 140-43.

15. See Mary Richmond, *Social Diagnosis* (Philadelphia: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917); *The Long View: Papers and Addresses* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930), 418; Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work*, 121-23; Lyman, *In Retrospect*, 114; Elizabeth N. Agnew, *From Charity to Social Work: Mary E. Richmond and the Creation of an American Profession* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).

16. For an overview of Mormon charitable efforts before the changes that came through cooperation with the Red Cross see Garth L. Mangum and Bruce D. Blumell, *The Mormon's War on Poverty* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1993): 77-83. On the inad-

equacy of public relief agencies see Lubove, *The Professional Altruist*, 52–54.

17. Acting on her own recommendation, the following year she saw to it that representatives from the Church joined an even larger Utah delegation to the next meeting of the National Conference in Kansas City. “Mrs. Lyman, Delegate, Reports;” Alexander, “Between Revivalism and the Social Gospel,” 27; Amy Brown Lyman, “Notes From the Field: National Conference of Social Work,” *Relief Society Magazine* 5, no. 7 (July 1918): 458.

18. Williams’s familiarization with home service work at this early stage contributed to her subsequent support of Lyman’s ongoing efforts to bring modern social welfare methods into the Relief Society. For the development of this aspect of the work see Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 3; and “The Red Cross Conference in Denver,” *Relief Society Magazine* 4, no. 12 (December 1917): 687–90.

19. Kasius eventually moved east and achieved some distinction in national social work circles. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 3–4; “Relief Workers Return to Salt Lake,” scrapbook clipping, November 1917, Lyman Papers, Perry Special Collections; and Vera White Pohlman, Interviews, conducted by David Hall, 1990–1994.

20. In 1916 she was asked to address the National Conference on her accomplishments in Denver, and ten years later she rose to the presidency of the organization. “Gertrude Vaile,” in Walter I. Trattner, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of Social Welfare in America* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 723–25; “Gertrude Vaile, 1878–1954,” *Social Service Review* (March, 1955), 84–85; Gertrude Vaile, “Public Administration of Charity in Denver,” *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction at the Forty-Third Annual Session Held in Indianapolis, Indiana, May 10–17, 1916* (Chicago: National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1916), 415–18.

21. See examples of correspondence between the two women and Lyman from 1917 to 1932, as contained in the Lyman papers, Perry Special Collections.

22. Emmeline B. Wells Diary, October 23, 1917, Emmeline B. Wells Collection, Perry Special Collections.

23. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 4.

24. Smith and Lyman were joined by Jeannette Hyde at this meeting. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 4–5.

25. Mangum and Blumell, *The Mormons’ War on Poverty*, 52–74.

26. Richard D. Poll, ed., *Utah’s History* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1978), 434–42, 687.

27. Amy Brown Lyman, “General Relief Society Conference,” *Woman’s Exponent* 40, no. 8 (April 1912): 59.

28. “Jottings,” *The Survey* 38 (16 June 1917): 252. *The Survey* was at the time the preeminent journal of social work and reform. For the role of the publication in social work circles see Clarke A. Chambers, *Paul U. Kellogg and the Survey: Voices for Social Welfare and Social Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

29. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 5.

30. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 5.

31. Pohlman, Interviews; Evelyn Hodges Lewis, Interview, conducted by David Hall, 1992. Though professional social workers were trying to raise standards during this period, Lyman’s brief training period was still fairly typical of many in the profession. By the early 1930s, government studies indicated that only a small percentage had lengthy training in a formal setting. See *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President’s Research Committee on Social Trends* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933), 1190–91.

32. Joseph F. Smith no doubt felt at ease that such a resource was available within the Church. However, the Relief Society would continue to clear these cases with the local COS. Pohlman, Interviews; Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 5; Amy Brown Lyman, “Na-

tional Conference of Social Work,” in “Notes from the Field,” *Relief Society Magazine* 5, no. 8 (August 1918), 458–62; *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work at the Forty-Fifth Annual Session Held in Kansas City, Missouri, May 15–22, 1918* (Chicago: Rogers and Hall, 1918). Among other delegates from Utah were apostle Stephen L. Richards and his wife, both of the Social Advisory Committee. In May, following President Joseph F. Smith’s discussions with Lyman, the committee had decided to send representatives to the conference with the aim of making a thorough study of modern social work techniques. In coming years, SAC members would prove important allies to Lyman in the cause of modernizing Church charity work. Alexander, “Between Revivalism and the Social Gospel,” 27.

33. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 6.

34. For an overview of the influenza epidemic see Alfred W. Crosby, *America’s Forgotten Pandemic: The Influenza of 1918* (Cambridge University Press, 1990). On the influenza’s impact in Utah see Leonard J. Arrington, “The Influenza Epidemic of 1918–19 in Utah,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58, no. 2 (Spring 1990): 165–82.

35. This exposed Lyman to a wider range of social problems than she had previously encountered. See Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 6.

36. This assessment of Lyman’s abilities was shared by those who worked under her as social workers, and by such figures as Gertrude Vaile and Katherine Lenroot of the Children’s Bureau. Leona Fetzer Wintch, Interviews, conducted by David Hall, 1990–1996; Lewis, Interview; Pohlman, Interviews.

37. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 6; Madsen, “A Mormon Woman,” 402; Pohlman, Interviews. For Grant’s efforts to shore up the Church’s finances see Thomas G. Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890–1930* (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1986), 116–25.

38. Thomas G. Alexander, “From War to Depression,” in *Utah’s History*, 463–72.

39. Lyman, “Social Service Work,” 7–8; Pohlman, Interviews; Wintch, Interviews; Lewis, Interview. For the Relief Society’s adoption efforts see Mary Jane Woodger, “Amy Brown Lyman: Mother of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints’ Child Placement Agency,” in Carol Cornwall Madsen and Cherry B. Silver, ed., *New Scholarship on Latter-day Saint Women in the Twentieth Century: Selections from the Women’s History Initiative Seminars 2003–2004* (Provo, Utah: Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History, 2005), 68–80.

40. Anna Laura Stohl Cannon, Interview, conducted by Loretta L. Hefner, 1979, typescript, James H. Moyle Oral History Program, Church History Library; Lewis, Interviews; Wintch, Interviews; Amy Brown Lyman to Florence Hutsinpillar, August 10, 1920, Lyman papers, Perry Special Collections. For the larger context of training for the profession see Lubove, *The Professional Altruist*.

41. Lydia Alder Bean, Interview, conducted by Loretta L. Hefner, 1979, typescript, James H. Moyle Oral History Program, Church History Library, Cannon, Interview; Pohlman, Interviews; Wintch Interviews; Lewis, Interviews.

42. Lyman to Florence Hutsinpillar, February 8, 1922; Cannon, Interview.

43. Pohlman, Interviews; Wintch Interviews; Lewis, Interview.

44. Pohlman, Interviews.

45. In 1919, Lyman arranged for a member of the Presiding Bishopric to visit Denver’s City and County charities. She used the prestige bestowed by her growing prominence in the field to influence public officials to fulfill their legal obligations in welfare matters by expanding services offered by public agencies. In 1923, for instance, she sought to enlighten and inspire Salt Lake’s new county commissioner of charity to step up to his responsibilities when she arranged for his visit to the Denver charity offices. Florence

Hutsinpillar to Amy Brown Lyman, September 9, 1919; and Amy Brown Lyman to Florence W. Hutsinpillar, April 30, 1923, Lyman papers, Perry Special Collections. See also Lyman, "Social Service Work," 8.

46. Vera White Pohlman reported seeing Gates call Lyman in this fashion on numerous occasions in the early 1920s. She also indicated that as young woman unfamiliar with the internal struggles going on behind the scenes, she saw no outward indication of tension between Lyman and Gates. Pohlman, Interviews.

47. Cannon and Derr, "Resolving Differences/Achieving Unity," 128–31; Madsen, "Mormon Woman," 401. Gates's argument against using modern methods is summarized in Susa Young Gates to the President and Board of the Relief Society, November 4, 1919, Susa Young Gates Collection, Church History Library.

48. See Lyman, "Social Service Work," 6; Amy Brown Lyman, "Mrs. Annie D. Palmer," *Relief Society Magazine* 19, no. 9 (September 1932): 523; Cannon and Derr, "Resolving Differences," 128–29; Utah Stake Relief Society Minutes, February through December, 1919, Church History Library; Mark K. Allen, Interviews, conducted by David Hall, 1991, 1994. The Utah Stake Relief Society continued to serve the community for several years until its activities were finally assumed by the county government.

49. Cannon and Derr, "Resolving Differences," 130; Program, Colorado Conference of Social Work, Denver, November 19–21, 1919, Lyman papers, Perry Special Collections. The text of Lyman's speech does not appear to have survived.

50. Cannon and Derr, "Resolving Differences," 130–31.

51. Cannon and Derr, "Resolving Differences," 131.

52. See Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 16–37, 116–25.

53. Lyman, "Social Service Work," 1–2; Wintch, Interviews; Lewis, Interview; Amy Brown Lyman, "General Relief Society Conference," *Relief Society Magazine* 7, no. 12 (December 1920): 712.

54. Rebecca Foster Cornwall, "Susa Young Gates: The Thirteenth Apostle," in Vicki Burgess-Olson, ed., *Sister Saints* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1978), 79. Despite Gates's release from the board, Lyman's husband, Apostle Richard R. Lyman, suspected that her efforts to undermine the new directions in Church charity work continued. See Richard R. Lyman, Journal, July 26, 1922, Perry Special Collections. Annie Wells Cannon, daughter of Emmeline B. Wells and member of the Relief Society General Board, opposed much of Lyman's agenda. See Annie Wells Cannon, Diaries, 1921–1928, Perry Special Collections.

55. Those trained were often stake or ward Relief Society presidents or specially designated social service aides. Pohlman, Interviews.

56. Beeley was also a member of the Social Advisory Committee and worked closely with Lyman in that capacity. Amy Brown Lyman, "Class in Charities and Relief Work: Brigham Young University Summer School," *Relief Society Magazine* 7, no. 8 (August 1920): 437–40; Lyman, "Social Service Work," 9; Pohlman, Interviews; Wintch, Interviews.

57. Lyman, "Class in Charities and Relief Work," 438; Edward T. Devine, *The Normal Life* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1917); Amy Brown Lyman, "General Relief Society Conference," *Relief Society Magazine* 7 (June 1920): 335–46. On Devine's prominence during this period see McClymer, *War and Welfare*, 165; Lyman, *In Retrospect*, 116–17.

58. Amy Brown Lyman, "Notes from the Field: Leadership Institutes," *Relief Society Magazine* 8, no. 1 (January 1921): 35–36.

59. While the women of the Church were actually carrying out the welfare work, they depended on the cooperation of their male bishops and stake presidents. Lyman thus saw

that the local male hierarchy were invited to these institutes in the interest of gaining their informed support. Lyman, "Social Service Work," 2, 28–31.

60. Lyman, "Social Service Work," 28–29.

61. Cora L. Bennion, "Social Service," *Relief Society Magazine* 11, no. 6 (June 1924): 288–89.

62. Vera White Pohlman, *In Memoriam: Amy Brown Lyman, 1872–1959, Biographical Summary and Funeral Services* (Privately Printed, 1960), 14, 19; Pohlman, Interviews; Wintch, Interviews; Lewis, Interview.

63. Paul L. Benjamin to Mrs. Amy Lyman, July 15, 1921, Lyman papers, Perry Special Collections. I have found no evidence that Lyman wrote the report Benjamin requested.

64. Williams, "General Officers Meeting," *Relief Society Magazine* 7, no. 12 (December 1921): 679.