5-2002

Friends or Foes? How 19th Century LDS Literature Supported Manifest Destiny

Richard Edward West
Utah State University

FRIENDS OR FOES?
HOW 19th CENTURY LDS LITERATURE SUPPORTED MANIFEST DESTINY

By Richard Edward West
Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree

of

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT HONORS

in

Literary Studies

Approved:

Dr. Andrea Tinnemeyer Thesis Advisor	Dr. Kristine Miller English Honors Advisor

Dr. David Lancy
Honors Program Director

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, UT

2002

FRIENDS OR FOES?
HOW 19th CENTURY LDS LITERATURE SUPPORTED MANIFEST DESTINY

"They felt that the Indians had to become civilized according to non-Indian standards. They did not know or understand the Indians' way of life nor did they want to."

— Idaho Indians: Tribal Histories

This quote refers to the United States government, but it could have also referred to many nineteenth-century members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). This religion, centered in Salt Lake City, Utah, was one of the faiths that most influenced the Native Americans in the western United States. The LDS settlers and Native Americans had an unusual relationship — one that was very different from other white/red relationships of the nineteenth century. The myth, passed down through generations of LDS Saints, is that the pioneers and the Native Americans thought of each other as friends. Yet, in the decades of 1850-1870, they clashed in several violent wars. The obvious question, as Utah historian William Z. Terry asks, is "Why should there have been any Indian wars in Utah, considering the fact that the settlers considered themselves as friends of the Indians, and the Indians considered the Mormons as their friends, even distinguishing between Mormons and other white men by the use of the words: Mormonee and Mericats?" (104). By analyzing the nineteenth-century poems, songs, and narratives written by the settlers, it becomes apparent that the myth of a friendly pioneer/native relationship was not always true because LDS settlers did not fully believe in the ideology of their president, Brigham Young.

While Young established the official LDS Indian Policy during his presidency (1847-77), many settlers appear to have carried with them in their handcarts more than

just wheat seed and clothing; they carried some of the anti-native opinions and prejudices of their Eastern American neighbors. On the surface, the settlers affirmed their loyalty to Young's Native American policies, but their writings and actions prove that in reality, they opposed Young's optimistic view of the Utah Indians. This amounted to more than just civil disobedience. Because LDS doctrine affirms that the church president is the literal representative of God on the earth, the pioneers disobeyed divine authority by submitting to Manifest Destiny prejudices. In this paper, I will first attempt to provide a historical and cultural context for the stories these LDS settlers told about the Native Americans in their journals, newspapers, and oral histories. I will then analyze some of these stories and poems to show that many of the settlers were not obedient to Young's Native American policies, but in fact supported a Manifest Destiny ideology.

The Context of LDS / Native American Relationships

Before analyzing the LDS/Utah Indian relationship, it is important to understand somewhat the rocky background of interaction between the natives and the Anglo-Europeans. Christopher Columbus was the first European man to write about the inferiority of the Native Americans, and he believed that the Native Americans actually *wanted* to be assimilated into the European culture. "Your Highnesses may have great joy of them," he wrote to the King and Queen of Spain after his first voyage to the new world. "For soon you will have made them into Christians and will have instructed them in the good manners of your kingdoms" (Todorov 43). On succeeding voyages, Columbus and other explorers realized that the natives were not as anxious to be assimilated and converted as the Europeans had originally thought, but that did not keep

the explorers from believing that Europe was justified in conquering the natives (Todorov 51-98).

Columbus and many of the Spanish explorers argued for a strange paradoxical theory of the natives' racial equality. They believed that the Native Americans were inferior enough to be treated as savages, but equal enough to be converted to an Anglo-European religion like Catholicism. This paradox was popularized in the Valladolid debates of 1550. In this debate, philosopher Ginés de Sepúlveda argued that the natives were inferior and should be exploited as slaves. He quoted Aristotle's theory in *Politics* that there is a hierarchy of humans, and Sepúlveda attempted to persuade the judges that "In wisdom, skill, virtue and humanity, these people are as inferior to the Spaniards as children are to adults and women to men; there is as great a difference between them as there is between savagery and forbearance . . . as between monkeys and men" (qtd. in Todorov 153). The Dominican bishop Bartolomé de Las Casas argued against Sepúlveda, believing that because the Spanish were trying to convert the natives, they must be considered a race that is redeemable and civilizable.

While Las Casas won the debates at Valladolid, historian Sherburne Cook argues that this debate continued in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with men who believed, "The lot of the Indian was to be improved in the material as well as in the religious sense. He was to be lifted from savagery and taught the arts of civilization in order that he might assume a respective position in society" (474). According to Cook, men during this time period believed the Indians were redeemable materially and spiritually, but this belief did not lead Americans to grant the natives equal rights and opportunities. Historian Bernard Romans justified the suppression of the natives by

arguing, "God created an original man and woman in this part of the globe, *of different species* from any other parts" (Horsman 154, emphasis added). Romans added that American Indians were ". . . a people not only rude and uncultivated, but incapable of civilization." Even one of the early U.S. presidents, John Quincy Adams (1825-9), believed that the Native Americans were not "improvable" as a race and were "essentially inferior" to the Anglo-Americans (Horsman 154).

Political racism reached its height in the 1830s with Adams' successor, Andrew Jackson. Jackson embodied the attitude of Manifest Destiny with his belief that the United States should extend "the area of freedom" (Johannsen 56). This phrase justified many of Jackson's expansion projects and was one motivation for compelling the Cherokee nation to move west in the infamous Trail of Tears ("A Brief History"). With their political leaders supporting racism, many Americans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries truly believed that the Native Americans were inferior. Reginald Horsman understood that Manifest Destiny propelled these beliefs in Native American inferiority. "Americans in general were delighted to accept new interpretations which provided a rationale for the failure of American Indian policy and a justification for the seemingly ruthless appropriation of both Indian and Mexican land" (153). Racism was a very useful attitude to have in the nineteenth century because it justified pushing the natives aside to create an American nation that stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Jackson's racist agenda emboldened the nation against the Native Americans during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, who organized the LDS church in 1830 and was murdered only one year before the death of Jackson. Joseph Smith was an exception to the prevailing belief that the Native Americans were an inferior race, even though he

believed that their nation had degenerated spiritually. Smith's beliefs about the Native Americans derived from the Book of Mormon, a book of scripture that his followers testify he translated from 1827 to 1830 by the power of God. Smith taught Brigham Young and others that the Book of Mormon proved that the American Indians were once a highly civilized nation that had turned away from God. In the book, the Native Americans are called "Lamanites" because they descend from Laman, an Israelite who migrated to America from Jerusalem in 600 B.C. Mormon, the principal writer in the Book of Mormon, wrote to the Native Americans who had survived a battle many centuries ago: "I would speak somewhat unto the remnant of this [the Lamanite] people, . . . yea, I speak unto you, ye *remnant of the house of Israel*; and these are the words which I speak: Know ye that *ye are of the house of Israel*. Know ye that ye must come unto repentance, or ye cannot be saved" (The Book of Mormon 7:1-3, emphasis added).

This idea that the Native Americans were brothers to the LDS Saints was very popular among the pioneers. In fact, the following hymn was often sung in Nauvoo, Illinois, where these pioneers lived until they moved west. This simple poem teaches that the natives had the same father as the Saints.

Oh stop and tell me, Red Man,
Who are you, why you roam,
And how you get your living;
Have you no God, no home?

Before your nation knew us,
Some thousand moons ago,

Our father fell in darkness

And wandered to and fro (Burt 156, emphasis added)

This hymn presents the interesting paradox, similar to the one debated at Valladolid by Las Casas and Sepúlveda, about Native Americans in early Mormon thought. It suggests that the LDS and natives share the same ancient fathers, but it still divides the two cultures by color, calling the natives "Red Man." It also implies that the natives are like lost prodigal sons because they roam without a home, a God, or a way to earn a living. The next stanza builds on this thought of native depravity and shows the LDS settlers' resolve to convert the natives:

Yet hope within us lingers,

As if the Spirit spoke,

He'll come for your redemption

And break your Gentile yoke (Burt 157).

In the LDS culture, the word "Gentile" often refers to anyone who is a non-Israelite, or in other words, a person who is not a member of the LDS faith, Native American culture, or the Jewish bloodlines. In this specific usage, the word probably applies to the U.S. federal government, which has put the natives under physical bondage by taking away their lands. This hymn describes the Native Americans, those who live in Utah as well as in other areas, as Israelites (because they are separated from the Gentiles) who had fallen away from the gospel truth. The redemption spoken of is not only a spiritual redemption, but also a physical redemption from the Gentiles (U.S. government).

This song thus alludes to the early LDS theory that if the Native Americans converted and were faithful in the church, the U.S. government would no longer oppress

them. Church leader Wilford Woodruff, who was an apostle under Young's leadership, said, "The [Native Americans] will blossom as the rose on the mountains. . . . Every word that God has ever said of them will have its fulfillment, and they, by and by, will receive the Gospel. It will be a day of God's power among them, and a nation will be born in a day" (Fyans 12). Woodruff's quote explains the popular LDS belief that spiritual "blossoming" or conversion would create a strong native nation by God's hand.

This distinctive LDS belief made the Saints very unpopular with their racist neighbors in the East. "The Mormons were also accused by the people of Missouri of plotting with the Indians for the destruction of non-Mormons," Brigham Young biographer M.R. Werner said about the Saints' situation in 1834. "This suspicion arose from the tenet of the Mormon creed which makes the Indian a descendent of the lost tribes of Israel" (100). Werner correctly identifies the prevailing attitude of Americans in the nineteenth century towards anyone who was a friend to the Indians: "Any one who regarded an Indian as anything but an enemy could never be popular" (101). The LDS pioneers, who were already unpopular and had been targeted by mobs in Illinois and Missouri, were only creating more violent opposition against themselves by supporting their friends, the natives.

Despite the danger of befriending the Native Americans, Smith had faith in the goodness of the native people and this prompted him to send the church's first missionaries in 1830 to the Native Americans. Because the church was still located in the East (at this time, in New York) the first LDS contact with Native Americans was with the Seneca, Wyandot, Shawnee, and Delaware tribes in the eastern states. The Second Elder of the church, Oliver Cowdery (who was second to Smith in church authority) led

this mission (Price 459). The American Indians were very accepting of the new LDS religion, perhaps because it was the first Christian religion using scriptures that specifically referred to the Native American people.

The Native Americans might also have been accepting of the LDS faith because it appeared to be anti-expansionist. Cowdery himself told the natives "if the red man would receive this Book [of Mormon] and learn the things written in it, and do according thereunto, they should be restored to all their rights and privileges . . . Then should the red men become great" (Parley P. Pratt, qtd. in Price 459). Cowdery did not elaborate on what his statement meant, but it would have been easy for the natives to interpret it as a promise that they would regain the lands that they had lost to the Anglo-Americans and again would be in control of the American continent. After many years of violent oppression by the Anglo-Europeans, the American Indians thought that they had finally found a religion and a group of white men who would support their claim of American land ownership.

The LDS and native cultures shared many other similar experiences and beliefs. Both groups believed in polygamy (some stories suggest that Chief Wakara joined the LDS Church to gain a white wife to add to the native ones he already had) while the rest of the United States outlawed the practice in 1882. However, because of pressure from the federal government, both the Native Americans and the LDS church gave up polygamy (church President Wilford Woodruff officially ended the practice in 1890, and the individual tribes slowly gave up the practice).

Both groups also believed in the sacredness of nature and in the reality of visions. Critical to LDS doctrine is the belief that Joseph Smith saw a vision of God and Jesus

Christ. While this declaration repelled many white non-LDS people of other faiths, it attracted many Native Americans who also believed that their chiefs could have visions. Brigham Young reported that Ute Chief Wakara received revelations while they traveled together. Another Ute, Chief Tabiona, told President Young in the fall of 1872 that he had received a vision on three successive nights of three white-robed, white-bearded strangers. They had promised Tabiona that Young and the Mormons were the best friends the Indians had (Culmsee 166). This vision helped end the bloody Black Hawk War that had lasted for seven years (1865-72).

Another similarity between the two cultures was their unified belief in communal use of land and food because nature and its bounty were meant for all to share. This belief had created many complications between other Anglo-Americans and natives. If one Native American sold his right to a section of land, the white man did not know that this transaction did not apply to the other members of the tribe. The other tribe members might also claim the land as theirs and not honor the transaction. However, the LDS pioneers had been taught by Joseph Smith that in a perfect community, all food and land would be shared among its members. This type of community was to be called Zion, and it was to be established " by [or close to] the Lamanites" (Doctrine and Covenants 28:9). Thus, the Saints knew that their future would be living side-by-side with the Native Americans, sharing food and other bounties from the land. There is some dispute about whether the LDS pioneers followed this belief and truly desired to live communally with the Native Americans, but that issue will be discussed later in this thesis. At any rate, the issue was complicated by the fact that both the natives and the pioneers laid claim to the land of Utah, but neither owned the land in the eyes of the federal government. The

United States won the area of Utah in 1848 in the Mexican War. This was one year after the LDS pioneers had settled the area and started to build what they hoped would be their own nation.

This land dispute later bound the Native Americans and LDS Saints together against a common enemy — the United States federal government. The government was aware that the church and the tribes shared similar grudges against the union, and political leaders suspected that the two cultures were uniting against the United States. In 1855, Dr. Garland Hunt arrived in Utah as an Indian Agent for the federal government, and by May 2, he wrote the commissioner of Indian Affairs that, in his opinion, President Young was rallying the Utah Indians against the United States (Madsen 63). Partly because of this report, President Abraham Lincoln sent Colonel Patrick Connor and between 750-1,500 men to "prevent Indian hostilities and keep an eye on the Mormons" in Utah (Arrington 248). Reports like this were unfounded because even though the natives and the Saints both counted the U.S. government as an enemy, the two cultures never organized together to defend Utah against U.S. troops. The fear that they might, however, served to keep a steady federal military presence in the growing state.

The greatest similarity between these two cultures was the intense persecution that both the Native Americans and the Mormons received for not being the "ideal American" — i.e. white, Protestant. Because of this prejudice, the government did not recognize the Native American tribes as free nations, and Congress decided in 1887 that the Mormons would no longer be recognized as a church (Whittaker 42). In much the same way that the Cherokees were forced to leave their lands in the Southeast and travel 1,000 miles in 1838 to go West to the Indian Territories, the Mormons were forced to

leave Missouri the same year because of an extermination order signed by Governor Lilburn Boggs. The only land that the Mormons were allowed to settle on was the same desert western land that several Indian tribes had already claimed. Because they had suffered similar persecutions, the Native Americans were sympathetic toward the Mormons. The great Pottawattamie chief Pied Riche LeClerc told the LDS pioneers, "We have both suffered. We must keep one another, and the Great Spirit will keep us both. . . . You can make your improvements and live on any part of our actual land not occupied by us. Because one suffers and does not deserve it, is no reason he should suffer always" (Arrington 98). For a time, it seemed that mutual suffering would bring the LDS people and the Native Americans together.

History of Utah Settlement

Perhaps the LDS leader most influential in molding the official policies of the church towards the Native Americans was Brigham Young, the second president of the church. Young, as the church's senior Apostle, took over leadership of the church in 1844 when Smith was murdered. Three years later, he was named the president of the church in time to lead a westward migration of LDS pioneers after they were removed in 1847 from Nauvoo, Illinois. A year later, Boggs' extermination order forced the last of the Saints out of Missouri, and the LDS pioneers turned their sights toward settling in the West. While leading the church members to Utah, Young earnestly tried to create a state that would blend the LDS and native cultures and avoid confrontation. Specifically, he chose to settle the Salt Lake Valley, partly because no Native Americans had appeared to claim it. The Shoshonis lived to the north, and the Utes were in the south, but the valley

itself was unclaimed (Whittaker 37). Young did not learn until later that the valley was claimed indirectly by a couple of tribes as their hunting ground.

Once its members were settled in the Salt Lake Valley[1], the church began looking to expand and possess more land. Because of the Homestead Act in 1862, settlers were allowed to buy 160 acres of land for a small filing fee. Young knew that the church would be growing in membership, especially because converts were still migrating to Utah. He knew that the church would need more land, and he wanted to purchase as much of it as possible before non-LDS settlers snatched it up. LDS historian James Arrington describes Young's purpose in buying the land as being, "two-fold: it gave an opportunity to expand, and it would keep unwanted nonmembers at a safe distance" (247). This expansion of the LDS society, like Manifest Destiny, meant pushing the Native Americans into smaller sections of land.

However, at first the Native Americans were happy to share their land with the pioneers. In fact, they sometimes requested that the pioneers expand their settlements further so they could teach more natives some of the white man's survival skills. In 1849, Ute Chief Wakara asked Young to send some settlers to the San Pete Valley, a 100 miles south of Salt Lake, so that they could learn "the white man's ways" (Gibbons 161). The Shoshonis of Idaho wrote in their tribal histories that the pioneers were always welcome in their lands:

> The Chiefs saw something in these white people that they liked. They saw their guns were being used to kill game instead of Indians. They saw women and children in the group. They seemed like a friendly, happy family group. The

[1] In this thesis, the term "Salt Lake Valley" refers to the present area of Salt Lake County, or the lower Jordan River Valley.

> Indians shared their knowledge on food gathering and preparation with the pioneers. Many times Indian women placed moccasins upon bleeding white feet that were without shoes. (Idaho Indians 55)

This tribal history of the Shoshonis shows that the friendship between the cultures was mutual. The LDS Saints were not violent towards the natives and often gave them food and clothing, and the Shoshonis frequently returned the favor with clothing and food-gathering techniques that might have saved some pioneer lives.

The Native Americans grew to like the pioneers even more when they compared them to other Anglo-Americans, most specifically the men rushing to California as part of the 1849 Gold Rush. Approximately 25,000 miners passed through Salt Lake between 1849-50, destroying Indian trails, depleting wood resources, and killing what little wild game was available (Madsen 30). Historian Brigham Madsen describes these '49ers as "young and impatient to get to the diggings in California" and remarks that they "introduced a new and trying era in Indian relations (39). The gold diggers exemplified the principle of Manifest Destiny that the land should be used at will to serve mankind: "Natives viewed the land as belonging to the group and whites thought that undeveloped land was wasted earth" (Whittaker 41). To a gold digger, if a plot of land was not being fenced or farmed, then it was unused and he could use it at will. Many gold diggers damaged large plots of land because of this rationale (Madsen 30). However, Native Americans had different views on the use of the land. They believed that land was sacred and should be protected as much as possible. Even though the LDS pioneers also believed in settling unused land, it appears that the natives approved of the LDS saints more than the '49ers. It is unclear why this is, but one possibility could be that the natives

appreciated how the pioneers used the land to produce food instead of destroying it in search of gold.

Just in time to try and settle down flaring native emotions, Brigham Young was named the superintendent of Indian Affairs in Utah in 1850 and governor of the territory of Utah in 1851. In the next few years, there were only small skirmishes between individual natives and LDS settlers until 1853 when the Walker War erupted. The war has often been described as starting because of the Utes' practice of selling stolen children from other tribes as slaves. This was a major source of income for Chief Wakara, who would raid other tribes to steal their children and would then sell them to the Mexicans. When the LDS pioneers settled in Utah, Chief Wakara wanted to sell children to them too, but Brigham Young forbade it. When Young became governor, he decided to outlaw the slave trade entirely. In Young's eyes, the practice was abominable not only because it enslaved children, but also because it sometimes included murdering them.

On one occasion, Chief Wakara demanded that some settlers buy the slave children he had for sale. When they refused, he dashed the brains of one child against a rock, killing the child (Beecher 31). The Chief threatened to do the same thing to another little girl, but the Saints bought the girl to save her life, and settler Charles Decker brought her to Clara Decker, his sister. Clara was married to President Young, and the couple adopted the girl and named her Sally. Like conversion, adoption was sometimes a popular method used by the pioneers to assimilate natives into the LDS culture. Sally grew up without her native culture, but she was raised with love as a member of the Young family. This experience led Brigham Young to outlaw the slave trade, which

infuriated Chief Wakara. Although there were many minor incidents that initiated the war, the disagreement between the settlers and the Indians over the slave trade was one of the major causes for the Walker War (1853-4).

Chief Wakara ended his war against the LDS people on May 11, 1854, when Brigham Young healed the Chief's sick daughter while on a peace mission to the tribe (Alexander "The Walker War"). The federal government went on its own warpath only three years later. The Utah War, which only lasted from spring 1857 to spring 1858, was caused when U.S. president James Buchanan tried to install a non-Mormon governor in Utah ("The Utah War"). Even though this war was short and has been largely forgotten in U.S. history, it did strengthen the relationship between some Utah tribes and the church. The Utah natives might have been sympathetic to the LDS because the natives too believed that their spiritual leader should be a political leader. Other reasons for native sympathies were that many of the natives liked Brigham Young and they disliked the federal troops. Ute chief Arrapeen was angered when another chief was killed by some federal soldiers, and he announced that he and sixteen Indian nations were going to "unite with the Mormons to wipe out the Americans" (Madsen 90). President Young declined Arrapeen's offer, but in the Ute chief's mind, Young was still the best of the white men, a man who had "a big heart and it is white and clean as the sun" (Madsen 90). Comparing Young to the sun might have been Arrapeen's way of accepting Young as a white prophet because the sun was considered to be very sacred to the natives.

Perhaps Arrapeen believed in Young's spiritual powers because he had witnessed or heard of the healing of the daughter of the mighty Wakara. However, Arrapeen's respect for Young did not extend to Young's congregation, and the last major conflict

between the settlers and the Utah Indians was caused in part by Arrapeen. This was the Black Hawk War (1865-72), one of the bloodiest of all of the altercations between the Saints and the natives. The war began on April 9, 1865, when an LDS settler, John Lowry, offended Arrapeen, and an infuriated Black Hawk vowed not to cut his hair while he was at war. The next day, Black Hawk and his braves stole several cows belonging to the Saints and killed Peter Ludvigsen, an innocent man who had not participated in the first offense and had watched the whole ambush thinking it was only a simple Ute prank (Culmsee 34-7). The war ended when Black Hawk finally cut his hair in a symbolic gesture of peace and stated that most of the Mormons were his friends (140-50). The Walker and Black Hawk wars have since become known as milestones in Mormon / Indian relations. These wars were the fire that molded President Young into a skilled diplomat with the natives. The fighting against both chiefs was resolved in many ways because of Young's leadership and policies.

Brigham Young's Indian Policies

When he was the senior apostle presiding under Joseph Smith, Young had many opportunities to be indoctrinated by the martyred prophet's beliefs. Young was one of Smith's most loyal supporters and believed everything Smith taught about the Native Americans (Werner 243-4). He believed that they were a blessed race, descended from the Israelites and destined to accept the church with open arms. He had also seen how generous the American Indians were when he had served as a missionary to the Iroquois (Bringhurst 30). Because of this background, Young tried to avoid fighting with the Native Americans whenever possible, and he developed a Native American policy quite

different from that of U.S. President Jackson and many other contemporary political leaders.

The most famous aspect of Young's Indian policies was his belief that the Saints should feed the Indians instead of fight them. He first introduced this concept in a general conference of the church on April 6, 1854. In that conference, he taught the pioneers that he wanted them to follow his example of feeding and serving the Utah Indians: "I have fed fifty Indians almost day by day for months together. I always give them something, but I never forget to treat them like Indians" (Werner 244). It appears from this statement that Young understood the natives had different customs and beliefs from the settlers, and Young wanted to help them without degrading them. When the LDS settlers were not feeding the natives, Young wanted them to strengthen their forts to prevent any attacks from violent natives: "Do not encourage them to come into your camps. But if they come, give them presents of food and clothing. Never steal from an Indian and never wrong one in any way. It is cheaper to feed than to fight them" (Burt 157). Young firmly stuck to this policy even in times of war. During the Walker War, Young wrote a letter to Chief Wakara, accusing him of causing the fighting and asking him for peace:

> I send you some tobacco to smoke . . . You are a fool for fighting your best friends, for we are the best friends and the only friends you have in the whole world. Everybody else would kill you if they could get the chance. If you get hungry, send some friendly Indians down to the settlements and we will give you some beef-cattle and some flour (Burt 162).

The statement that "everybody else would kill you" appeals to the hatred that the natives held for the federal government and reminds the chief of the differences between his

treatment by the LDS pioneers and the United States government. What Young does not admit here is that the relationship is reciprocal: many Americans wanted to kill the Mormons too, and the natives were the best friends the pioneers had at this time, as well. Carlton Culmsee, who is one of the leading experts on the Black Hawk War, recognized this relationship between Young and the natives, and believed that Young's policies and leadership could have prevented some of the battles between the natives and the settlers: "If the governor of Utah [a non-LDS governor had replaced Young by the time of the Black Hawk War] had understood the Indian nature as well as did Brigham Young, and cooperated with him whole-heartedly, the Black Hawk War could have been prevented" (Culmsee 49).

Young's commandment to feed the Indians was crucial because hunger, according to William Z. Terry, was the principal cause of hostility between the natives and the pioneers. Terry points out that before the arrival of the Saints, "The country was poor. There was practically no buffalo, and only a few elk. The Indians used as food the deer, rabbits, mice, gophers, squirrels, grasshoppers, ants, pine nuts, grass seed, some roots and berries, and some leafy plants which were boiled for food" (106). While other reports have indicated that the situation was not as bad as Terry believes, the food supply did become scarcer when the LDS settlers came: "The white man came and selected the best sites for his villages. These favored spots had been the winter range of the deer and the gathering places of the Indians. . . . Deer were driven back into the mountains or were killed off" (Terry 106).

Young maintained his policy of giving food to the hungry natives and serving them even during the violent conflicts between the two cultures. He despised the use of

violence as a way of settling disputes, and in the 1854 church conference, he criticized the federal government for fighting the natives: "The inhabitants of the United States have treated the Indians in like manner. If but one person or only a few were guilty of committing a depredation upon a white settlement, they have chastised the whole tribe for the crime, and would perhaps kill those who would fight and die for them" (qtd. in Werner 244). Here, Young accurately describes the informal federal policy of "shoot first, ask questions later." Frequently, when there were reports of an Indian attacking a white man or stealing his cattle, the U.S. troops would attack an entire tribe, killing innocent and guilty natives. The Shoshoni people claim that this is why their ancestors were destroyed in the Bear River Massacre by Col. Patrick E. Connor. On January 29, 1863, Col. Connor led federal troops in slaughtering about 250 Shoshoni men, women, and children (Madsen 190-2). The Shoshoni believed Connor attacked because three braves had stolen some cattle from the white settlers: "Three members of their tribe, known as trouble makers, stole some horses and cattle from nearby corrals and headed for the Fort Hall, Idaho, area" (Idaho Tribal Histories 55).

In contrast to Connor, Young considered the American policy of killing innocent Indians corrupt, and he commanded the LDS settlers that "I will not consent to your killing one Indian for the sin of another" (Werner 244). This single sentence is a fair summary of Young's attitude towards the native: he believed they should be treated with justice. If an Indian harmed a settler, then the settler had the right to seek a just payment or restitution for what was lost or harmed. But Young did not support irrational violence against Indians who had not themselves committed any crimes. On another occasion, Young said, "I want it distinctly understood that no retaliation be made and no offense

offered. I want all to act entirely on the defensive until further orders" (Burt 162). Sometimes Young did allow LDS troops to be sent to help protect the pioneers, but he usually preferred that in times of attack, the settlers defended their property by forming small, close-knit communities protected by forts (Burt 157).

However, many LDS settlers disregarded Young's advice in their desire to collect and own large plots of land. The natives more easily assaulted these larger plots. Daniel Jones, an LDS settler and friend of the Utah Indians, said, "Many of the settlers . . . had settled on farms and were much exposed. This had a tendency to make the Indians aggressive" (53). Jones probably believed this because the hungry natives were more likely to steal from an exposed farm that was more difficult to defend. Jones continues, "The continual advice of President Young was to build in towns, fence their lands and be kind to the Indians. . . . Some heeded this counsel, while many did not" (53). Often the conflict zones where the pioneers and the natives were hostile to each other were areas where the settlers had colonized more land than church leaders had authorized.

The desire of the pioneers to colonize large tracts of land also clashed with Young's desire to respect native land rights, as referred to earlier by his decision to settle the unclaimed Salt Lake Valley. As the church expanded in Utah and the surrounding states, Young frequently tried to negotiate with the natives for sections of land without forcing them to remove. For example, Young sent a church representative and apostle, Charles. C. Rich, to the Bear Lake Valley in 1863 to ask Chief Washakie of the Northern Shoshoni tribe for permission to settle in the valley. Washakie relented, but only if the LDS did not settle in the south end of the valley where the Shoshonis liked to hunt. Rich agreed, and the LDS settlers moved into the valley (Arrington 250). Later, when the

Shoshoni were being forced onto federal reservations, they turned to the LDS church for help and Young, independent of any federal assignment, assisted in finding them a new home: "The northwestern Shoshonis turned to the Mormons for help when game became scarce and their way of life was disrupted by white [non-LDS] settlers and farmers. They had no land and no one to turn to for help except the Mormon Church" (Idaho Indians 57). Culmsee believes that "Brigham Young . . . fostered peace-making on more than one occasion" (22). With his policy of feeding the natives, non-violent retaliation against criminal acts, and careful expansion with native permission, Young minimalized the hostilities between the LDS settlers and the Utah Indians.

The Divorce: Young and LDS settlers divide in opinion towards natives

Even though Young preached service, love, patience, and tolerance towards the Indians, many of the settlers showed in their literature that the prevailing attitude of the Mormons ran contrary to Young's declared policies. This should have been considered heresy by LDS definition because church members are taught that they are to accept the president of the church as a prophet and the word of God on earth. The Doctrine and Covenants, a book of LDS scripture published in 1835, quotes the Lord in the first section as stating, "whether by mine own voice or by the voice of my servants [prophets], it is the same" (D&C 1:38). Thus, the pioneers should have accepted Brigham Young's Indian policies as God's policies. However, LDS pioneer literature seems to suggest that many pioneers — indeed, the vast majority — did not believe in Young's Native American principles.

The study of LDS nineteenth century literature is limited to mostly journals, memoirs, newspaper articles and oral narratives passed down to later generations. In many of these writings, the LDS people appear to espouse the same racist, supremacist beliefs as their Anglo-American neighbors in the East — the same beliefs that created the era of Manifest Destiny in the nineteenth century. Many of the LDS writers seem to believe that the Mormons were superior to the natives both culturally and racially and that the land of Utah had been divinely given to them by God to be used by the LDS, not the Native Americans. Another dominating theme is that the natives were savage, animalistic, and inherently evil. This belief follows the racism that Horsman identified as prevalent in most Anglo-Americans, even though it was quite different from the teachings of the LDS founder, Joseph Smith.

In most of the writings about the Native Americans, the LDS' chief complaint appears to be the theft of their cattle. Many of the violent skirmishes with the natives were caused, in part at least, because a native stole some cattle. The Utah Indians, however, may not have perceived the act as theft. Because the pioneers had settled on native lands, the natives might have felt justified in using some of the grain and cattle grown and grazed on their lands. Nevertheless, to the settlers, the taking of cattle was always robbery, even though the pioneers professed to believe in communal living. It appears that the natives were "brothers" and friends but not desired members of the LDS community, and so the cattle did not have to be shared with them. Repeatedly in LDS literature, when the natives take cattle, it is defined as sinful robbery: "The Indians lived on roots, reptiles, insects and grass-seed when they could not steal emigrants' or Mormons' cattle and grain. Whenever they could do so [take cattle], they did" (Werner

248). Cattle robbery was also the chief crime committed by Chief Black Hawk and his warriors. I will now refer to a song in the appendix, written by a man only described as "F. Christensen of Fairview, Utah." He describes the anxiety of having cattle taken by Chief Black Hawk. Although we do not know the time that this song was popular, we can assume it is from 1865-7. Even though other chiefs carried on the war until 1872, Black Hawk himself was only on the warpath for two years.

The first stanza and chorus of the song seem to mock the sound of the Native American war chants, emphasizing the wailing and yelling that probably sounded animalistic to the settlers. The first stanza is rife with prejudice as it depicts Chief Black Hawk as a savage who stole for pride's sake. The line about his desire for "Mormon beef" is a direct reference to Arrapeen[2], Black Hawk's brother. Arrapeen was livid with anger at the LDS settlers, and he rode about shouting that he would "kill Mormons and eat Mormon beef" (Culmsee 34-5). The chant, because of common racist fears in the nineteenth century about "savage" Indians, might have even appeared cannibalistic to the frightened settlers.

The second stanza refers to the Walker War, which was caused by a different Ute chief from a different tribe and occurred about 10 years earlier than the Black Hawk War. However, the two wars are often grouped together. Wakara was known as "the Hawk of the Mountains" (Burt 159). This song seems to refer to both warring "hawks" with the word "every" in the line that reads "Ev'ry 'Hawk' has piercing

---

[2] Arrapeen was the first of the two chiefs to wage war against the LDS because the grieving warrior believed the whites had used evil spirits to murder his father. Because his father had died of smallpox, his accusation may be true, and the death might have been caused indirectly by settlers who brought the disease with them to Utah.

eyes." This stanza also defames Young's peacemaking polices that were sometimes interpreted as passive and inadequate by the settlers. Here, as well as in the final stanza, the songwriter indicates that it is not enough to "pray and sleep," but that the pioneers better "watch as well as pray" if they do not want to lose their cattle. The other stanzas rationalize the LDS violence towards the natives. Only when "they find their cattle gone" do the settlers "get their guns … (and) get on the Indian trail."

History teaches that the settlers were not always fighting to preserve their cattle as this song indicates. Occasionally, we find that there were one or two stories where the roles are reversed: the LDS people are the starving thieves and the natives are the ones missing a few head of cattle. One such story, "The Wily Chief," was told by settler Le Roi C. Snow and compiled in a book by LDS historian Preston Nibley. The event occurred in the summer of 1876. While this is a decade removed from the date of the song quoted above about the Black Hawk War, it is still a valuable story in this comparison. In the story, pioneer James S. Brown met Chief Piecon, who was a Navajo leader living near the southern LDS settlements. This chief thrust a Native American youth towards Brown and told him to "take him and do as you please" (Nibley 241). When Brown asked for an explanation, Piecon demanded that the LDS people punish the youth because he had been caught stealing some LDS cattle, and the chief wanted "to use him as an example, even though it may mean his death" (Nibley 242). Brown did not think the crime was so serious, and when the settlers consulted with a town council, the truth was revealed that it had been some LDS settlers who had done the stealing, and the natives were the victims. The settlers had been starving and had killed the cattle to survive. The Navajo chief knew all this and

had presented the native boy to Brown so that "Brother Brown [would] pronounce punishment on his son, which he in turn would mete out upon the 'Mormon' people" (Nibley 243). Interestingly, Snow concludes this story not by condemning the church members who stole the cattle but by twisting it into a show of honesty that they were willing to make amends for the theft: "This incident undoubtedly proved to the Lamanites [or the Native Americans] the honesty and good intentions of the 'Mormon' people, and welded the friendship that was growing between them" (Nibley 243). Even when the LDS people steal, they can be apparently still provide examples of honesty in LDS literature; however, such paradoxes are rarely used to the benefit of the Native Americans.

Still, there are other stories written and told by the settlers that do show the Native Americans in a more positive light. The most famous ones were told by Jacob Hamblin, who was sent on a mission to the Native Americans in southern Utah by Brigham Young in 1853, only three years after he arrived in Utah. Hamblin usually worked with the tribes in the south around St. George, but his influence extended to other parts of the state, as well. Wherever he went, he was well respected by the natives. One story that demonstrates this has become so popular in the LDS culture that it is still well known in the church today. In this story, Jacob Jr., the missionary's son, is told to trade a pony to the Paiute natives for some blankets. Jacob Jr. was offered several blankets for the pony, but "determined to show my father that I was a good trader, I asked for another blanket. The chief looked at me out of the corner of his eye and added another blanket to my pile. Then I asked for another and another and still another. By now the chief was grinning broadly, but he continued to add as

many blankets as I demanded" (Kenison, "Jacob"). The boy thought he had done well and went home proudly to show the loot to his father. When he reached the house, however, his father divided the blankets into two piles and told him to take half of them back. When Jacob Jr. returned to the Paiute chief, the native leader said "I know Jacob send you back. He honest man. He my father as well as your father" (Kenison).

In this story, the native chief is depicted as friendly and honest, even though his English is broken and uneducated. The tale became a popular one because of its honesty moral, and it could be interpreted as a form of propaganda for Brigham Young's Indian policies. This story, and the one mentioned earlier of the "wily chief," supported Young's teachings that treating the Native Americans well would encourage them to return good will to the LDS settlers. If the pioneers had abused and punished the boy in the former tale, the natives would have returned the violence. In the latter story, honesty begets honesty in the relationship between Hamblin and the chief. Both stories contain the paradox that a pioneer is at fault (Jacob Jr. in the latter tale), but the story's moral is that the pioneers are honest with the natives.

Despite its purpose of promoting a strong native/LDS relationship, however, one word in the latter story about Hamblin's honesty might betray a hint of a Manifest Destiny theme: the Paiute chief calls Jacob Hamblin Sr, his "father." Another story, "A Mystery Solved" uses this parental title. Anthony W. Ivins, another missionary to the Indians, tells this story; however, the term "father" is used this time in reference to Major John Wesley Powell who accompanied Hamblin on a peacemaking mission to the Shivwits, a band of Paiutes, in 1870. One of the members of the tribe tells Hamblin, "Your talk is good, and we believe what you say. We believe in Jacob, and

look upon you [now referring to Major Powell] as a father" (Nibley 204). Ivins then elaborates on this theme of the white man as a "father" to the innocent native "children." According to the story, the Shivwits spokesman said, "We are ignorant like little children compared with you. When we do wrong, do not get mad, and be like children, too. When white men kill us, we kill them, too, and then they kill more of us. It is not good" (Nibley 205). If this story is true (which may be doubtful because it is recorded by the settlers and not the natives) the Shivwits are only encouraging more Manifest Destiny principles by suggesting that their race is inferior and in need of LDS guidance.

This terminology strikes a harsh racist chord and was passed down from the Catholic missionaries of the previous century, who also believed they were fathers to the neophytes of California. Historian James Sandos observes that Junípero Serra, who was one of the first priests to establish a mission in California, brought "the prevailing religious attitude toward Indians, their conversion, and their treatment. In Spanish law, the Franciscans' relationship to the Indian converts was that of parent to child or custodian to ward" (1254). The early Catholic missionaries sometimes felt that this paternal relationship justified them in disciplining and even beating the natives, and this led to brutality: "Once an Indian accepted Roman Catholicism as symbolized by baptism, the neophyte had to live according to the church's precepts, and disobedience or backsliding was corrected physically. Ordinary corporal punishment included whipping, imposing shackles, or imprisonment in stocks" (Sandos 1254). There is no history of LDS brutality on this level, but the preceding two stories about Jacob Hamblin could indicate the possiblity that the LDS felt the

same feelings of paternal superiority that the Catholic missionaries felt. Here again we could remember Sally, the adopted Indian daughter of Brigham Young, as a representation of how "Brother Brigham" (as he was known to the LDS settlers) could become "Father Brigham" to the natives. Because he fed the natives as a father provides for his children, and because he was trying to raise up the Utah tribes in the light of the gospel, Young could be described as a spiritual and temporal father figure to the Utah Indians.

If Young was a father figure to the natives (and a spiritual father to the pioneers), then the LDS church members were often the angry children who felt like their brothers, the Native Americans, were taking advantage of them behind father's back. Unlike Hamblin, most Saints did not trust the natives to be honest but believed they were violent savages who enjoyed stealing from the pioneers. Peter Gottfredson, an LDS historian who claimed to know the native "depredations" first-hand as a boy experiencing the Black Hawk War in Sanpete and Sevier valleys, wrote that "It was the inherent nature of the Indian to steal" (6). He then recounts an oral story of a Native American who brings a worn-out ax into a blacksmith and asks for it to be fixed. The blacksmith replies that he cannot fix it because it has no steel in it and the native answers "Oh yes, . . . it is all steel, me steal it last night" (6). Gottfredson continues his introduction to his book on the *History of Indian Depredations in Utah* by saying that "on account of their thieving propensity, . . . it was necessary for the settlers to build forts for protection" (6).

Many other LDS writers join Gottfredson in depicting the Native Americans as not only dishonest, but also heartless and cruel. In one story by pioneer Jane Hull

Riley, told by her daughters Bertha Clancy and Hattie Graham, the Utah Indians are described as the settlers' worst enemies: "Of all the problems connected with pioneer life, the most difficult one during the first three years at Franklin [County, Idaho] was the Indians" (Hunter 212). The story continues that in the winter of 1862, "the demands of the red man" were getting intolerable, and the natives supposedly threatened to massacre the settlers if they did not give them more food.

The native demands for food were compounded by the guilty consciences of the Saints, who remembered that Young had commanded them to feed the natives. However, this winter there was not enough to go around, and the pioneers knew they could not give the natives more. William G. Hull, a young interpreter, tried to delay the natives from getting too aggressive until the soldiers arrived to protect the settlers. According to the story, Hull took the last nine sacks of wheat owned by the Saints and pled with the Shoshonis to allow the pioneers to keep it for seed. However, "the red men only laughed and insisted on taking the grain" (Hunter 213). Then, when the soldiers started to appear, the natives ruthlessly slashed the sacks loose, spilling the precious grain on the ground (213).

Whether or not this story was true, it would still greatly impact the settlers' mentality towards the natives. Stories such as this one, told amongst the Saints and passed down to their children, helped inculcate a general distrust and fear of the Native Americans. Celia Hall, a descendent of a pioneer family, wrote that "children always ran for the house if they saw a band of Indians approaching; there was a general fear of the red men in the minds of the settlers" (Hunter 216). Stories told

about the Utah Indians created a popular belief that all Native Americans were violent savages.

One such story was written by D. C. Johnson and published as "An Indian Scare" in the February 1891 edition of *The Contributor*. This story does not refer directly to any major war between the Saints and the natives, but it demonstrates how hostile the relationship still was almost twenty years after the Black Hawk War ended. In this "factual" tale, "savage" Native Americans kidnap two courageous LDS children. In many ways, the story seems to be the LDS version of the captivity narratives popular in the Puritan religion of the Eastern colonies. Like the authors of captivity narratives, Johnson compares the Native Americans to wild animals by writing that the children were "surrounded by wild and ferocious beasts, and still more . . . red men" (Hunter 155). When the natives first confront the children, Johnson describes the captors as bloodthirsty "marauders" who are evil enough to prey on children:

> "Get up, heap quick, papoose go to Injuns' wick-i-up [a frame hut covered with matting]; no try to get away, or me kill 'um sure."
>
> These words were accompanied by a cruel leer, and a significant motion of drawing his hunting knife across his throat (Hunter 158)

The first offense of this passage is that it demeans the Indians by making them sound childish and uneducated. This is followed by a description of the captor as savage enough to enjoy killing. The children are kicked and abused that night and tied up when the Indians go to sleep. Then, Karl, the oldest at 12-years-old, cuts his bonds with a razor blade and steals their captors' guns. The two children escape after staging

a standoff with the two warriors in the night, and their father finds them the next day. Two years later, after the tribe and the local settlers had made peace, one of the captors purported to recognize the boys at a campfire. Still limping from a rifle ball that Karl had given him in the leg, the native pats the children on the head and exclaims, "Brave boys, heap brave!" (Hunter 167). Up to this final line, the story shouts its theme that even two prepubescent white boys were more courageous and valiant than two full-grown Indians, and it implies that the Lord will deliver the righteous settlers out of the hands of the savage natives.

Because the savages were inherently cruel and savage, the prevailing attitude in many pioneer stories is that it was often necessary for the settlers to fight them. One LDS song about the Black Hawk War, presumably from the 1860s, asserts that "A treaty of peace we did try to contrive / With Sandpitch and Black-Hawk and Jake Aropine [Arrapeen] / To try to appease them and end their wild spleen" ("Recollections from the Black Hawk War in Sanpete," verse two, in Gottfredson supplement 15). This verse tries to mask the settlers' violent intentions by explaining that they are only following Young's policy of fighting after every peaceful effort has been made.

The chorus of this song gives another validation to LDS violence against the natives, making it seem patriotic to fight and kill Native Americans: "Hurrah, hurrah, we always were true / To stand by our friends and the red, white and blue. / We never were slackers, but went to the war" (Gottfredson supplement 15). This song illustrates how the LDS settlers changed their position from allies with the Native Americans against the United States federal government to allies with America against its

natives. Despite President Young's counsel to not fight the Utah Indians, the LDS settlers sometimes seemed more willing to side with their nation's political leaders than with their own religious leaders. As shown by the song reprinted above and others referred to in this thesis, many LDS settlers wanted to fight the natives more often than Young was willing to allow.

Despite such acts of aggression, the myth that the LDS people fought the Indians only in self-defense appears in many individual writings. One example is the official account of the start of the Walker War given by George McKenzie, an LDS settler, to the Utah Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1853. McKenzie writes that the war started because a settler (John Ivie) tried to save a Native American woman from a beating from her own husband and two other tribesmen (1). In the story, McKenzie depicts his friend as innocent — the natives come to trade some fish for flour, Ivie agrees, and his wife starts to measure the flour while he goes back outside to work. One of the warriors, upon seeing how little flour his wife was getting in the trade, starts to beat his native wife. Mr. Ivie then saves the day by pulling the man away from the abused woman. This action angers the natives, and they attempt to shoot Ivie, but he grapples with the gun until it is broken, leaving both the native and Ivie with half of the gun. Ivie then uses his end of the gun to strike the natives one at a time as they attack him — including the native woman he was trying to protect (McKenzie 3).

A quick reading of this account discovers the humorous depiction of a single mighty white man who heroically saves a woman by whipping three male natives. It seems that the LDS settlers are so superior to the natives that they can fight them

three to one! The language sounds suspiciously like propaganda — as if Ivie knew he was wrong for fighting the natives (and killing one of them) and was trying to justify his violence toward the natives. The story appears a little exaggerated up to this point, and even McKenzie calls it a "drama." Though the Saints believed Ivie had acted in self defense, the story continues with Bishop Aaron Johnson trying to appease Chief Wakara who was angry because his relative died in the skirmish: "Johnson with his interpreters tried every-thing in their power to settle the trouble with chief Wakara by offering ponies, beef, flour and blankets but Wakara refused to settle only by giving up Ivie to be tried by the Indians which Johnson refused to do" (McKenzie 3). The point seems stressed that Johnson did "every-thing in his power" to be peaceful, and that he was especially generous in giving up LDS material goods in order to save the peace. If there was violence, it would be caused by the natives. The account ends by describing how Wakara killed Alexander Keele as a blood payment for the dead native, and that this caused the war (4).

In reality, the LDS Saints were not always as reluctant to fight the Native Americans as they pretended and as McKenzie depicted in this account of the Walker War. Many accounts of the wars with the natives claim that the fights were caused, at least in part, by unprovoked LDS violence toward the Native Americans. Daniel Jones was a LDS priesthood leader (ordained a "seventy" which is a priesthood calling fashioned after the seven called by Jesus to assist the Twelve Apostles in the Bible) and Native American translator. In his autobiography, *Forty Years Among the Indians*, Jones testifies that white aggression caused the two most serious Utah wars. Concerning the beginning of the Walker War, Jones recounts Ivie's fight with only

one Native American, and describes the LDS man's aggression in more violent terms: "The immediate cause of the Indian War (Walker) was the striking of an Indian with a gun by a white man at Springville" (54). Jones tempers the language to make it sound like the gun is what struck the Indian, but he does not try to deny that, ultimately, the guilty hand was white. Jones later writes, "The immediate cause [of the Black Hawk War] was because of a "whipping of an Indian by a white man. This occurred April 9. Next day three white men were killed by Indians" (160). In his accounts of both of these wars, Jones seems to side with the Native Americans and claim they were being oppressed and beaten by white settlers.

Jones' autobiography records that many pioneers did not follow Young's orders to not fight the natives unnecessarily. Many other pioneer stories and poems argue against a different aspect of Young's Indian policies: his command to feed the Native Americans. The stories, many of them quite humorous, show that while the Saints usually obeyed their prophet, they often did it grudgingly. The pioneers were angry because they often felt that the Native Americans were taking advantage of them by expecting food all of the time. One story, "The Squaw and the Onion" told by Charlotte Berrett Gibson in 1882, is about a wife in the Ogden valley who was tired of native women asking every day for eggs, milk, and fruit. One afternoon, Charlotte was sitting on her porch peeling onions for pickles when an older native woman came with a bucket for milk. This native woman saw the onions and because she assumed it was a type of fruit, she asked for one. Charlotte declined, but while she was gone to fill the bucket with milk,

> The squaw snatched a large one from the pan and Charlotte turned just as she took a big bite from it. The strong tasting 'fruit' was evidently a big surprise to her. She did not want to admit she had stolen some, so with Charlotte looking steadily at her, she held the bit of onion in her mouth as long as she could. Finally, with a choking sound and tears streaming from her eyes, she spat the onion from her mouth, took up the milk and hurried away. (Carter 386-7)

Perhaps because the pioneer women had heard Gibson's popular account of this experience, they tried similar methods to dissuade natives from their constant begging. It was not uncommon to hear of LDS women contaminating some food for the natives hoping that they would stop asking for more. Culmsee recounts one time when a housewife became so exasperated that she put a cathartic in her squash pie, which was a favorite dessert with the native women. One squaw ate the pie and "Suddenly panic froze the squaw's face and made her eyes glare. She rose, she started toward the door, but she did not reach it in time" (139). Practical jokes like this one undoubtedly heightened native hostilities towards some LDS families, and it shows that Young's welfare policies for the natives were not very popular. When the men disagreed with Young's Indian policies, they often went to war against the natives. Handing out cathartic pies might have been the female version of this aggression.

It may now be beneficial to discuss in more depth the native girl that Brigham Young adopted and to analyze the significance of this story as a possible reverse captivity narrative, or story of a native girl losing her culture through adoption rather than through captivity. Reverse captivity narratives were not very popular in the nineteenth century, but a classic example is *Hope Leslie* by Catharine Maria

Sedgwick. The 1827 novel tells of two white women captured by a native tribe and two native girls who are similarly adopted and "captured" by white families. Most people would argue that Sally Young was saved rather than captured, because she was adopted to prevent her being killed by Chief Wakara. Still, her story is a form of reverse captivity because she lost all of her native culture in exchange for the LDS way of life.

Sally's story begins when she was Pidash, a member of the Pibandy band of Shoshonis. Her father had died and her stepfather was cruel to her and eventually sold her to Chief Wakara as part of the latter's slave trade (Beecher 31). She was adopted by President Young to save her life and was given the English name of "Sally" to begin her assimilation into the white, LDS culture. Eliza Roxcy Snow, one of the foremost LDS poets and songwriters of the nineteenth century, wrote in her diary that in 1847, Clara Young was "disgusted with her native habits" but that under the careful care of her LDS parents, she "became neat and tasteful in dress, and delicate in appetite, although at first she cronched [sic] bones like a dog" (Beecher 31). With deliberate and poetic language, Snow expresses her opinion in this story that Pidash was almost bestial as a native, but as Sally, a civilized member of the LDS culture, she becomes "a good, virtuous woman [who] died beloved by all who knew her" (Beecher 31).

Just as Snow felt that Young's family had civilized the savage Pidash, other settlers' writings discuss how the LDS settlers were sent by God to civilize the Native Americans. Jacob Hamblin, perhaps the most famous missionary to the Utah Indians, published a story in the *Deseret News* on April 4, 1855, about how he changed the

Indians' tradition of "squaw fighting" for a bride. In the story, Hamblin uses descriptive dialogue to portray the Native Americans as savages who give little respect to the females in the tribe. In the fight described, two husbands claimed one woman (one man had stolen her away from the other). To determine who could own her, the braves "stripped themselves" and held a fistfight (Hunter 251). When one of them fell, a friend jumped to take his place in the fight, and so on until "all had a share in the melee, and most had their faces badly bruised" (251). This entire fight, according to Hamblin, represented bravery in the tribe.

Partway through the fight, one native grabbed the bride and dragged her through the crowd until another challenged him. They eventually carried the woman into the river and kept her in the middle of the fight. Hamblin writes that "they all commenced fighting like so many dogs, children and women shouting and hallooing. The bride was trampled under their feet" (Hunter 252). Eventually, the braves almost kill the girl, at which point Hamblin "ran between them and it [the girl], telling them, as well as I could, how unwise, how unkind! . . . I then went to the chief, . . . and told him there was a better way . . . and they should love their women" (Hunter 253). Because of Hamblin's preaching, the entire tribe deleted the popular squaw fights from their culture (253). In this way, the account depicts how a Mormon civilized the Indians and taught the natives to be more humane and to be better husbands and fathers.

One of Hamblin's acquaintances, John Young, wrote in his memoirs that Hamblin's action "was a step which marked an epoch in the life of the Indians; and incidentally it serves to illustrate the influence for good that this wonderful peace-

maker held over our fallen brethren" (Hunter 140). John Young, like many of the LDS pioneers in the nineteenth century, referred to the Native Americans as a "fallen" people that needed to be lifted up by Mormonism to a more civilized plateau. With writings such as these, bordering on propaganda, we begin to understand how the LDS settlers justified treating the Native Americans as uncivilized and inferior.

Failures of Brigham Young's Indian Policies

Despite his good intentions, history has shown some failures of Brigham Young's Native American policies. One major problem arose from Young's policies of teaching the Native Americans to farm. In a way, this effort attempted to "civilize" the Native Americans and to make them adopt Anglo-American ways of feeding their families. The Shoshonis and Utes of Utah were nomadic hunters and gatherers who foraged for food. Agricultural food was not a part of their diet. But because the LDS pioneers began fencing their fields on the natives' hunting grounds, the Utah Indians had to learn how to farm out of necessity. Forcing the natives off of their hunting grounds and then teaching them to farm took away native independence and autonomy and forced the natives into a form of symbiotic relationship with the Saints.

This relationship consequently made the natives dependent on the LDS settlers for seed, farming supplies, and farming knowledge: "Since 1870, then, the Shoshonis have been rapidly dislodged from their native habitat, . . . Others remained near home but were gradually forced off the native economy. Left largely to their own devices, small groups and colonies of them have attached themselves to ranches and towns, where, on a very low standard of living, they maintain a kind of symbiotic

relationship with the white man" (98). Instead of helping the Native Americans be economically independent, the establishment of "Indian Farms" and Young's policies of always feeding the natives only made the Utah and Idaho Indians more dependent on the pioneers.

However, the biggest failure of Young's Indian policies was that the members of the church did not universally follow them. In the areas closest to where Young lived, there were few problems with the Native Americans. Contrary to the myth that the pioneers always followed their prophet, though, there is evidence that in the outlying pioneer settlements, the pioneers sometimes neglected Young's policies of peace. In these areas, the LDS settlers often aggravated the Native Americans by intruding on their land. They also retaliated at times against an entire tribe when only one or two natives committed an offense against the Saints. One example of the pioneers rejecting Young's counsel is in the settling of Rich County, Utah, a story alluded to earlier in this paper. In the early 1860s, shortly before the Black Hawk War, Young sent Charles C. Rich to Chief Washakie to ask if the pioneers could settle in the beautiful Bear Lake Valley. Washakie was one of the Saints' best Indian friends, and Rich wrote that the Shoshoni chief "seemed pleased and was perfectly willing we should come here and live" (Arrington 250). Washakie granted permission for the pioneers to settle in the valley only on condition that they leave the southern end of the valley alone because that was his favorite hunting and camping ground. Apparently, the chief also expected that "when the whites succeeded in growing crops, Indians would expect to receive food when they visited the area" (Arrington 253).

Rich, on behalf of Young, agreed to Washakie's conditions, and the pioneers settled the valley. A few years later in 1865, some Saints broke away from the rest of the camp and settled in the forbidden south end of the valley. Furious, Washakie rode through the new settlement with his braves and tore down fences and destroyed crops. Young was too far away from the situation to control the settlers, but Rich finally persuaded Washakie to relent and to give up the southern end of the valley: "Naturally, as the Indians saw more and more land disappearing, they became increasingly resentful," Leonard J. Arrington, the historian who tells this story, concludes (258).

Some historians believe that the settlers' problems with the Native Americans arose from settler disobedience to Young's policies. Milton Hunter in his twentieth century book *Utah Indian Stories* writes, "When the people followed the Indian policy established by the leaders, difficulties with the Indians were practically always averted. Most of the troubles that did occur, however, were brought about by disobedient Mormons" (Hunter 71). If church members had believed in Young's policies of feeding the Native Americans and of respecting their rights and culture, then many of the conflicts in Utah might have been avoided or their effects lessened. Young himself was a skilled diplomat with the Native Americans and was considered by many of them to be a good friend. Nevertheless, many of the church members maintained the expansionist, white supremacist views they had acquired when they lived in New England. They believed that the church had the right of way in Utah, and they consequently ignored Young's counsel and created several conflicts with the Utah Indians.

Conclusion

It is ironic how the LDS pioneers unknowingly supported the same principles of Manifest Destiny and the same prejudices that chased them out of their homes in Missouri. The pioneers were threatened and persecuted by the vision of Manifest Destiny, which was the belief that the United States should extend to the Pacific sea and conquer the native land with the Anglo-European culture and the Protestant religion. This expansionist vision excluded both the Native Americans and the Mormons. It was indirectly because of Manifest Destiny that the pioneers fled to Utah in the first place. However, once established in Utah, the LDS pioneers inflicted their own version of Manifest Destiny upon the Native Americans. The pioneers were trying to expand their own boundaries and authority over the entire state. By doing so, they persecuted the Native Americans and aided in the destruction of their culture and the loss of their lands. Historian, and LDS member, David J. Whittaker writes, "We have yet to learn that cultural pluralism is desirable and that we have much to learn from other cultures without demanding these cultures merge into our own" (48).

Brigham Young, whom the natives looked upon as their greatest benefactor, taught the LDS pioneers that the Native Americans were their equals and spiritual brothers. Because he was the LDS prophet, and the only man accepted by the church as representing God on the earth, his word should have been sufficient. However, examples of the literature written by the Saints during the middle of the nineteenth century show that the pioneers often ignored Young's counsel and frequently disagreed with his teachings. According to LDS theology, this constituted civil

disobedience (to Young as the governor of Utah) and serious religious disobedience to the representative of the Lord. It appears that the dominating principles of Manifest Destiny were so ingrained in U.S. nineteenth century culture that even deep religious convictions could not overcome Manifest Destiny prejudices. The result was that the Native Americans in Utah received the same fate that their native brothers were handed in other states — displacement, hunger, and a loss of their culture to expansionist ideals.

Appendix

Black Hawk Times
By F. Christensen

Black-Hawk and his red-skin band,
was a terror in the land,
Proud he was the Indian chief,
Who could live on Mormon beef.

Chorus
Singing heyeh, heyeh, yah,
Singing heyeh, heyeh, yah,
Heyeh, heyeh, heyeh, yah,
Heyeh, heyeh, heyeh, yah,

Ev'ry "Hawk" has piercing eyes —
From the hills his prey he spies —
Waits till Mormons pray and sleep,
When he takes their cows to keep.

I have always heard folks say
Men should watch as well as pray,
True, they did quite early rise,
Scratch their heads and rub their
eyes.

Then they find their cattle gone —
Beat the drum and sound the horn;
Get your guns and don't bewail,
But get on the Indian trail

Up the canyon big and wide,
Watching ev'ry mountain side,
While ahead some twenty miles,
Black-Hawk and his red-skins
smiles.

After hours continuous tramp,
Strike they Black-Hawk's breakfast
camp;
Seraps of hide and roasted bone,
But the hawks had long since flown.

Hungry and with weary feet,
Turn about and make retreat:
Having learned this truth that day,
Better watch as well as pray.

(Gottfredson supplement, 14-5)

LDS Church Chronology

The following are several historical dates relevant to this thesis.

June 1, 1801	Brigham Young is born in Whittingham, Vermont.
Dec. 23, 1805	Joseph Smith born in Sharon, Vermont.
April 6,1830	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints organized in New York.
1833	LDS begin migrating to Missouri, establishing the headquarters at Independence.
1839	LDS driven from Missouri into Illinois.
June 27, 1844	Joseph Smith murdered in Carthage jail by a mob. Brigham Young takes over leadership of the church as the head Apostle.
1846	Brigham Young begins the mass exodus of Saints from Illinois to Utah. They reach Utah in 1847.
1848	The United States wins the Utah area in the Mexican War.
1849	LDS Saints establish the state of Deseret and adopt a constitution, but their request for statehood is denied.
1850	Jacob Hamblin, who joined the church in 1842, migrates to Utah. He settles in Tooele, but is soon called to serve as a missionary to the Native Americans in southern Utah.
1850	U.S. Congress creates the Utah Territory.
July 17, 1853	James Ivie kills Shower-Ocats while intervening in a domestic dispute between a native man and his wife. Shower-Ocats was a relative of Chief Wakara, and the killing ignites the Walker War.
May 11, 1854	The Walker War ends when Brigham Young heals Chief Wakara's sick daughter.
1857-1858	Utah War between the Saints and the United States government.
Jan 29, 1863	Bear River Massacre occurs near present day Preston, Idaho. It was the bloodiest battle between white men and Native Americans in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Almost 300 Shoshoni natives and 14 volunteer soldiers died.
April 9, 1865	Black Hawk war officially begins, although tensions had been high for years earlier.
Fall of 1867	Black Hawk cuts his hair in token of peace. Other chiefs continue the war until 1872, but Black Hawk is no longer at war with the Saints.
Aug. 29, 1877	Brigham Young dies.
1889	The LDS church establishes an Indian farm to teach the natives at Washakie, near Brigham City, Utah. This farm became the model for other non-reservation Indian farms in Utah (Whittaker 37).
1896	Utah becomes the 45th state in the Union.

Works Cited

Alexander, Thomas G. "The Walker War." *Utah History To Go.* <http://www.utahhistorytogo.org>. The State of Utah, 2001. 18 April 2002.

Anonymous. *Idaho Indians: Tribal Histories*. Boise: Native American Committee, Idaho Centennial Commission, 1990.

Arrington, Leonard J. *Charles C. Rich: Mormon General and Western Frontiersman.* Provo, Utah: Brigham Young UP, 1974.

"A Brief History of the Trail of Tears". *Official Site of the Cherokee Nation.* <http://www.cherokee.org>. 27 September 2001.

The Book of Mormon. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1980.

Burt, Oliver. *Brigham Young*. New York: Julian Messner, Inc, 1956.

Bringhurst, Newell G. *Brigham Young and the Expanding American Frontier*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1986.

Carter, Kate, Ed. *Treasures of Pioneer History*. Vol. 1. Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1952.

Cook, Sherburne. "Roman Catholic Missions in California and the Southwest." *History of Indian-White Relations*. Ed. Wilcomb E. Washburn. Vol. 4. *Handbook of North American Indians*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1986. 472-480.

Culmsee, Carlton. *Utah's Black Hawk War*. Logan, Utah: Utah State UP, 1973.

The Doctrine and Covenants. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1980.

Fyans, Thomas J. "The Lamanites Must Rise in Majesty and Power," *Ensign,* May 1976.

Gibbons, Francis M. *Brigham Young: Modern Moses/Prophet of God.* Salt Lake City, Deseret Book, 1981.

Gottfredson, Peter. *History of Indian Depredations in Utah.* Salt Lake City: Skelton Publishing Co., 1919.

Horsman, Reginald. "Scientific Racism and the American Indian in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." *American Quarterly*, 27.2 (May, 1975): 152-68.

Hunter, Milton R. *Utah Indian Stories*. Springville, Utah: Art City Publishing Co., 1946.

Johannsen, Robert Walter. *To the Halls of the Montezumas*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Jones, Daniel. *Forty Years Among the Natives*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1960.

Kenison, Dave. "Church History Stories Collection." <http://www.xmission.com/~dkenison/lds/ch_hist/>. 5 Feb 1998. 12 April 2002.

Madsen, Brigham D. *The Shoshoni Frontier and the Bear River Massacre*. Salt Lake City: University of UP, 1985.

McKenzie, George. "Causes and Origins of Walker Indian War in Territory of Utah in the year 1853." Original manuscript in possession of the Utah State Special Collections.

Nibley, Preston comp. *Pioneer Stories*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1952.

Price, John A. "Mormon Missions to the Indians." *History of Indian-White Relations*. Ed. Wilcomb E. Washburn. Vol. 4. *Handbook of North American Indians*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1986. 459-463.

Sandos, James A. "Junipero Serra's Canonization and the Historical Record." *The American Historical Review*, 93.5 (Dec., 1988): 1253-69.

Werner, M.R. *Brigham Young*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1925.

Whittaker, David J. "Mormons and Native Americans: A Historical and Bibliographical Introduction." *Dialogue*. 1985. 18(4): 33-64.

Terry, William Z. "Causes of Indian Wars in Utah." *Indians of Utah: Past and Present*. Ed. Jesse D. Jennings, Elmer R. Smith, and Charles E. Dibble. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Extension Department, 1959.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America*: The Question of the Other. New York: HarperPerennial, 1984.

"The Utah War." *Utah History Encyclopedia Online*. <http://www.media.utah.edu>. 11 April 2002.