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ABSTRACT

Contested Space: Mormons, Navajos, and Hopis in the Colonization of Tuba City

Corey Smallcanyon
Department of History
Master of Arts

When Mormons arrived in northern Arizona among the Navajo and Hopi Indians in the late 1850s, Mormon-Indian relations were initially friendly. It was not too long, however, before trouble began in conflicts over water use and land rights. Federal agents would soon consider Mormons a threat to the peaceful Hopis because both the Navajo and Mormons were expanding their land claims. Indian agents relentlessly pleaded with Washington to establish a separate Indian reservation. They anticipated this reservation would satisfy all three parties, but its creation in 1882 only created more problems, climaxing in the 1892 death of Lot Smith at the hands of Atsidí, the local Navajo headman. Tensions continued to increase until federal agents intervened in 1900 and placed Tuba City under a Presidential Executive Order. The order withdrew Tuba City from white claims and resulted in the expulsion of the Mormons from Tuba City in 1903.

My contribution is to show how the Navajo and Hopi Indians may have considered the coming of the Mormons as an invasion by a group of foreigners which led to the resulting contest between the trio for the limited natural resources of the northern Arizona desert. Tuba City/Moenkopi has a complicated history and its origins remain contested because it was claimed not only by Mormons, but also by the Navajos and Hopi. Previous historians have neglected the wealth of history that come from using Native American oral histories. This thesis will include the Native point of view but will also integrate it with Mormon and non-Mormon narratives. Doing so will provide another perspective on some of the following: the founding of Tuba City, the creation of the 1882 and 1900 Executive Orders for Navajo and Hopi reservation expansions, the death of the Mormon Lot Smith, and Native American-Mormon relations in the late 1800s in northern Arizona.
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Introduction

There is no easy way to explain what happened. There are many stories that are conflicting.

— Alice Mary Baugh Smith (polygamist wife of Lot Smith)¹

Most of the information in this thesis is new. Only small portions have been published previously. The early history of the colonization efforts of the Tuba City/Moenkopi area is briefly discussed in three publications about the life of Jacob Hamblin.² There have been several published journals and articles looking at individual accounts but they do not venture outside this realm. For example, David K. Flake provided a general history of the Tuba City/Moenkopi area, providing an excellent perspective of Mormon-Indian relations in his thesis, but neglecting a large portion of history by failing to take an in-depth look at the colonizing efforts of the Mormons and the problems that resulted, or how the Navajo and Hopi Indians reacted to the Mormons.³ An analysis of all three perspectives – Navajos, Hopis and Mormons – is necessary to understand the complicated history of northern Arizona.

The historiography dealing specifically with the Native American-Mormon relations of the Tuba City/Moenkopi area is very limited. James H. McClintock’s, Mormon Settlement in Arizona: A Record of Peaceful Conquest of the Desert (1921) provided a beginning point but did

¹ Alice Mary Baugh Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch,” Manuscripts Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.

² There are three publications about the life of Jacob Hamblin; see Pearson H. Corbett, Jacob Hamblin, The Peacemaker (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1952), Paul Baily, Jacob Hamblin, Buckskin Apostle (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, Inc., 1966), and Hartt Wixom, Hamblin: A Modern Look at the Frontier Life and Legend of Jacob Hamblin (Springville, UT: Cedar Fort, Inc., 1996).

³ The term Mormon is used to describe a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and their use of scripture called The Book of Mormon. Mormons are also referred to as Latter-day Saints, abbreviated as LDS.
not undergo peer review. Ira B. Judd’s, an agronomist, 1969 article, “Tuba City, Mormon Settlement,” in *The Journal of Arizona History* is a very brief account that provides a short history of Mormon colonization of Tuba City but does not offer any perspectives of the Indian residents. Two years later in 1971, noted Mormon historian Charles S. Peterson wrote “The Hopi and the Mormons, 1858-1873,” published in the *Utah Historical Quarterly*, who concluded that the Mormon interaction with the Hopis caused no change or had no effect among the Hopis, as if the Mormons had never been there. In 1973, Peterson published, *Take Up Your Mission: Mormon Colonizing Along the Little Colorado River, 1870-1900*, coming to some of the same conclusions as his 1971 article. He briefly mentions that problems do occur between Mormons and the Hopis, but this was essentially due to anti-Mormon agitation by non-Mormons. In 1989, Rex C. Reeve, Jr. and Galen L. Fletcher wrote “Mormons in the Tuba City Area,” published in *Regional Studies in LDS History: Arizona*. This publication, stemming from a symposium setting, chronicled the Mormon movement into northern Arizona. As with the rest of the publications this, too, depicted the Indians as props in the background, placing the Mormons as the main and most important actors in the story and neglecting large portions of history critical for understanding what happened between the Indians and Mormons.

---


Most of the more detailed information about the Indian-Mormon relations in the Tuba City/Moenkopi area comes from unpublished works. One of the earlier works comes from a Brigham Young University thesis by David K. Flake, a descendant of early Mormon settlers of Arizona. His 1965 thesis, “A History of Mormon Missionary Work with the Hopi, Navaho, and Zuni Indians,” provides a Mormon story and only includes Indians when depicting Mormons as victims of “savage” and “hostile” Indian atrocities.9

Mormon colonizing contributed to the continual fight in the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute. Books about the dispute neglect any in-depth discussion about Mormon expansionism. David M. Brugge’s, *Historic Use and Occupancy of The Tuba City-Moencopi Area* (1972) provides a Navajo story of the dispute between the Navajos and Hopis, mentioning the first arrival of the Mormons and eventual displacement of the Mormons.10 Unfortunately, he neglects much of the Mormon story since his work focuses solely on the Navajos and Hopis. Brugge concluded his work stating that more research needs to be done to include the Mormons. For a Hopi version of the dispute, George P. Hammond, wrote a two part series, “Navajo-Hopi Relations, Part I: 1540-1882,” and “Navajo-Hopi Relations, Part II: 1882-1911.”11 His work mirrors Brugge’s by

---

9 In the acknowledgements, Flake declares his thesis will focus solely on the efforts of specific Mormon missionaries, and as a result the Natives spoken of have no voice in his thesis; see David Kay Flake, “A History of Mormon Missionary Work with the Hopi, Navaho, and Zuni Indians” (M.A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1965), iii-iv.

10 Brugge is a Euro-American born in New York and was an anthropologist by trade. He conducted anthropological and ethnohistorical research for the Navajo Nation on various land disputes such as *Healing v. Jones* (Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute). Brugge states that the Mormon population began with 25 members in 1877 and increased to 230 members in 1885. This population explosion began to create problems with the local Indians of Tuba City. Brugge concluded he was unable to provide a detailed account of the situation in Tuba City. See David M. Brugge, *Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City-Moencopi Area* (Window Rock, AZ: Research Section, Navajo Parks & Recreation Department, The Navajo Tribe, 1972), 17-18.

11 Hammond is a Euro-American from South Dakota and was an historian by trade. His three-part typescript belonged to Senator Clinton P. Anderson who sat on the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indians (Eighty-fourth through the Ninety-second Congresses.) The committee was designed to rehabilitate the Navajo and Hopi Indians from the effects of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute and to help them find a better utilization of the
emphasizing the Indian point of view. Neither Brugge nor Hammond considers the interactions between Mormons and Indians in Tuba City – Moenkopi.

Published works about the Native American-Mormon relations of the Tuba City/Moenkopi area have been explored essentially by Mormon historians. In Ronald Walker’s “Toward a Reconstruction of Mormon and Indian Relations, 1847-1877,” he states that these authors who write about the Mormon-Indian relations do so “within the framework of established interpretation: The Mormon-Indian frontier, while never without tension and even conflict, was nevertheless characterized by the Mormons’ good intentions.”

Some may categorize this thesis as a revisionist history or a nonfaithful Mormon history because it addressed the problems caused by Mormon interactions with the Navajo and Hopi Indians. When looking at this less flattering view of relationships between Indians and Mormons, Sondra Jones’ “Saints or Sinners? The Evolving Perceptions of Mormon-Indian Relations in Utah Historiography,” portrays how Mormon and Utah historians have “preferred to gloss over or ignore,” the problems caused by Mormon-Indian relations. Over time, Mormons in general have preferred to romanticize and ritualize their history and have created a faithful Mormon history. Jones argues that these early histories are told by the prejudices of the


14 For a glimpse into the discussion about Mormon authors providing faithful Mormon histories, see George D. Smith, ed. Faithful History: Essays on Writing Mormon History (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992); James L. Clayton, “Does History Undermine Faith?” Sunstone 7 (March/April 1982): 33-40; and also see Thomas G. Alexander, “Historiography and the New Mormon History: A Historian’s Perspective,” Dialogue 19, no. 3 (Fall 1986): 25-49.
authors, but also from the prejudices of the sources they were using. If that is the case, then this thesis hopes to provide something that none of the previous historians that have written about Native American-Mormon relations in Tuba City/Moenkopi area have produced, and that is to provide a history with a Native American perspective by using Native American oral history. It would also be assumed that Native oral histories would have their own biases, but these sources should not be neglected.

In John Wunder’s “Native American History, Ethnohistory, and Context,” he argues that a study of the history of Native American people requires an ethnohistorical approach, including the use of Native American oral history. Wunder writes that the use of Native oral history is “crucial for bringing forth native voices to explain native interests and native perspectives.”15 Angela Cavender Wilson’s, “American Indian History or Non-Indian Perceptions of American Indian History?” argues that authors who neglect the Native American voice only provide a portion of the information readers need.16 She asks, “If an archive somewhere were filled with information relevant to a scholar’s study, and she chose to ignore it, accusations of sloppy scholarship would be hurled from all directions. But if a scholar in the field of American Indian history ignores the vast number of oral sources, the scholar’s integrity is safe.” She asks, “Would you write a German history without consulting German sources, or a Chinese history without consulting Chinese sources?” The same question should be applied to Native American history. Wilson contends that authors who neglect Native American voices should have a subtitle like, “Non-Indian perceptions of American Indian history.” She concludes that scholars


should not discontinue their research, but maybe they should discontinue the pretense that they are writing Native American history.

Donald A. Grinde, Jr., writes that the new historian who writes Native American history is usually accused of being a historian of “victim groups” or writing “disuniting” American history. Grinde contends that Indian history needs more balance, and that there is a fallacy among some that Native American authors are trying to rewrite history altogether. He denies this, stating that Natives are just trying to provide another perspective to Native American history.17 In Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, she states that Native American history is painful sometimes, but emphasis should not focus on the pain, but on how Natives responded to these challenges.18

History can be viewed from many different angles. My contribution is to show how the Navajo and Hopi Indians may have considered the coming of the Mormons as an invasion by a group of foreigners which led to the resulting contest between the trios for the limited natural resources of the northern Arizona desert. Tuba City/Moenkopi has a complicated history that revolves around the central issue of land. Its origins remain contested because “it was claimed not only by Mormons, but by Oraibis, Paiutes, and Navajos.”19 This thesis should be viewed as revisionist history, not only for including the Native point of view but also for integrating it with Mormon, and non-Mormon narratives. Despite Mormon rhetoric and idealism toward Indian

---


redemption, some have seen this as a story of conquest, exploitation and oppression which reflects the same white-Indian relations as experienced throughout the rest of the nation.
Chapter 1
Mormon-Indian Relations along the Great Basin’s Southern Rim

Prior to 1850, Native American-white relations in the Great Basin were limited to a few visiting travelers. With the arrival of the Mormons into the Great Basin in 1847 a new era dawned. As Mormons learned how to survive in an arid environment, they sought to replicate their eastern culture in the West, and solidified their presence with the formation of Utah Territory in 1850.

The Utah frontier period was similar to what had transpired elsewhere in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with the displacement of its indigenous population. Native Americans gradually lost their lands, were placed on reservations, and were pressured into acculturating elements of Euro-American culture. Utah’s Native nations reacted to these changes by choosing to follow the white man’s “civilization,” or by determining to remain true to their culture and tradition, or some combination of the two. Their choices resulted in periods of social, economic, political, and cultural disruption and conflict.\(^1\) Since a majority of the population coming to Utah was Mormon, some consideration needs to be taken when looking at their belief and its tie to Native Americans they were encountering.

Theologically, LDS interest in Native Americans dates back to the translation and publication of the Mormon scripture, *The Book of Mormon*. The book indicates that some of the ancestors of the Indians came from Palestine about 600 B.C.E. On the American continents they built a remarkable civilization, but through neglect of their religious laws, they were cursed with dark skin and became known as “Lamanites.” Surviving warfare, these Lamanites were still “of

---
\(^1\) Forrest S. Cuch, ed., *A History of Utah’s American Indians* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Division of Indian Affairs and Utah State Division of History, 2003), 18.
the blood of Israel,” and a promise was given to them that they may become converted and become “a white and delightsome people.” Mormons felt that the task of saving the Indians was their responsibility.

Early on in the LDS church, missionaries were sent to preach to different tribes as early as 1831. All missionary work was placed on hold as the Mormons were forced to relocate and move out west. When the Mormons first settled the Great Basin in 1847, Utah was technically still part of Mexico, at least until the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, and then it fell under the authority of the United States. During the Mexican War, reports were sent to Brigham Young about the Colorado River area by LDS soldiers who marched through the area as part of the Mormon Battalion in 1846, en route to California. As “Zion” was becoming more

---

2 Found in early versions of Mormon scripture, as seen in the first edition (1830) and second edition (1837) of The Book of Mormon, it declares that the Gospel of Jesus Christ shall be taken to the remnants of Israel located here in America, or indigenous inhabitants of the Americas. It states, “And then shall they rejoice: for they shall know that it is a blessing unto them from the hand of God: and their scales of darkness shall begin to fall from their eyes: and many generations shall not pass away among them, save they shall be a white and a delightsome people.” See Joseph Smith Jr., trans., The Book of Mormon: An Account Written by the Hand of Mormon, upon Plates taken from The Plates of Nephi (Palmyra: E.B. Gradin, 1830), 2 Nephi 12; subsequent U.S. publications starting in 1840 and 1842 editions of The Book of Mormon display edits to this same quote taken from 2 Nephi 12; the new edits state “save they shall be a pure and a delightsome people.” See Joseph Smith, Jr., ed. The Book of Mormon 3rd ed. (Nauvoo, IL: Robinson and Smith, 1840), 2 Nephi 12.

Even through the change of text, “the white and delightful” teaching was still a common belief as taught by Brigham Young that Lamanites (Native Americans) were a wicked people who were cursed with dark skin, but eventually the curse would be removed “and they will become ‘a white and delightsome people.’” See Brigham Young, sermon on 3 December 1854, Journal of Discourses: By Brigham Young, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, His Two Councillors, the Twelve Apostles, and Others, 26 vols. (London: F.D. Richards, 1855), 2:143; in speaking to the residents of New Harmony about the local Indians, Young instructed the people to “be kind to them all, it will not be many generations before they will be a white and delightful people – be kind to them”; see Brigham Young, sermon on 20 May 1854, Teachings of President Brigham Young, ed. Fred Collier, vol 3. (Salt Lake City: Collier’s Publishing, Co., 1987), 316-19.


established and Young was preparing to propose his “State of Deseret” territory, “he foresaw the importance of trade routes and roads moving out of the center of the Mormon kingdom in every direction. Control over the southern portion of the Mormon territory was a key to maintaining theological and temporal control over the area.”5 This curiosity over the possibilities concerning the Colorado River led to an interest and desire to explore Arizona, which was eventually followed by the colonization of Arizona.

Briefly, Young entertained the idea of sending LDS immigrants and merchandise to Panama, where they could cross the isthmus, travel by boat up the Colorado River and then overland to Salt Lake City. The California Gold Rush of 1849 and the search for a possible route for the transcontinental railroad also attracted people looking for new routes to the West.6 Young also established a number of settlements along a corridor south of Salt Lake City along the Old Spanish Trail to San Bernardino, California. In the southwestern corner of Utah Territory, Young set up the Southern Indian Mission in Santa Clara in 1853. This mission was to convert local Indians to Mormonism, but was also used to explore the river systems leading to the Panama isthmus. Rufus Allen, president of the Southern Indian Mission, led an expedition in

5 Martha Sonntag Bradley, A History of Kane County (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society and Kane County Commission, 1999), 38; for more of a discussion about what the Mormons hoped to use the Colorado River for and the impending desire to explore Arizona, see Leonard J. Arrington, “Inland to Zion: Mormon Trade on the Colorado River, 1864-1867,” Arizona and the West 8 (Autumn 1966): 239-50; also see Milton R. Hunter, Brigham Young, the Colonizer, 4th ed. (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, Inc., 1973), 85-91.

6 In a letter by Mormons Parley P. Pratt and Franklin D. Richards which was published in the Millennial Star newspaper, they state “we hope soon to explore the vallies [sic] three hundred miles south.” They hoped to find a route through a seaport in the Gulf of California or near Central America that would help avoid the “apostates and gentiles” in New Orleans and Missouri. It would “facilitate the emigration from Europe to these valleys.” From there they would travel north on the Rio Grande River or find a better trail to follow in the warmer desert climate, avoiding the harsh winter months; see Parley P. Pratt, letter dated 9 March 1849, The Latter-day Saints’ Millennial Star, 99 vols. (Liverpool: Orson Pratt, 1849), 11:246-47; in 1855, U.S. Army Captain T.J. Cram also wanted to survey the Colorado River as a possible mode of transportation as a shipping route, but Lieutenant Joseph C. Ives was actually assigned the survey work instead. Lt. Joseph C. Ives published his travels in, Report Upon the Colorado River of the West, in 1861.
1855 down the Colorado River to determine its navigability. Due to harsh conditions, the party was forced to return home to Santa Clara but concluded the Colorado River was traversable.\(^7\)

Concurrently, a number of Indian missions were established by the LDS church in the 1850s. The Mormons sent missionaries to a number of different tribes. In 1853, they were called to the Green River Mission (ended in 1857) and the Santa Clara Creek Mission (ended in 1856). In 1855, several Indian missions were established; the Carson Valley Mission (ended in 1857), the Elk Mountain Mission (ended in 1855), the Indian Territory Mission (ended in 1860), the Las Vegas Springs Mission (ended in 1858), the Salmon River Mission (ended in 1858), and the White Mountain Mission (ended in 1855).\(^8\) Even though these missions had short life spans, it shows Mormon fervor to convert Indians (see Figure 1).

Mormon men were called to serve, preach, teach, and intermarry with the Indians. Missionaries were called during the semiannual General Conferences of the Church held in April and October. Brigham Young gave three rules which the missionaries were to follow. First, they were to teach and to be an example to the Indians. Young’s second rule was to deal with

\(^7\) Thomas D. Brown, *Journal of the Southern Indian Mission: Diary of Thomas D. Brown*, ed. Juanita Brooks (Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 1972), 128-132; an undated newspaper clipping from the *New York Tribune* was included in the *Millennial Star*, which stated that Brigham Young had begun exploring the “Colorado, Green River, and their tributaries, for the purpose of making settlements to raise cotton for home manufacture”; see Pratt, clippings under 28 August 1852, *The Latter-day Saints’ Millennial Star*, 14:431; sources are inconsistent with the naming of the Santa Clara Mission, which includes the Santa Clara Creek Mission, the Santa Clara Mission, the Arizona Mission, the Southwest Indian Mission and the Southern Indian Mission. Originally established to proselytize among the Southern Paiutes, Utes, and Goshutes, it was eventually expanded to include the Navajos, Hopis, and Zunis.

\(^8\) For more information about the Mormon Indian Missions, see Juanita Brooks, “Indian Relations on the Mormon Frontier,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 12, no. 1-2 (January-April, 1944): 1-48; Wesley R. Law, “Mormon Indian Missions – 1855” (M.S. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1959); and Hunter, *Brigham Young, the Colonizer*, 312-64.
the Indians honestly and righteously in all things. Young’s final plea was to not kill any Indians for stealing and to lay aside any desire to kill Indians.⁹

The standard procedure for these missions was to locate an ideal spot to build a fort, plant crops, and then to preach the gospel and to teach the Indians to become “civilized” like their white brothers in hopes that they would help establish and protect Zion. Euro-American farming techniques were taught and missionaries were encouraged to intermarry to build relationships with the local tribes, so that in times of need they could be used as a shield of defense against outside threats.¹⁰

As earlier Utah Indian missions were closing, efforts were also made to visit tribes outside of Utah Territory, and the Hopis were one of the earlier tribes visited. It has been suggested that there are three contributing reasons as to why the LDS church visited the Hopis. First, the Paiutes in southern Nevada were not responsive to the Mormons and they looked elsewhere for converts. Second, there were reports of a “civilized” Indian tribe that brought hope to their efforts. Third, there were rumors that surviving children from the Mountain Meadows Massacre were among the Indians in northern Arizona and they were going to determine if this was true.¹¹

---

⁹ Young, The Teachings of President Brigham Young, 3:186-87.

¹⁰ Young, Journal of Discourses, 4:346; for more information about Indian-Mormon intermarriages, see Richard D. Kitchen, “Mormon-Indian Relations in Deseret: Intermarriage and Indenture, 1847 to 1877” (Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 2002).

But with Indian missions failing one after another, Young decided to reopen the Santa Clara Mission hoping to teach the Navajo, Hopi and Zuni Indians, especially when there were hopes for a more “civilized” group of Indians that might be more responsive to Mormonism.

When Mormons arrived in northern Arizona among the Navajo and Hopi Indians in the late 1850s, Mormon-Indian relations were initially friendly. It was not too long however, before trouble began in conflicts over water use and land rights.\textsuperscript{12} Federal agents would soon consider Mormons a threat to the peaceful Hopis because the Navajos and Mormons both were expanding their land claims. Indian Agents relentlessly pleaded with Washington to establish a separate Hopi reservation. They anticipated this reservation would satisfy all three parties, but its creation in 1882 only created more problems, climaxing in the 1892 death of Lot Smith at the hands of Atsidí, the local Navajo headman. Tensions continued to increase until federal agents intervened in 1900 and placed Tuba City under a Presidential Executive Order. The order withdrew Tuba City from white claims and resulted in the expulsion of the Mormons from Tuba City in 1903.

Chapter 2

The Peacemaker: Jacob Hamblin, Mormon Colonization, and Indian Resistance

If the whites in their character and position with the intelligence and knowledge of the world and of mankind which they have, had been as kind to the Indians as they have been to the whites from the beginning, there never would have been a single difficulty to this day.

— Brigham Young

One of the earlier Euro-Americans to make contact with the Hopi Indians was Jacob Hamblin, a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (see Figure 2). Not only did he serve as a missionary, but also as a political agent for the Church and its leader, Brigham Young. As early as 1852, Walkarum (better known as Walker), a Ute leader, indicated that there was an advanced tribe to the south that the Mormons might consider working with. In November, Hamblin tried to locate these Hopis and took with him Ammon, a Ute sub-chief, and

---

1 Brigham Young, sermon on 6 April 1854, Journal of Discourses: By Brigham Young, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, His Two Councillors, the Twelve Apostles, and Others, 26 vols. (London: ASA Calkin, 1859), 6:327; Young at times reprimanded fellow Mormons with similar warnings, “And now we say, that every solitary instance of Indian hostility and depredation has been committed through neglect, disobedience of orders, carelessness, or disregarding the counsel which had been given from time to time. Brethren, when will you be wise, and follow in the precepts of wisdom?” see James R. Clark, ed., epistle dated 8 July 1854, Messages of The First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, Inc., 1965), 2:132.

2 Walkara informed John D. Lee of the Hopi Indians, stating that he informed the Hopis of the Mormons’ desire to trade and explore their country. Walkara called the Hopi Indians the Welsh Indians because some had blue eyes and light hair. Walkara also told Lee that U.S. soldiers had a fort (probably Fort Defiance which was built in 1851) on the Colorado River and had recently made a treaty with the Navajos, giving a sense of security for when they decided to travel to the area; see Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 17 April 1852; by the end of 1853 Parley P. Pratt met several Spaniards visiting Salt Lake City who also spoke highly of the Hopis. They stated that the Hopis lived in Navajo country, had good soil, plenty of timber, mild climate, short winters, and ideal pasture lands; see Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 1 December 1853; in an interview with Henry Harris, Jr. of the Uintah-Ouray Indian reservation stated that whites could not pronounce Walkarum so they named him Walkara and that had eventually been changed to Walker. See Henry Harris, Jr., interview by Floyd O.Neil, “The Walker War,” Utah Historical Quarterly 39, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 178; for a general history on the impact of For Defiance on the Navajo, see Maurice Frink, Fort Defiance & The Navajos (Boulder, CO: Pruett Press, 1968).
together they began their journey south towards the Hopi but en route Hamblin felt impressed to return home before they had traveled very far.  

Interest in the Hopis was put on hold for several years while missionaries’ work among other tribes continued. Missionaries began looking southward for new fields of labor. As central Utah and southern missions to the Indians closed in 1856, the missionaries switched their efforts to the Las Vegas Springs Mission. In August 1857, the Santa Clara Mission reopened under the name Southern Indian Mission. Young instructed Hamblin to “Continue the conciliatory policy towards the Indians, which I have ever recommended, and seek by works of righteousness to obtain their love and confidence, for they must learn; that they have either got to help us, or the United States will kill us both.” The warning was in regards to the coming of the Johnston Army and fear of attack from the United States during the Utah War.

About a month after Hamblin received a call as Mission President of this new mission, the Mountain Meadows Massacre occurred on land that had been leased by Hamblin. The details from this event have been discussed in great detail by a number of authors and so there is no need to go into great detail about those dreadful events. To summarize, local Mormons in Cedar City attacked a California-bound wagon train and killed 120 emigrants. The repercussions from this event severely hampered Mormon missionary work among tribes in southern Utah.

---


4 Brigham Young to Jacob Hamblin, 4 August 1857, Jacob Hamblin Papers, 1857-1885, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter abbreviated as HBLL.

5 B. H. Roberts, an LDS historian for the Church, wrote about the Mountain Meadows massacre and concluded that, “Since the massacre many of the Indians who had previously learned to labor have evinced a determination not to work….The moral influence of the event upon the civilization of the Indians has been very prejudicial! Inevitable consequences! For they had seen that their white neighbors, instructors in industry, had been capable of an act of treachery and savagery equal to their own, even if not more treacherous and murderous. Surely there could be no more white man’s moral and spiritual influence over the red men after what the latter had witnessed at Mountain Meadows!” See B. H. Roberts, Comprehensive History of the Church, 5 vols. (Salt Lake
Some Paiutes used the incident to distance themselves from the Mormons and Hamblin used the opportunity to expand Mormon missionary efforts into the present state of Arizona. Rumors stating that a few surviving children from the Mountain Meadows Massacre resided among the Hopis caused Brigham Young to authorize an expedition to verify the truth. Historian Juanita Brooks argued that this was a ploy by Young to receive federal funding for Hamblin to explore northern Arizona, indicating that Hamblin already knew these children were sheltered in Mormon homes in southern Utah.

Hamblin also used his trip “to check the validity of a report that the Hopis were of Welch descent, spoke the Welsh language and were a highly civilized people.” The persistent rumor was that sometime during the twelfth century, Prince Madoc of Wales had journeyed to America and from that enterprise, the possibility existed that “the Moquis had incorporated some Welsh words into their tribal vocabulary.” By September 26, 1858, Brigham Young approved a

6 Author Helen Bay Gibbons is a descendent of Andrew S. Gibbons, who was a former Indian missionary and colonizer of northern Arizona sent by the Church. Her book includes an account of her ancestor’s work in northern Arizona. See Helen Bay Gibbons, *Saint and Savage* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1965), 61.


10 Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 64; during a visit to the Zunis, Welsh-American Mormon missionary Llewellyn Harris stated that there is a history of “the ancient Britons, which speaks of Prince Madoc, who was the son of Owen Guynedd, King of Wales, having sailed from Wales in the year 1160, with three ships. He returned in the year 1163, saying he had found a beautiful country across the western sea. He left Wales again in the year 1164 with fifteen ships and three thousand men. He was never again heard of”; see Llewellyn Harris, “Miraculous Healing Among the Zunis,” *The Juvenile Instructor* 14 (1879): 160-161; also see Ronald Dennis’ article, which goes into more detail about the myth of Prince Madoc. See Ronald Dennis, “Captain Dan Jones and the Welch [sic] Indians,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1985): 112-117.
special conference in Santa Clara, during which fifty Indian missionaries were called. During this meeting the Las Vegas and Muddy missions were officially closed. Seven missionaries were called to preach to the Hopis.\textsuperscript{11}

The first group of missionaries to the Hopis left Santa Clara on October 28, 1858 (see Figure 3) and traveled by way of Pipe Springs and Buckskin Mountains.\textsuperscript{12} They came across Tódích’ii’nii Nééz, a Navajo man, who at the time was living among and led a group of Kaibab Paiutes (see Figure 4).\textsuperscript{13} A successful war leader, he was elected as a Naat’áanii, or leader of his band in order to protect his followers from Ute war parties. As the missionaries approached Tódích’ii’nii Nééz’s Paiute territory in November 1858, Tódích’ii’nii Nééz led about a dozen warriors and intercepted them at Kaibab Plateau.\textsuperscript{14} He had heard stories of Mormons and wanted

\begin{itemize}
  \item Helen Bay Gibbons states that those called from this meeting were Andrew S. Gibbons, Thomas Leavitt, Dudley Leavitt, Ira Hatch, Benjamin Knell, Fredrick Hamblin, and William Hamblin, with Jacob Hamblin as the mission president; see Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 63.
  \item Part of this first group was Jacob Hamblin, Dudley Leavitt, Thomas Leavitt, Frederick Hamblin, William Hamblin, Samuel Knight, Ira Hatch, Andrew S. Gibbons, Benjamin Knell, Ammon M. Tenny (Spanish interpreter), James Davis (Welsh interpreter), and their Paiute guide and interpreter named Naraguts; see Jacob Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative of His Personal Experiences as a Frontiersman, Missionary to the Indians and Explorer: Disclosing: Interpositions of Providence, Severe Privations, Perilous Situations and Remarkable Escapes}, ed. James Little (Salt Lake City: The Deseret News, 1909), 72-73.
  \item The name Tódích’ii’nii Nééz translates as: The Tall Man of the Bitter Water Clan. Tódích’ii’nii Nééz is better known as Spanshanks, as originally called by Hamblin. See Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 82; under the pseudonym of Maurice Kildare, Gladwell Richardson moved to northern Arizona in the late 1920s and became a well known Indian trader. Under the alias, Kildare, he wrote an article stating that Tódích’ii’nii Nééz was also known as Scarbreast, “because of a long scar received in battle,” during which “He took a captured pony wearing a New Mexico Spanish brand for his own use, and this led to his being called Spanish Horse, too. He’s mentioned in Jacob Hamblin’s biography as Spanshanks. This error apparently occurred due to faulty translation from Navajo to Piute into English.” Maurice Kildare, “Chief Scarbreast, Master Killer,” \textit{The West: True Stories of the Old West} 3 (November 1965): 21; also see the \textit{History of Santa Clara, Utah}, which states that Tanigoots or Tódích’ii’nii Nééz was taken prisoner by a Kaibab Paiute band during a battle with the Navajos. A young boy at the time, Tódích’ii’nii Nééz was raised by a Kaibab chief. During his stay he married a Paiute maiden, which was considered “beneath his station.” This is given as the reason as why Tódích’ii’nii Nééz did not return to his people until the death of his Paiute wife. See Joyce Wittwer Whittaker, ed., \textit{History of Santa Clara, Utah: “A Blossom in the Desert”} (Santa Clara, UT: Santa Clara Historical Society, 2003) 86-87.
  \item Hamblin calls these Indians “Kibab” Indians and states that they are from the foot of the Kibab, or Buckskin Mountains in Arizona; see Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 73.
\end{itemize}
to learn more about them and their leader, Jacob Hamblin. The Mormons did not understand Navajo, but they did bring along Naraguts, a Paiute interpreter who spoke Navajo. After two days of camaraderie, “a friendship sprang up between the chief and Hamblin.”

After visiting with Tódích’íi’níi Nééz, Hamblin reached the ford known as the “Crossing of the Fathers,” which was named after the famous ford made by Friars Dominguez and Escalante in 1776. The party crossed the Colorado River and continued their travels south into Navajo country making its way to the high mesas, now known as Three Mesas, which have protected the Hopis for centuries from intruders. Days later the party arrived at the main Hopi village of Oraibi, where they met Teuve, a leader who greeted the Mormons in the fall of 1858, which marked the beginning of Hopi-Mormon relations” (see Figures 5 and 6).

In Hamblin’s account of that first visit, he wrote that upon their arrival an old unidentified Hopi man told him of a prophecy that prophets would come to the Hopis from the West who would bring them back blessings which they had lost. He believed that Hamblin and the other Mormons were those spoken of by the prophecy. Hamblin did not dissuade this man of the notion, stating that they did come to fulfill the prophecy to return the Hopis to a higher


16 According to Gibbons, Teuve was thought to be born in 1810 to Nunnu Rinwah and Quwonghonayingway. See Helen Gibbons, “Chief Tuba of the Saints,” The Improvement Era (November 1963): 930-932, 988-991; also see Katharine Bartlett, “Navajo Wars, 1823-1870,” in Hopi History (Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona Society of Science and Art, 1951), 8; and see Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 26 April 1941; Christen Lingo Christensen, a Mormon missionary sent to the northern Arizona area in the early 1900s, indicated he knew Teuve personally and that Teuve’s father was named Pal-la-kah, but in the same account Christensen states that Pal-la-kah was Teuve’s brother. He also indicates that Teuve was not only Hopi, but had Aztec blood. Christensen states that this information was told to him personally by Teuve, and that his full name was once Tuba-wa. Supposedly, Teuve told him that “Once I was the great Fletcher of our race, as indicated by my former name,” Tuba-wa. Christensen was also given Teuve’s Hopi name, Woo Pah; see Christen Lingo Christensen, “Hopi Legends,” Improvement Era 24, no. 6 (April 1921): 516-518; Hamblin calls Oraibi, “Oriba” village, which was made up of about three hundred dwellings and three stories high; see Hamblin, A Narrative, 75; Gibbons states that Teuve was the first to welcome the Mormons to Oraibi; see Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 74; the spelling of Teuve’s name varies as: Tuuvi, Toovi, Tivi, Tuvi, Tuevi, Teuvi, Tewbi, Tuba and other variations of the name.

17 Hamblin, A Narrative, 77.
state. This intrigued the Indians, but no action was taken. The missionaries also visited seven other Hopi villages in the area.

As requested by Brigham Young, James Davis, the Welsh interpreter, began studying the Hopi language, but could find no similarities between the two languages.\(^{18}\) Overall, Hamblin was pleased with their visit and invited the Hopi to come and visit them in Utah. The Hopis told him that their traditions taught them that they should remain in Hopi country until the arrival of the three prophets that would come from the West.\(^{19}\) In Helen Gibbons’ book, *Saint and Savage*, it states that out of the Hopi group, Teuve was certain that these Mormons were those prophesied of, and his belief of this is what nurtured their friendship and eventually led to their conversion to Mormonism.\(^{20}\)

During their preparations to leave, Hamblin asked permission to leave a few missionaries behind, which was approved by the Hopis. He told them that he would split up their party, with seven men returning home and five staying among the Indians. Among the latter, Thomas Leavitt and William Hamblin were assigned to the Hopis and Andrew S. Gibbons, Samuel Knight and Benjamin Knell were assigned to the Navajos. Teuve was appalled by hearing this and warned Hamblin that the Navajos were too dangerous. Hamblin then adjusted his plans accordingly, deciding to leave William Hamblin, Thomas Leavitt, Benjamin Knell, and Andrew Gibbons behind with the Hopis.\(^{21}\) The Mormon men were instructed to stay behind to learn the Hopi language and culture and to begin teaching them.

\(^{18}\) Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 77.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 77-78.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 78-79.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 80.
The coming winter months provided little comfort and less food among the Hopis. Several of the Hopi leaders began to dispute whether these Mormons were those spoken of by the prophecy. During the middle of the winter the missionaries were asked to leave, which they did to preserve peace with the Hopis.\textsuperscript{22}

Upon returning to Utah, Jacob Hamblin wrote Brigham Young a favorable report. Young responded in kind, asking him to send a few of the Hopis to visit him in Salt Lake City. Young asked Hamblin to relocate the entire tribe north to settle in Utah.\textsuperscript{23} This was something that was out of the ordinary and something Young did not explain in detail. At this time some individual Indians had been allowed to live with LDS members. Small bands had been given the opportunity to live next to LDS members. For the most part, missionaries had been asked to live among the Indians. While many LDS settlements were in close proximity to Indians, never before had an entire tribe been asked to uproot and move to Zion.

Hamblin accompanied a second missionary force to Oraibi in 1859.\textsuperscript{24} They left Santa Clara on October 20 and traveled to the mouth of the Paria River. Here they came into contact with some Paiutes. The Mormons asked for a guide, but were told that the guide they needed was out hunting. Disappointed, the company decided to travel on to the Crossing of the Fathers to get to the southern side of the Colorado River.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{22}Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 78.

\textsuperscript{23}Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 78; also see Flake, “A History of Mormon Missionary Work,” 22-23, 50; and Pearson H. Corbett, \textit{Jacob Hamblin, The Peacemaker} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1952), 168.

\textsuperscript{24}According to Hamblin the company consisted of Marion J. Shelton, Thales Haskell, Taylor Crosby, Benjamin Knell, Ira Hatch, John W. Young, and himself. See Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 79.

On November 6, the party arrived at Oraibi.\textsuperscript{26} They were informed that some U.S. soldiers had recently visited them and told them to kill the Mormons if they came again. The Hopis informed Hamblin that the U.S. soldiers would be returning on the morning of November 16.\textsuperscript{27} In preparation to leave Oraibi to avoid the soldiers, Hamblin proposed to the Hopis that they leave their homes to relocate in Utah. The Hopis declined, stating that they were still waiting for the three prophets to arrive. Even though Hamblin did not get them to move north, he asked if two LDS missionaries could remain in Oraibi. It was agreed that Thales H. Haskell and Marion J. Shelton could stay.\textsuperscript{28} The rest of the company traveled back to Utah.

Upon hearing that there were two Mormons at Oraibi, Tódích’ii’níí Nééz traveled four nights to visit them, but missed Hamblin. On December 10, 1859, Tódích’ii’níí Nééz greeted Haskell and Shelton. He told them that when he had visited the American forts, the Americans treated him poorly because he liked the Mormons. Haskell’s impression of Tódích’ii’níí Nééz was somewhat negative. He wrote, “I do not know whether he was lying or not but I did not like his appearance and concluded he was gasping as to get presents from us. I told him that we were out of tobacco and had nothing to give him & that we were stopping here to learn the Oriba

\textsuperscript{26} Hamblin states they arrived on November 6. See Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 80; Haskell recorded that they arrived at Oraibi on November 10. Haskell provides more detailed information reporting that throughout their trip they encountered friendly Indians, noting that some even camped with them and traded with them. Just before arriving at Oraibi, some Indians that were camping with them went ahead to tell the Hopis that the Mormons were coming to visit them. See Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 80.

\textsuperscript{27} Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 81.

\textsuperscript{28} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 80; as Hamblin left Haskell and Shelton behind, Haskell recorded his initial thoughts about spending a year with the Hopi Indians in Oraibi: “Slowly and sorrowfully I wended my way back to the village. Such a feeling of utter loneliness I never experienced before, for search the wide world over I do not believe a more bleak, lonesome, heart sickening place could be found on the earth where human beings dwell. And here we are, Bro Shelton and me, with strange Indians who talk a strange language, situated far from the busy haunts of men. Who but Mormons would do it? Who but Mormons could do it? Make up their minds to stay here a year!” See Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 82.
language and wished to be friends with all the Indians in the country.”

Tódích’íi’nii Nééz ended up spending the night with Haskell and Shelton before heading back to Navajo country. He told the Mormons that he “would talk good for us to his people” and invited the Mormons “to come and trade with them next summer.” Haskell responded, “Maybe they would.”

During their stay in Oraibi, Haskell and Shelton were to study the Hopi language and to teach them the newly created LDS Deseret Alphabet and “perhaps reduce their dialect to a written language.” After the two men were acquainted with the Hopi language they were to teach the Hopi people about The Book of Mormon. Not much is said about this, but as for missionary work, there were no converts and the two men returned home on March 25, 1860. The trip was not a complete waste; Haskell did become acquainted with Teuve.

Haskell’s first encounter with Teuve was on December 16, 1859, during an incident when a Navajo had stolen some cloth from a Hopi woman and Teuve hopped on his horse in pursuit, capturing the Navajo and returning the cloth to the Hopi woman. Haskell was a spectator to the event. The second account of Teuve is on February 26, 1860, and Haskell stated that he “had a

---

29 Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 85. It is apparent that Haskell did not know that Jacob Hamblin and the first Mormon expedition into northern Arizona was greeted by Tódích’íi’nii Nééz in 1858. Haskell’s hostility towards the Navajos is somewhat understandable. Up to this point several items had been stolen from Haskell and Shelton with blame being placed on the Navajos. Throughout the rest of their stay at Oriabi, more of their possessions were stolen, and blame was placed on the Navajos. The Hopi Indians were constantly telling Haskell and Shelton that the Navajo Indians were to blame. The Navajos were constantly portrayed negatively by the Hopis. With the arrival of Tódích’íi’nii Nééz, Haskell was somewhat bitter at the Navajos and that could possibly explain his rude behavior. Haskell does state that they were there to learn the “Oriba” or Hopi Language.

30 Ibid., 85.

31 Brigham Young to Jacob Hamblin, 18 September 1859, “Journal and Letters of Jacob Hamblin,” Jacob Hamblin Papers, HBLL.

32 On December 4th there is a brief mention that they tried to teach a Hopi man they named Alma the Deseret alphabet, but Alma had no desire to learn. Haskell again tried to teach some Hopis the Deseret alphabet on February 22nd and had no success. On January 31st, Haskell mentions that he talked to a group of Hopi Indians about the Mormons, but does not mention much of this experience. See Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 84, 91, 93.
talk with our friend Tuby.” The third encounter occurred on March 2, when Teuve traded for a pony with some visiting Navajos. The pony was then given to Haskell as a gift. The last mention of Teuve is probably the most important.

During Haskell’s and Shelton’s stay at Oraibi, they attempted to make a spinning wheel to help the Hopis find an easier way of spinning wool. Unable to find a suitable piece of wood, they gave up their efforts. It is believed that because Teuve noticed their interest in spinning and weaving, he showed the Mormons the Hopi cotton crops in Moenkopi Wash, forty to fifty miles north of Oraibi. Haskell recorded this event as happening on March 5, 1860, also stating that Teuve “recommended it to us as a good place to build a mill and for the Mormons to make a small settlement.” It is from this visit that stemmed the later Mormon interest in and eventual settlement of Moenkopi and Tuba City.

Moenkopi is called Keuchaptewa or “White Sand” by the Hopis. The Navajos call the surrounding area, Tó Naneesdizi, meaning “Place of Water Rivulets.” The area has been a desirable place because of the fertile canyons around Moenkopi and more importantly, the flowing water there, especially in this arid region (see Figure 7).

Since the main group of Hopis was located at Oraibi and on the surrounding mesas, they were afforded ample protection from attacking enemies. Living on the high mesas did come with some disadvantages. One was the lack of water, especially for crops. Oraibi did have farms

31 Ibid., 86, 93, 94.

34 Harry C. James, The Hopi Indians: Their History and Their Culture (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, LTD., 1969), 78.

35 Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 94. Haskell states that they explored the area and did not find the area very good for a colony; this contradicts an account by Ira Hatch written by Richard Ira Elkins, a family member of the Hatch family, who states that when Haskell and Shelton returned from Oraibi, they “noted that it was a good place for a settlement”; see Richard Ira Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 1835-1909: PU-AM-EY (Bountiful, UT: Richard Ira Elkins, 1984), 62.
nearby but there was not always enough water to accommodate the number of Hopis living at Oraibi. To help offset this problem the Hopi men came up with a forty mile solution.\textsuperscript{36} At planting and harvesting times the men would run forty miles to Moenkopi Wash, make camp, and when chores were done they would run home. Moenkopi Wash boasted of having plenty of water for irrigating crops, it had a warmer climate, lower altitude and a longer growing season.\textsuperscript{37} This practice had been carried out by the Hopis for centuries, until Teuve built a more permanent structure at Moenkopi for year-round residency around 1872-73.

After the report of the second trip to Oraibi, Brigham Young asked Jacob Hamblin to take a group of missionaries with a year’s supply of food for another trip. Haskell returned with Jacob Hamblin and eight other men in October 1860.\textsuperscript{38} On their way to Oraibi, Hamblin’s party was greeted by some of Tódích’i’ñi Nééz’s men. They came to warn Hamblin that there was a group of hostile Navajos who were waiting to ambush them if they continued any further. Contemplating the situation, Hamblin believed that the trail to Oraibi would be easier and did not think their parched animals would make the trip to Tódích’i’ñi Nééz’s camp, and so he decided to push forward and press their luck, accompanied by Tódích’i’ñi Nééz’s men.\textsuperscript{39}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{37} In the Hopi autobiography of Helen Sekaquaptewa, she states that Teuve’s wife was her grandmother’s sister. See Helen Sekaquaptewa, \textit{Me and Mine: The Life Story of Helen Sekaquaptewa}, ed. by Louise Udall (Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press, 1969), 37, 236.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38} This company consisted of George A. Smith, Jr., Thales Haskell, Jehiel McConnell, Ira Hatch and his plural Indian wife, Isaac Riddle, Amos Thornton, Francis M. Hamblin, James Pierce, Jacob Hamblin and his plural Indian wife, and an Indian they called Enos, see Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 80-81; according to Elkins, this so-called plural wife of Hamblin was actually his adopted Indian girl named Eliza, and not his wife. See Elkins, \textit{Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary}, 64.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{39} Hamblin states that four Navajo men came to them and invited them to Tódích’i’ñi Nééz’s (Spankshank’s) camp. Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 82.
\end{flushright}
As forewarned they encountered the hostile Navajos who demanded payment if the Mormons wanted to continue towards Oraibi. After the Mormons denied their offer, the angered Navajos promised if the Mormons turned over all of their ammunition and goods, then they would be allowed to return home unmolested. While meeting with these Navajos, one of the Mormons named George A. Smith, Jr., noticed one of his horses was missing and by dusk he decided to search for it. Leaving the protection of camp, Smith, was shot by several Navajos. A search party found him still alive with three bullet wounds and four arrow wounds. The Navajos demanded that Hamblin turn over two more men to be killed in retaliation for several Navajos that were killed by U.S. soldiers. Hamblin refused which only angered the Navajo party. As the Mormons carried Smith back to camp Hamblin decided to end their trip and retreat

40 Ibid., 83.

41 In a newspaper account it states that the Mormon party came upon the Navajos “who fled thither from their own country for safety, as the United States troops had fallen upon and killed many of their old men, women and children, for which they were very angry, and when they saw the small company of whites, they wanted to kill them or a part of them to avenge the blood of their slain.” See Deseret News (Salt Lake City) 2 November 1860; according to Gary Tietjen, the hostile group of Navajos was angry about an attack on them by the Army in which they lost three of their men. They were now out for revenge on “any three white men;” Haskell was one of those who found Smith injured and helped take him back to camp. Haskell states that the hostile group of Navajos was angry because U.S. soldiers had killed some of their men. He also contends that this group of hostile Navajos numbered 200. See Haskell, “Journal of Thales H. Haskell,” 95-96; also see Gary Tietjen, Ernest Albert Tietjen: Missionary and Colonizer (Bountiful, Utah: Family History Publishers, 1992), 42; The number of 200 Navajos seems quite exaggerated compared to Hamblin’s narrative which estimated about forty Navajos being present; see Hamblin, A Narrative, 84; according to Marjory Fullmer, a descendent of John L. Blythe, former Mormon missionary sent to northern Arizona in the 1870s, Blythe believed that the leader of the hostile Navajos was Peokon, a son of Tódích’i’íní Nééz. “Peokon came to his father and wanted him to give up all the missionaries that they might die to pay for his dead warriors who were killed by the Mormon soldiers.” Tódích’i’íní Nééz refused and Peokon left cursing his father. Supposedly, these soldiers spoken of were thought to have come from Camp Floyd, a military base just south of Salt Lake City and since they were from Utah, they were assumed to be Mormons. According to Fullmer these soldiers were also supposed to have been in the same area at the time Peokon’s men were killed and were therefore assumed to be the guilty party. See Marjory Fullmer, Already to Harvest (Privately printed, 2008), 129. Elkins states that these Mormons had never encountered Navajos on their way to Oraibi before this trip. “But the U.S. Army had hired Kit Carson to assist them in trailing the Navajos and the Army had been very successful in defeating them out in the open. They had now come into the mountains of the Southwest to avoid the Army.” Elkins also states that they later learned that a U.S. Army detachment from Camp Floyd had a shootout with this hostile group of Navajos. Since the soldiers came from Utah, they were assumed to be Mormons. See Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 64, 67-69.
to the safety of the Mormon colonies in southern Utah. The Mormons abandoned camp and headed home during the cover of night.

Smith slowed the party down and requested to be left behind. The next day Smith died and was laid to rest in a hollow place by the side of the road.\(^{42}\) The Mormons hurriedly made their way to the safety of Tódích’ii’nii Nééz’s camp. The Mormon party rested here for a day before making their way back to Utah. While visiting Tódích’ii’nii Nééz, they learned that the hostile Navajo group that attacked them were not under his authority but were from Fort Defiance and had visited Tódích’ii’nii Nééz to warn them of the Mormons and tried to persuade Tódích’ii’nii Nééz to kill the Mormons. Tódích’ii’nii Nééz’s response was that he was the leader of this country and the Mormons were to be left alone.\(^{43}\)

When back in Santa Clara, Hamblin sent word to Brigham Young and George A. Smith, Sr. of what had transpired. Hamblin later took a party of twenty men to recover the remains of

\(^{42}\) Hamblin states that the Navajos in his party repeatedly told him to leave Smith behind because he was at death’s door and that the Navajo who shot Smith would follow them to obtain Smith’s scalp, even if they had to dig up his body. Several years after the fact Hamblin states that on their way to Fort Defiance, they stopped and spent the night at the same location Smith was killed. While camping there, some Navajos joined them, one claiming to have witnessed the death of Smith. The Navajo claimed that they did not take Smith’s scalp, and most of the Navajos were opposed to the idea of taking it. It was also mentioned that the Navajo man who killed Smith later died a “miserable death,” something other Navajos considered a sign that the Mormons were a “good people,” and the Navajo man had done something wrong. See Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 86, 135; Flake shares a different interpretation; he states that Smith’s body was buried because it would allow them enough time to escape because the hostile Navajos “were determined to have his scalp, and to keep the body would endanger the rest of the party,” and “To bury it would only mean that it would be dug up again and mutilated.” He also states that while the Mormons went back to retrieve the body they found “the body scalped and mutilated as expected with only a few larger bones remaining.” See Flake, “A History of Mormon Missionary Work,” 26-27; this account contradicts the Navajo belief system and fear towards the dead and their belongings. Navajos are not known for scalping their victims, mutilating bodies, or disturbing the remains of the dead out of fear of being haunted by the spirit of the dead. For additional information about the taboo subject of death among the Navajo people, see Albert E. Ward, *Navajo Graves: An Archaeological Reflection of Ethnographic Reality* (Albuquerque: Center for Anthropological Studies, 1980), and also see Franc J. Newcomb, *Navajo Omens and Taboos* (Santa Fe: Rydal Press, 1940).

\(^{43}\) Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 88-89.
George Albert Smith, Jr. They traveled back to Arizona in the winter of 1860 and found the remnant of some bones and the skull which were gathered and taken back to Utah.\textsuperscript{44}

The death of Smith halted any immediate efforts to visit the Hopis. Drought and other problems in southern Utah also prevented Hamblin from immediately returning to the Hopi. Despite the death of Smith, the thought of completely ending any future trips to the Hopis was never entertained. The Elk Mountain Mission ended in 1855 and the Salmon River Mission closed in 1858 due to threats on the missionaries’ lives by other groups of Indians, but the Church continued their efforts with the Hopis.\textsuperscript{45}

By the autumn of 1862, President Young again requested Hamblin to find a better road to the Hopis’ settlement and see if he could persuade any of them to visit Utah.\textsuperscript{46} Taking a large group of men for protection, they met with the Hopis at Oraibi on December 16, 1862. On this trip the Mormons tried teaching the Hopis the Deseret Alphabet again.\textsuperscript{47} The Hopi again declined the proselytizing of the Mormons, after which the Mormons left Oraibi. They decided

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 90.

\textsuperscript{45} In a message given as the governor of Utah Terrirory, Brigham Young stated that three people were killed by Yampah Utes near the Elk Mountain Mission; see Brigham Young, letter dated 11 December 1855, \textit{The Latter-day Saints’ Millennial Star} 99 vols. (Liverpool: Orson Pratt, 1856), 18:259; in an undated clipping from the \textit{Deseret News} newspaper, more detailed information is provided about the killings at Elk Mountain and the abandonment of the Indian mission, see Orson Pratt, ed., clipping under 26 January 1856, \textit{The Latter-day Saints’ Millennial Star}, 18:58-59; according to an article in the \textit{New York Tribune}, the Salmon River Mission was also abandoned due to the killing of several people and the stealing of livestock by Indians; see \textit{New York Tribune} (New York), 12 June 1858.

\textsuperscript{46} Hamblin’s list of those on this trip included: Jacob Hamblin, Jehiel McConnell, Thales Haskell, Ira Hatch, Lucius M. Fuller, and James Andrus. There is also mention of Indian guides leading them to Oraibi; see Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 95, 97-98; Mosiah Hancock, a Mormon missionary sent to northern Arizona, states that there were twenty-one Mormon men on this trip: Jacob Hamblin, Isaac Riddle, Andrew Gibbons, Brother (Jehiel) McConnel, Thomas Haskell, Brother Steel (John Steele), James Andrew, Ira Hatch, and himself. See Mosiah Lyman Hancock, “The Life Story of Mosiah Lyman Hancock,” \textit{p}. 62, typescript, Mosiah Lyman Hancock Collection, HBLL; Elkins states that Orson Pratt called these men in October 26, 1862, and soon after they set out to Oraibi; see Elkins, \textit{Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary}, 76-77.

\textsuperscript{47} Hancock, “The Life Story of Mosiah Lyman Hancock,” 64.
to leave three male missionaries behind, hoping that the Hopis would associate this with the old Hopi prophecies of the three prophets that would come from the West. The three men left behind were Jehiel McConnell, Thales Haskell, and Ira Hatch, but with these three, Ira Hatch’s Indian wife, Sarah, also stayed in Oraibi, technically making the total count four and not three. The Mormons may not have considered Sarah, a female, to be significant enough to be counted as part of the Hopi prophesy, but it did matter to the Hopis. Since there were four people left in Oraibi, the Hopis never associated the Mormons with the three leaders that would come from the West.

Sarah Hatch is a person of interest, however, considering that her father was Tódích’íí’nii Nééz. In an interview with Amos Tietjen, a descendent of Sarah and Ira Hatch, he stated that Sarah was originally called Maraboots. Her father Tódích’íí’nii Nééz had left his people for a time after marrying a Paiute woman (which was looked down upon) who gave birth to two children, Peokon and Maraboots. Soon after, Tódích’íí’nii Nééz’s wife died, leaving behind the two children. Knowing that if he took Maraboots, being half Paiute, back among the Navajo people she would be treated as a slave, he took her to his friend, the Mormon known as Ira Hatch. Tietjen indicates that Maraboots was about seven years old when this happened. Soon after taking in Maraboots, Hatch’s wife died and he then decided to have Maraboots, whom they called Sarah, live with the Andrew Gibbons family. During an LDS conference, an LDS apostle named Charles C. Rich came at the request of Brigham Young to ask if Hatch would marry Sarah to solidify ties with the Navajo people. That night they woke Sarah and asked if she would marry Hatch. She said she would, but could not understand why it could not wait until
morning. Nevertheless, they were married that night on October 15, 1859, at the Gibbons household in Santa Clara, Utah.⁴⁸

Breaking Hopi Tradition

As with previous trips, Hamblin invited several Hopi headmen to return with him to Utah, and was again rejected. On the trek back to southern Utah, three Hopi men caught up to Hamblin, stating that the tribal council advised them to go and visit Brigham Young in Utah. Mormon apostle Wilford Woodruff stated that the Hopi men were to visit the Mormons “to see if we are the people they have been looking for,” again referring to the Hopi belief they were waiting for the three prophets to bring back blessings to their people.⁴⁹ One of these men was rumored to be Teuve (See Figure 8).⁵⁰ This was in direct violation of Hopi tradition that they

⁴⁸ Amos Teitjen, a grandson of Ira and Sarah Hatch, stated that Sarah was placed into a Mormon home at the age of seven, baptized as a Mormon at eight, and lived among the Mormons in Santa Clara until she was eighteen or nineteen. At this time she was approached to marry Ira Hatch. This story brings up several questions. According to Teitjen, the earliest Hatch arrived in Santa Clara, Utah, was 1858 because of his mission call, and Santa Clara was one of the earlier Mormon settlements in southern Utah, founded in 1854. According to LDS and Hatch family records, Sarah and Ira Hatch were married in 1859. It is unlikely that Sarah spent about ten years among the Santa Clara Mormons before marrying Ira Hatch, especially with the recorded date of her marriage in 1859. If Sarah was really placed in the Hatch home at seven years old, then she would have married him the following year in 1859, making her eight years old and having her first child with Hatch at eleven years old in 1862. See Amos Tietjen, “History of Ira Hatch While on His Mission Among the Lamanites,” typescript, John S. Boyden Collection, HBLL. Hereafter anything from the John S. Boyden Collection will have the following abbreviation, JSBC; another descendant of the Hatch family, Richard Ira Elkins, states that Ira Hatch was called to help settle Harmony, Utah, in the spring of 1854. By the spring of 1855, Hatch was supposedly sent to visit the Kaibab Indians and met Tódích’i’i’nii Nééz (Elkins calls him Danish Yank) for the first time. Tódích’i’i’nii Nééz’s Paiute wife was apparently deceased at this time, and Tódích’i’i’nii Nééz desired to return to his people, but did not want his daughter Maraboote (Sarah) to be the subject of ridicule and servitude among the Navajos. As a result Sarah was given to Ira Hatch during this trip, and according to Elkins, Sarah was 11 years old. When Hatch married Sarah, Elkins states she was 16 years old; see Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 20-21, 28; for a fictionalized account of the Sarah and Ira Hatch story, see Blaine Yorgason, To Soar With The Eagle (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1993).


⁵⁰ Hamblin states that the Hopi men that caught up to their party were just that, Hopi men, who were instructed by “their chief men.” If this is the case, then at this time Teuve was not a “chief” of Oraibi. See Hamblin,
were not allowed to cross the Colorado River until the fulfillment of the three prophets had been carried out.\textsuperscript{51}

Happy with their new companions, they began making their way back to Utah, stopping to make camp in the area where George A. Smith, Jr. was shot. As soon as camp was set, Tódích’ii’nií Nééz came to visit them for a while.\textsuperscript{52}

The group then returned to Utah with their Hopi guests, arriving in St. George in early January 1863. They stayed here for about three days before traveling to Salt Lake City, accompanied by Jacob Hamblin and William B. Maxwell. During their visit to Salt Lake City, the Mormons did everything they could to instruct the Hopis about the Mormons and “to show them that which would gratify their curiosity and increase their knowledge.”\textsuperscript{53} During their stay in Salt Lake City they were also entertained by Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff and other Church leaders. Recorded in Woodruff’s diary, he states that the Hopis “feel anxious that we should instruct them & direct them in their affair” and it is possible this reenergized Mormon interests in the Hopis.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{A Narrative}, 96; according to a 24 July 1932 article in the \textit{Arizona Republic}, Teuve was supposedly one of the Hopi men to travel to Salt Lake City to talk with the Mormon leaders. Before leaving Oraibi, Teuve insisted that three white men be left behind to guarantee his safe return. See \textit{Arizona Republic} (Phoenix), 24 July 1932. This article is one of the earlier writings about the history of Tuba City, the Hopis and Mormons; besides James H. McClintock’s, \textit{Mormon Settlement in Arizona: A Record of Peaceful Conquest of the Desert} (1921; repr., Heber City, UT: Utah Printing Company, 1995). Anthropologist Peter M. Whiteley also shared this idea that Teuve was one of those to visit Salt Lake City. If this is true, there is no mention that Teuve was considered a “chief” among the Hopi or Oraibi village. Peter M. Whiteley, \textit{Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture Through the Oraibi Split} (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 35; to go along with Teve’s belief that the three Mormon missionaries were to be held at Oraibi as hostages, Gibbons states that the three missionaries left behind were considered “hostages” waiting for the return of the three Hopi Indians going to Utah. See Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 112.

\textsuperscript{51} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 78, 96.

\textsuperscript{52} Hancock, “The Life Story of Mosiah Lyman Hancock,” 66.

\textsuperscript{53} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 98.

\textsuperscript{54} Woodruff, journal entry of 4 February 1863, \textit{Waiting for World’s End: The Diaries of Wilford Woodruff}, 275.
By February 1863 Hamblin and his Hopi guests left Salt Lake City to return to St. George. Hinder by bad weather, the group stayed in Utah for another month before making their way back to Oraibi in March.\(^{55}\) This time Hamblin took an exploratory route going around the Grand Canyon area. It took them a month before reaching Oraibi, but when they finally reached it, the three Hopi men were glad to be home and the Mormons left behind the year before were happy to see their white friends. The missionaries and Hamblin decided to return to Utah.

Hamblin again tried to persuade some of the Hopis at Oraibi to relocate to Utah to live among the Mormons. “Whether this was to aid the Hopis by giving them better farm lands, or to aid the Mormons by making the Hopis a short buffer state between themselves and the Navajos and Paiutes, or both, we do not know.”\(^{56}\)

For the Mormons, the visit from the Hopis sparked the interest of the Church in sending missionaries back to Oraibi. Brigham Young wrote a letter to Jacob Hamblin in regards to the missionaries who were to serve the Hopis. Young said, “the solemn responsibility which rest upon them to labor for the redemption of Israel; to build up the kingdom should be the first, the only object desired by all the Elders (see Appendix A).”\(^{57}\)


\(^{57}\) Andrew Jensen, ed., *Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;* microfilm, letter dated 16 February 1863, box 19, reel 20, HBLL.
A Warlike People: The Mormon Wars

The Hopi people recognized a distinction between Mormons (momonam) and Americans (pahaanam). According to Hopi author Helen Sekaquaptewa, Teu’ue’s trip across the Colorado River helped solidify the continued demarcation between Mormons and Americans. The Hopi men reported that the Mormons were a friendly group of people, “They were industrious and would share their food with hungry Indians.”

Since the first day of arriving in the Great Basin area, the Mormons had numerous encounters with the Utes, Goshutes, Shoshones and other tribes. As Mormon settlement expanded, disputes arose and resulted in “Indian depredations” throughout Utah. Young’s official policy toward the Indians was one of peace and kindness, but it was hard for him to implement it among his Church members.

Utah historian, Thomas Alexander stated that “The attitude of the Latter-day Saints towards the Indians represented a convergence of theology, Euro-American imperialism, and racism.” He contended that theology supported the efforts of conversion, but Mormon need for land used theology to deny Native Americans ownership of land and through this came the era of conflict between the two groups. “Even though Mormons did not recognize the Native American title to the land, as a practical matter the leaders urged the federal government to buy from the Indians the region where they had settled.” As the federal government failed to do so, Mormons would simply move onto Indian lands.

---

58 Sekaquaptewa, Me and Mine, 238.

On November 16, 1850, Young and his councilors wrote Washington, D.C., requesting the extinguishment of Indian title to the land, and the removal of the Utah Indians to the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada, the Wind River Mountains, or to the Snake River area. Young stated that “the progress of civilization, the safety of the mails and the warfare of the Indians themselves called for the adoption of this policy.”

Two years later the Territorial Legislature asked Congress on March 6, 1852 for authorization to be given to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Brigham Young, to make treaties and purchase the lands of the “Shoshone, Utah, Pauvante, [sic] San Pitch, Snake Digger, Uintah and Yampa Ute tribes.”

In 1854 Young asked Congress for approval to conduct treaties and requested monies to entreat Utah Indians. With continued requests to claim Indian land, Young’s peace policy turned to a removal policy. Young sent out surveyors to areas said to be uninhabitable and useless for Mormon settlements and suggested those sites as Indian reservations. President Abraham Lincoln signed an Executive Order establishing the Uintah Valley Reservation in 1861, which was signed by Congress on May 5, 1864. Eventually, other reservations would be established for the removal of all Natives in Utah (see Figure 9).

---

60 Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 16 November 1850.


62 W. Richards and J. M. Grant, Memorial to Congress for an Act authorizing Treaties with the Indians, to Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, 20 Jan 1854, Manuscript Collections, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah; hereafter abbreviated CAL.

63 The first Indian reservation was established by request of Brigham Young and approved by President Lincoln on behalf of the Utes in 1861 and ratified in 1864. In 1863, the Shoshones and Goshutes signed treaties for removal, and after years of conflict between the Indians, Mormons, Utah and Federal governments, reservations were established for the Goshutes at Skull Valley in 1912 and Deep Creek in 1914. The Shoshone never received a reservation until the donation of land by the LDS church in 1960. In 1865 the Paiutes also agreed to hand over tribal lands and over years of conflict were given several reservations which included the Shivwits (1891), Indian Peaks
As territorial governor, Young had been responsible for Indian and settler concerns. As the Mormon prophet, he also concerned himself with how Mormon settlers treated their Indian neighbors. Young stated that, “before the whites came, there was plenty of fish and antelope, plenty of game of almost every description; but now the whites have killed off these things, and there is scarcely anything left for the poor natives to live upon.” Some bureaucrats may have believed reservations would solve the Indian problems, but they just created new ones. The source of Young’s problems was that his people had expanded their settlements and used up the limited resources. Indians found themselves facing oppression and depression.

When soldiers vacated western forts to fight in the eastern theatre of the Civil War, some Indians took it as a divine sign of a return to peace. With the soldiers gone, however, any trouble between Indians and civilians that resulted in conflict resulted in swift and destructive reprisal by the militia. Utah was no different. During the Civil War era numerous wars broke out involving Mormons throughout present-day Utah. In the northern section of Utah, Mormons were

---

Tietjen described the Uinta and Ouray Reservation as a suitable home for the Indians, “Unlike many Reservations, this one was suitable for agriculture and grazing.” It was as if it was a “Garden of Eden” of sorts, but these views were from rose-colored glasses and far from the truth; see Tietjen, Ernest Albert Tietjen, 23; the land set aside for the Uintah and Ouray Reservation was also described in a Salt Lake City newspaper article, which stated that later attempts to settle the area by Mormon settlers was unsuccessful and they described the area as a harsh and unyielding land which even seasoned farmers would have a hard time surviving. See Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 25 September 1861; for more information on each tribe and situations leading up to individual reservations in Utah, see Catherine S. Fowler and Don D. Fowler, “Notes on the History of the Southern Paiutes and Western Shoshonis,” Utah Historical Quarterly 39, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 95-113; Floyd A. O’Neil, “The Reluctant Suzerainty: The Uintah and Ouray Reservation,” Utah Historical Quarterly 39, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 127-44; James B. Allen and Ted J. Warner, “The Gosiute [sic] Indians in Pioneer Utah,” Utah Historical Quarterly 39, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 162-177.

---

(1915), Koosharem (1928), Kanosh (1929), and Cedar Band (1980). The White Mesa Utes signed over tribal lands in 1868 and never received a reservation in Utah and are unrecognized by the federal government. The tribe did purchase lands at White Mesa and some tribal members reside there. The Navajos also signed over tribal lands through the 1868 treaty and were given reservation lands in southern Utah in 1884. See Forrest S. Cuch, ed., A History of Utah’s American Indians (Salt Lake City: Utah State Division of Indian Affairs and Utah State Division of history, 2003), 67-72, 104, 113-19, 139, 141-65, 189-94, 243, 261, 288-90.

---

connected to the Bear River Massacre (1863). Similarly, Central Utah Mormons also dealt with the Utah Black Hawk War (1865). In the furthest extreme, in southern Utah some Mormons assisted the government in the Navajo Long Walk (1864) against the Navajo Indians by employing Indians from other tribes to attack the Navajos. The southern Utah Mormons also participated in the Navajo Wars (1865).

The Navajo Long Walk has been attributed to extensive conflicts between the Navajo and New Mexican citizens. The army was sent in to negotiate peace between the two groups. By

---

65 The Bear River Massacre was actually carried out by Colonel Patrick Edward Connor and the U.S. Army against the Shoshone in Cache Valley (near present day Franklin, Idaho, which sits on the border of Idaho and Utah). The issues leading up to the Bear River Massacre were due to Native American displacement and damage to Native food sources stemming from Mormon colonization in the surrounding area. To make things worse, gold was discovered in the area, bringing in more Mormons and non-Mormons to the area. As a result the Shoshone were starving and began attacking all whites just to survive. See Brigham D. Madsen, *The Shoshoni Frontier and the Bear River Massacre* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1985), 136; according to Newell Hart, the Bear River Massacre was the final obstacle that allowed Mormons to settle and control Cache Valley. See Newell Hart, *The Bear River Massacre* (Preston, ID: Cache Valley Newsletter Publishing Company, 1982), 191.

66 Paul Goodman, interviewed by David M. Brugge and trans. by Bernadine Whitegoat, 6 Jan 1961, interview 689, transcript, Doris Duke Oral Indian History, Manuscript Collections, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. Hereafter anything from the Doris Duke Oral Indian History Collection will have the following abbreviation, DDOI; Ernest Nelson, a Navajo, states that “The Báyoodzin (Paiutes) were scouting at the time from the area of Salt Lake, Utah, or from somewhere else, saying that all of the Navajos were to be killed. At Salt Lake the Paiutes and Utes were issued rifles by the government to go out and scout for the Navajos.” Nelson goes on to retell an incident near Navajo Mountain during the Navajo Long Walk. “A Gáamalii (Mormon) who was in charge of the Paiutes. He was saying that all of the Navajos must be killed, and that the land then would belong to the Mormons – Paiutes and Utes as well.” The Mormon leader and Paiutes were killed, and a second Mormon was injured and let go. See “Ernest Nelson,” in *Navajo Stories of the Navajo Longwalk*, ed. Broderick H. Johnson (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1973), 173-74.

67 Native American historian Clifford Trafzer states that the Navajos in New Mexico have had a long history with the Spanish, Mexican and American government. With each governing body of people the Navajos continued a cycle of raids and attacks, which was also emulated by each governing body and citizens. With the acquisition of New Mexico by the United States, the U.S. Army decided to take action against the Navajos to protect their citizens, believing that if they allowed the Navajos to continue attacking non-American citizens in New Mexico, they would eventually begin attacking white American citizens. By 1861, the Navajos were also seen as a barrier to American expansionism. The Civil War also pressured the U.S. Army to protect all citizens in New Mexico to keep in favor with them. The army decided to bring in Kit Carson to subdue the Navajos. See Clifford E. Trafzer, *Anglo Expansionists and Navajo Raiders: A Conflict of Interests* [Pamphlet] (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1978), 5, 10-11; for more information about the Navajo Long Walk, see: Lynn R. Bailey, *Bosque Redondo: The Navajo Internment at Fort Sumner, New Mexico, 1863-1868* (Tucson: Westernlore Press, 1998); James D. Shinkle, *Fort Sumner and the Bosque Redondo Indian Reservation* (Roswell, NM: Hall-Poorbaugh Press, 1965); Martin A. Link, *Hwete* (Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Tribal Museum, 1971); Gerald Thompson, *The Army and the Navajo* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1976); Raymond Bial, *The Long Walk: The Story of*
1863, Colonel Christopher “Kit” Carson was called in to help subdue the Navajos. Carson used a tactic called the “Scorched Earth” policy. Commanding a company of troops, Carson lead a campaign aided by Ute, Hopi, and other Indian allies against the Navajo people during 1863-1864. He burned homes, orchards, corrals, and crops to starve out the Navajos. The captured Navajos were marched 300 miles to eastern New Mexico at Fort Sumner, often referred to as the Navajo Long Walk. While at Fort Sumner the Navajos had to deal with harsh conditions as prisoners of war until their eventual release in 1868 after the signing of a treaty between the Navajo people and the United States.

Most of Carson’s activities were limited to the eastern Arizona and New Mexico areas, but he heard that Navajos were hiding in Hopi country. On November 23, 1863 Carson led his troops westward to the Hopi villages. Hearing a rumor that the Hopis were in an alliance with the Navajos, he bound and took the Oraibi chief and one other leader with him to his camp along the Moenkopi Wash. Over the next several days scouting parties were sent out hunting Navajos. The parties returned with several prisoners, commandeered livestock, and reported they had burned down Navajo hogans. Carson led his troops down to the Little Colorado River, attacking Navajos around present-day Cameron, and moving on to the San Francisco Peaks area. There was plenty of evidence indicating Navajos had been living all around, but soon heard they left the area and it would be a three-day trip without water to reach their present location.

Discouraged, Carson led his troops back to Oraibi. Carson’s campaign probably did not have “any great lasting effect upon the composition of the Navajo population,” at least for the Navajos


68 Christopher Carson, Colonel, to A.A. General B.C. Cutler, 19 August 1863, typescript, JSBC.
west of the Hopi Indians. The greatest effect of the time period actually came from the local citizens. Three campaigns by Mexicans against the Navajos were recorded — two in 1864 and one in 1865. These civilian campaigns apprehended livestock, killed Navajos in battle, and took captives.69

Most Navajos along the Utah frontier were able to escape the imprisonment of the U.S. government and did not have to endure the trials awaiting their kinsmen at the dreaded Fort Sumner prison camp, which lasted from 1863-1868. One of the most notable Utah groups to escape Kit Carson was Hashkéneinii, but that was not the only group to evade capture.70 Helen Gibbons portrays these Navajos who escaped the Navajo Long Walk as “renegade” Indians who raided “weak” Mormon towns. Doing so allowed them to survive the Fort Sumner years. “By 1866 the Mormons were really feeling the pressure from fugitive Navajos, and their successes encouraged Utes and Paiutes to attempt similar raids.”71

Another explanation for the raids on the Mormons comes from author Bill P. Acrey, who states that many of the problems between whites and Navajos were due to the failures of the U.S. government and their difficulties upholding their agreements from the 1868 Treaty.

69 David M. Brugge, *Historical Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City-Moencopi Area* (Window Rock, AZ: Research Section, Navajo Parks & Recreation Department, The Navajo Tribe, 1972), 7-9.

70 See Charles Kelly, “Chief Hoskaninni,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (July 1953): 219-26; Navajo author Clyde Benally gives a small example of Navajo leaders who escaped Carson’s roundup; see Clyde Benally, *Dinéjí Nákéé’ Náahane’: A Utah Navajo History* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Printing Service, 1982), 136-38.

71 Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 141.
Congress did not always provide enough money on time for the Indian Bureau. This sometimes caused ration distributions to be an unsure thing. This, along with repeated crop failures, caused many Navajos to return to the old practice of raiding the border areas of the reservation. These problems, along with the Navajo general disregard for boundaries, began to cause tension between the Navajos and their neighbors.\footnote{Bill P. Arcey, \textit{Navajo History: The Land and the People} (Shiprock, Arizona: Department of Curriculum Materials Development: Central Consolidated School District No. 22, 2005), 80.}

One thing that Acrey neglects to take into consideration is that the 1868 Treaty at Fort Sumner only dealt with half of the Navajo population. The other half did not consider themselves to be bound by the treaty or its regulations. Because of this, many of them did not reside on the reservation established by the 1868 treaty and some of them became known as off-reservation Navajos. Nevertheless, all Navajos did have to deal with the effects of the Navajo Long Walk and the poverty it caused. Acrey argues that since the Navajo idea of wealth was placed in the number of livestock one had, the Mormons were considered a wealthy group of settlers moving into Navajo country and were prime targets for starving Navajos.\footnote{Ibid.}

Jacob Hamblin spent much of his time at his home in Santa Clara with his families. Instead of working among the Hopis and Navajos, Hamblin spent most of his time trying to resolve problems stemming from an increasing Mormon population that required more Indian lands to quench their wants and desires. Hamblin associated this increase of Mormon population and increased damage to Native lands with a decrease of Native support for the Mormons and an increase of hostility toward the Mormons.\footnote{Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 107-108.} Hamblin complained that,
With, perhaps, their children crying for food, only the poor consolation was left them of gathering around their camp fires and talking over their grievances. Those who have caused these troubles have not realized the situation. I have many times been sorely grieved to see the Indians with their little ones glaring upon a table spread with food, and trying to get our people to understand their circumstances without being able to do so. Lank [sic] hunger and other influences have caused them to commit many depredations.  

Helen Gibbons also concluded that as a result of “sheer hunger, the Indians felt compelled to resume their ancient practices of stealing and raiding.” During this time of upheaval, Mormon Indian missionaries hardly had time to preach the gospel. Most of their time was spent working as “interpreters, arbitrators, to calm and placate the Lamanites.”

Mormons’ damage to Native food supplies and Navajos’ retaliating by appropriating Mormon livestock amplified bitter feelings of resentment among both groups. Hamblin placing blame upon his fellow Mormons did nothing to resolve the situation. He also stated that when some of the Mormons took it upon themselves to exact revenge, they did not take heed to differentiate between “guilty” and “innocent” Indians. This created even more problems because it alienated Indians that wanted to be friends with the Mormons.

When Mormon settlers killed several Paiutes in an altercation at Mountain Meadows Creek, it caused tensions to boil over. Jacob Hamblin and Andrew Gibbons visited the Paiutes to try and reestablish peace. While meeting with the Paiutes they complained of Mormon encroachment and the destruction caused by their livestock. Jacob Hamblin replied, “We do not blame you for your feeling this way…but do you really wish a war?” Gibbons added, “Have you considered what will happen if you make war?...Would there not be more dead Paiutes from

75 Ibid.  
76 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 108.  
77 Ibid., 109.  
78 Hamblin, A Narrative, 108.
battle than from hunger?” Hamblin stated, “We agree that it is not right that papooses should starve…The white men do not wish that you be hungry.” Gibbons concluded by saying, “Let us be friends…You can get more grain by gleaning our fields than you used to get from all your grass seeds,” and so an uneasy peace returned to southern Utah.79

Hamblin also had to deal with the scarcity of water. He complained that Brigham Young had appropriated most of the water to build up St. George and argued that the Paiutes also needed water. He argued that Mormon livestock destroying traditional food supplies justified starving Indians eating Mormon livestock.80 As the Paiute and Navajo raids continued in southern Utah, Indian-Mormon relations heated up in central and northern Utah.

As Mormons began moving into the central Utah area, they began taking over the best lands situated along the rivers. Roots and wild seeds were eaten by people and livestock, and Mormon hunting depleted wild game.81 As tensions between the two groups increased, war officially broke out on April 9, 1865. The Utah Black Hawk War has been considered the longest and most destructive conflict between the Mormons and Indians of Utah.82

Ute leader Chief Jake Arropeen (Yene-wood) led a group of Utes to Manti, Utah, to settle a dispute over some cattle that were killed and consumed by Indians. During the meeting a

---

79 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 110; also see, Edward Leo Lyman, “Caught In Between: Jacob Hamblin and the Southern Paiutes during the Black Hawk-Navajo Wars of the Late 1860s,” Utah Historical Quarterly 75, no. 1 (Winter 2007): 25-26.
80 Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 26.
82 Larson states that when President Lincoln approved the establishment of a reservation for the Ute Indians in 1861, which was ratified in 1864, Brigham Young came to an agreement with the Utes located around Springville, Utah. The Utes were promised assistance, goods, and protection in exchange for removing to the new reservation. But the government failed to uphold their end of the agreement and this was the main factor in the Utes becoming agitated and eventually retaliatory towards the Mormons, leading to the Black Hawk Wars. See Larson, Outline History of Territory Utah, 168-70.
recalcitrant “drunken” Mormon became angry and knocked Arropeen off of his horse. Surprised and upset, the Ute delegation quickly left the parley and promised retaliation. One of the Utes in this group was Antonga Black Hawk. Within a few days the Utes made good on their word, killing five Mormons and stealing hundreds of cattle. Utah natives who were upset about Mormon depredations and expansionism joined Black Hawk’s movement. Not all Indians supported Black Hawk, but he was able to draw a number of Utes, Paiutes, and Navajos to his cause. Black Hawk can be viewed as a defender of Indian rights, a person who had remarkable vision and capacity. As a result of the Black Hawk War, Mormon expansion slowed almost to a standstill for about a decade.  

War raged on the Utah frontier. Mormons built forts for protection and outlying and small settlements were evacuated. Hundreds of Mormon militiamen tried to hunt down Black Hawk, but struck out at friendly Indians as often as against Black Hawk’s allies. Indian men, women, and children perished as around seventy Mormons and non-Mormons were killed or wounded in the fighting. By the fall of 1867, Black Hawk decided that peace needed to be reestablished. Without his leadership the resistance movement dissipated. A peace treaty was signed in 1868, but this did not stop intermittent raiding and killings. By 1872, some two hundred soldiers came to the Mormons’ aid and effectively ended any resistance. The Black Hawk War had a lasting impact on Utah’s history.  

---

84 In a letter from Brigham Young to Brigham Young Jr., the former comments, “The Indians have committed numerous depredations of late, and have killed several persons in Sanpete and Sevier counties, and one man in Utah County. The People in Piute, Sevier, Sanpete, Wasatch and Summit counties, as well as those living south of the rim of the Basin, have been counseled to abandon their small settlements.” Brigham Young, letter dated 23 May 1866, *Letters of Brigham Young to his Sons*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company in collaboration with the Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1974), 72.
Hawk War eventually spread to southern Utah and northern Arizona and the Navajos formed an alliance with the Utes.85

It is somewhat difficult to separate overlapping events between Mormons and Navajos during the Navajo Long Walk (1863-1868), and the Navajo Wars (1865-1870), but these two events are separate events that affected both parties. How many Navajos were involved with the Black Hawk Wars is nearly impossible to determine, but the war involved many of the Navajos who had escaped the dreaded Navajo Long Walk and evaded Kit Carson’s death march. With Kit Carson’s “Scorched Earth” policy and the devastating effects of the Mormon and livestock population boom, many Navajos found themselves hungry. Black Hawk was able to convince these Navajos to stage large-scale raids on Mormon herds throughout southern Utah.

During this turbulent time of trying to keep peace between the Mormons and local Indians, Hamblin visited the Paiutes and entreated them for peace. In March 1864, LDS apostle and newly elected local military commander of the Utah Territorial Militia of the Iron Military District Erastus Snow called Hamblin to go and visit the Navajo people, and to try to recover horses stolen from Mormons in Kanab. While he was in Arizona, Hamblin visited the Hopis and tried to convince two Hopis to return to Utah to learn how to smith and woodwork.86 On their way to Arizona they decided to cross at the area later known as Lonely Dell (Lee’s Ferry). Hamblin found this to be a better place to cross the Colorado than at the Crossing of the Fathers.

85 Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 28; also see Cuch, A History of Utah’s American Indian, 285.

86 A. Gary Anderson, “Events at Lee’s Ferry, or Lonely Dell, 1846-1928,” in Regional Studies in LDS History: Arizona, ed. H. Dean Garrett and Clark V. Johnson (Provo: Brigham Young University, 1989), 8-9; Hamblin states that this took place in the early part of 1865. See Hamblin, A Narrative, 110.
This crossing “opened the way for the extension of the Mormon frontier into northern Arizona.”

Nothing was really said about the trip to the Navajos, other than the fact that the Hopis told him that Tódích’ii’nií Nééz had been “discarded by his band; that his son had succeeded him as chief; and that he was disposed to raid at any favorable opportunity.” While visiting with the Hopis, Hamblin pleaded once again with the Hopi leaders to relocate to Utah. Their reply was the same as before — they were still waiting for their three prophets to return to them, who would give them permission to do so. “Aside from their traditions against moving across the great river, they could not see the utility of going over to live with us when we would yet move into their country.” Hopi leaders foresaw that the Mormons would soon be building settlements south of them. They rationalized that if Mormon country was so great, then why would they be moving away from their homes to move to Hopi country? It would only be a few short years before the Hopi prophecy came true.

Later that fall, Erastus Snow claimed that Tódích’ii’nií Nééz and a Navajo delegation came to visit the Mormons in southern Utah “pretending to be friendly.” The Navajos were well received and feasted. In return for Mormon generosity, they stole a number of horses from Kanab. This raiding may have resulted from the devastating effects of the Long Walk and not

87 C. Gregory Crampton and David E. Miller, eds., “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia against the Navajo Indians, 1869,” Utah Historical Quarterly 29, no. 2 (April 1961): 150.

88 Hamblin, A Narrative, 110.

89 Ibid.

90 Erastus Snow to Special Agent of the Indian Bureau Capt. R.N. Fenton, 17 November 1869, typescript, JSBC; historian C. Gregory Crampton believed that the theft of the Mormon horses in Kanab started the Navajo War. Crampton provides an account of Franklin B. Wooley who reported on the expedition looking for the Indians who killed Whitmore and McIntyre; see C. Gregory Crampton, “Military Reconnaissance in Southern Utah, 1866,” Utah Historical Quarterly 32, no. 2 (Spring 1964): 143.
from animosity toward Mormons. The raids by Paiutes and Navajos were often motivated by hunger.\footnote{Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 29.}

In the autumn of 1865, Hamblin briefly recorded a trip that he took with another Mormon, Dr. James M. Whitmore. They visited Las Vegas Springs and then traveled to the Colorado River.\footnote{Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 111.} During the winter months Whitmore and his son-in-law Robert McIntyre were killed near Pipe Springs by an Indian raiding party looking for livestock. After their death, the Utah Territorial Militia of the Iron Military District called one hundred Mormons to gather at Kanab to be led by William Henry Hancock. The party was slow to gather so Hancock, along with his brother-in-law Joseph McCleve, started out without the militia company. Leaving on December 10, 1865, Hancock was able to join the Pipe Springs Militia. Hancock briefly states that in the area, “After some Indians had been disposed of, and the bodies of our brethren found and sent to St. George, we began preparations to look after some more Indians.”\footnote{Hancock, “The Life Story of Mosiah Lyman Hancock,” 75; for more information about the events surrounding the death of Whitmore and McIntyre, see Robert W. Olsen, “Conflict in the Arizona Strip: The First Skirmish of the 1865-1869 Mormon-Navaho War,” \textit{Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly} 1 (1966): 53-60.} The Indians gunned down here were two Paiutes caught wearing the clothing of Whitmore and McIntyre. It was later learned that the murdered Paiutes earlier on traded for the clothing with some Navajos and died before they could correct the impression.\footnote{Tietjen, \textit{Ernest Albert Tietjen}, 25.}
Concurrently Hamblin led a separate company of men looking for the Navajos but ill health hampered his quest.\textsuperscript{95} Mormons blamed the Paiutes for the death of Whitmore and McIntyre; the Paiutes were said to be under the influence of the Navajos.\textsuperscript{96}

Meanwhile Hancock was sent back to Kanab and joined the militia there under Captain Roundy. Given a company of ten men, Hancock led them around the area and returned to Kanab by sunset. By nine o’clock that night the men were greeted by an Indian they called Lehi, who warned them that the Navajos were coming. Hancock and his company rode through the night and day trying to locate these Navajos, but only found their trail. Following the trail they concluded that the Navajos came upon cattle and horses that were stolen from the Mormons. Deciding to chase after them further, they traveled as far as the Buckskin Mountains in Arizona before another Mormon came after them, relaying a message that they were to let the Navajos go and return to Kanab.\textsuperscript{97}

Snow argued that the 1864 raid by Tódích’ii’nii Nééz and the 1865 raid that resulted in the death of Whitmore and McIntyre only encouraged other Navajo raiding parties to attack Mormon communities in southern Utah.\textsuperscript{98} During December 1865, Paiutes followed suit and raided Kanab, taking more livestock from the Mormons.\textsuperscript{99} In the spring of 1866, several Navajos killed three Mormons – Robert McIntyre’s wife, Joseph Berry, and Robert Berry, at Berryville (Glendale). “Martial law was proclaimed following these attacks, and the outlying

\textsuperscript{95} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 111-112.

\textsuperscript{96} Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 31.

\textsuperscript{97} Hancock, “The Life Story of Mosiah Lyman Hancock,” 76.

\textsuperscript{98} Snow, 17 November 1869.

\textsuperscript{99} Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 149.
settlements were abandoned.”  

During 1867 and 1868, Hamblin spent time among the Indians of southwestern Utah trying to maintain the peace. Hamblin employed several Paiutes to guard the Mormons. These Paiutes watched the main Colorado River crossings between Mormon and Navajo settlements. The Mormons considered the Navajo raiding to be too much to handle and the Utah Territorial Militia of the Iron Military District was called out once again for assistance.

Up to this point, the Mormon campaigns against the Navajos were mostly retaliatory. Now they began to take proactive measures. In an offensive move, the Mormon militia organized a preemptive strike against the Navajos. On February 25, 1869, Adjunct Edwin G. Woolley recorded his experiences on an expedition that lasted until March 12. They left St. George and traveled through Hurricane, Utah, and down to Pipe Springs, Arizona. Along the way they came across tracks believed to have been made by Indians with thirty to forty head of livestock but they lost the tracks. Then word reached the militia that another Navajo raid had occurred. The militia traveled northeast toward Kanab, guarding several passes hoping to head off any Indian escape. They came across more Indian tracks and followed them.

100 Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 149. Unfamiliar with Tódích’íí níi Nééz, Lyman claims that he was killed soon after Berry’s and McIntyre’s deaths in 1866. Lyman also states that Tódích’íí níi Nééz was the brother to Navajo Leader Barboncito. Both statements are false. See Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 31.

101 Hamblin, A Narrative, 113.

The expedition continued on past Kanab Creek and from there they looked and saw to the east, a snow capped summit they called “Spanny Shank Mountain.” Woolley claimed that the raiding Navajos were from this area, presumably referring to Navajo Mountain. The expedition continued on, passing the Buckskin Mountains, traveling northeast towards the Paria River and southeast down towards the Colorado River to Crossing of the Fathers before turning back to Kanab.

Adjunct Wooley later learned that the testimony of a friendly Paiute, Panguitch John, was used as the evidence for attacking the Navajos after the death of the three Mormons from Berryville. Woolley later learned that Panguitch John did not know who really killed these Mormons. John made up the story against the Navajos because he was upset and wanted revenge against the Navajos who had killed some of his kinsmen.

The Mormon-Navajo War angered Jacob Hamblin. During the summer of 1869 he finally decided to confront Apostle Erastus Snow about the current attitude toward the Indians, asking for more authority so that he could find a peaceable solution to the disputes with the Indians. With the permission of Brigham Young, Hamblin was made the president of the Southern Utah Indian Mission. He pled for help, begging the Mormons to get along with their neighbors without killing any more Navajos.

---

103 Ibid., 155. This “Spanny Shank Mountain” refers to Spaneshank or Tó dich'ii'nii Nééz. Woolley states that this mountain was beyond the Colorado River over one hundred miles away from their present location, which is presumably Navajo Mountain, near which Tó dich'ii'nii Nééz lived.

104 Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 168.

105 Lyman, “Caught In Between,” 38.
When Hamblin made his fifth journey to the Hopis at Oraibi in October 1869 he discovered they were not happy about his return. The Hopis mentioned to Hamblin that the Navajo Indians were planning a raid on the southern Utah settlements. Hamblin and the accompanying missionaries rushed back to Utah only to find that they just missed the raiding parties. Tódích’ii’nii Nééz had gathered a group of twenty-five Navajos and absconded with some fifteen hundred head of livestock from southern Utah settlements. One account claimed Tódích’ii’nii Nééz did this out of hate towards the Mormons. This may have resulted from Mormon attacks on Navajo raiders, Mormons arming the Utes and Paiutes during the Black Hawk Wars, or from the competition over limited natural resources.

No matter what the reason, constant Navajo raiding forced Hamblin to increase his efforts at guarding all crossings, but to no avail. Throughout the winter of 1869, Hamblin spent most of his time trying to retrieve stolen livestock. “This Navajo war caused me many serious reflections. I felt that there was a better way to settle matters and I made up my mind to go and see the Navajos and have a talk with them as soon as circumstances would permit.” Since the Navajo Indian Agency was located at Fort Defiance, Arizona, Hamblin decided to travel there in an effort to make peace between the Mormons and the Navajos.

While Hamblin was at Fort Defiance he hoped to reestablish peace between the Navajos and Mormons, but a second outbreak of Mormon-Navajo hostility ensued. Upon his return to

---

106 Hamblin, A Narrative, 114; Elkins states that the purpose of this trip was to “recover some horses stolen from the Kanab Creek area, visit the Moqui, and try to get them to cross the Colorado and join with us in Mormon Country.” This party consisted of Jacob Hamblin, Thales Haskell, Isaac Riddle, Andrew Gibbons, Dudley Leavitt, William Hamblin, Ammon Tenney and Ira Hatch. See Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 91.

107 Kildare states that Tódích’ii’nii Nééz was responsible for this raid and that they took 1,500 head of cattle, horses, and mules. See Kildare, “Chief Scarbreast, Master Killer,” 53; Hamblin estimated that about twelve to fifteen thousand head of livestock was taken from them, mainly horses and mules, see Hamblin, A Narrative, 114.

108 Hamblin, A Narrative, 116.
Utah, Navajos raided settlements north of St. George and on November 5, 1869, Adjunct Woolley, under the Iron Militia district leader Colonel James Andrus, left with a detachment to pursue some stolen horses. Woolley’s journal chronicled that the company left St. George traveling to Washington and then to Toquerville to recruit men to accompany them on the campaign against the Navajos. Part of this group from St. George included Hamblin, Samuel Crosby, George Lytle, and Joseph Judd. After picking up more recruits, the detachment moved south to Pipe Springs and set a trap to capture the raiding Navajos, but it proved unsuccessful.

By November 7, the detachment received word that another raiding party had struck. After looking into the affair, several men from the detachment could find no signs of the raiding party. Col. Andrus took nine men with him hoping to head off the Navajos at the Paria River. Unable to locate them, the detachment continued east and was still unable to locate anyone. Three days later on November 10, the detachment divided into two groups — one to stay and the other to return to Kanab.

After the split, the remaining detachment came across a trail thought to be a raiding party near Buckskin Mountain and began following the trail. The following day, on November 11, they came across a Navajo party consisting of eight Navajos and twelve horses. Sneaking up behind the party, the detachment came within one hundred fifty yards of the Navajos and five men from the detachment fired at the Navajos, injuring two. As the Navajos returned fire, the

---

109 This detachment consisted of Colonel James Andrus, Adjunct E. Gordon Woolley, Henry Harrison Herriman, John D. Lee, Jr., Joseph Norman Stratton, Andrew Sorenson, John Wesley Clark, Joseph Judd, George Theobald, Thomas Ransom, Albert Platt Spilsbury, Samuel Obed Crosby, George Andrew Lytle, and Jacob Hamblin. See Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 170-171, 176; Snow states that the Navajos escaped with about 250 horses and mules. He also states that the raiding took place sometime from November 6-10, 1869. See Snow, 17 November 1869.

110 Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 171.

111 Ibid., 172-173.
detachment found that they were not in the best location for a battle and retreated out of firing range. The detachment returned to the Paria River before returning to Kanab. Woolley states that Hamblin was supposed to be part of this detachment that shot and killed two Navajos, but along the way Hamblin was having some difficulties and was left behind on the trail and missed all the action.

Overall, the Mormon-Navajo War was very limited when compared to the Black Hawk War. However, from the two military campaigns against the Navajos came an important discovery — an in-depth record of the geography of the eastern base of the High Plateaus in the Colorado River Basin along the Arizona-Utah borders. The military expeditions into these areas brought back the first reports of the natural resources of that country and pinpointed ideal locations for Mormon farming and grazing.

On November 17, 1869, Erastus Snow wrote a letter to Special Agent of the Indian Bureau, R. N. Fenton, complaining that over the years the Mormons had lost over 500 horses and mules, 500 cattle, and 2,000 sheep. At great expense, the Mormons “have recovered considerable stock and killed some Indians,” but lost six Mormons and several Paiutes in altercation. Snow claimed that Hamblin’s visit to the Hopis in October was a peace-keeping mission to the Navajos, but this only provoked the Navajos to raid some Utah settlements on November 5. A request was put forth asking that this “lawless renegade portion of the main tribe of Navajos,” be escorted back to the reservation boundaries established through the Fort Sumner Navajo Treaty of 1868.

---

112 Ibid., 174.
113 Ibid., 150.
114 Snow, 17 November 1869.
While resting in Kanab, Hamblin met John Wesley Powell of the Colorado River expedition. Powell requested the assistance of Hamblin stating he had troubles with Indians from a previous expedition and hoped he would pacify them so he could explore the Grand Canyon. Agreeing to do so, Powell and company left Kanab to begin their trip in September 1870. The exploration with Powell lasted until autumn 1871 when Powell decided to return home in the East. Hamblin guided the expedition up to Fort Defiance before parting ways. On their way to Fort Defiance, the group stopped and visited with the Hopis.

Powell and Hamblin then made their way to Fort Defiance and met with a large group of reservation Navajos waiting for rations from the Navajo agent on November 2, 1871. Hamblin stated that all he wanted was peace and friendship with the Navajos, but because of the recent hardships descended upon them due to Navajo raiding parties in southern Utah, peace was not attainable. He argued that “If we would live in peace with each other, we could take advantage of all the land, grass and water, and become rich and have all we need.” His plea for peace was welcomed by Barboncito, a Navajo Headman, and other Navajos who wished for peace.

---

115 Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 118; for Powell’s version of this account, see, John Wesley Powell, “The Hopi Villages: The Ancient Province of Tusayan, A Classic Reprint,” *Southwest Heritage* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1974): 8-13, 36-43.

116 Hamblin states that Ammon M. Tenney, Ashton Nebeker, Nathan Terry, Elijah Potter, and an Indian named Frank accompanied Hamblin to Fort Defiance along with Powell and three strangers. See Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 121.

117 Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 122-23. Hamblin states that there were about 6,000 Navajos who were in attendance at this meeting, indicating that they were there specifically in attendance for Hamblin. It is possible that there were that many Navajo Indians present at Fort Defiance, but they came there not to visit with Hamblin. It just so happened that Hamblin arrived at the same time the Navajo agency distributed rations to the reservation Navajos, annuities promised them during the 1868 treaty between the Navajos and U.S. How many were actually at the meeting is uncertain.

After visiting for several more days among the Navajos at Fort Defiance, Hamblin’s group made their way back home.

For the Mormons this signaled the end of the Mormon-Navajo War. Thereafter Mormons began reestablishing abandoned communities and began expansion into new areas, especially the areas visited during the two Navajo campaigns. A fort was built at Pipe Springs, and settlements sprung up along the Paria and Fremont rivers, consisting of Cannonville, Paria, and Adairville. Lee’s Ferry also “replaced the hazardous Crossing of the Fathers…and opened the way for extension of the Mormon frontier into northern Arizona.”

The only problem with Hamblin’s peace treaty with Barboncito and other Navajo leaders was that they were reservation Navajos and their leadership powers or influence did not extend over nonreservation Navajos. These nonreservation Navajos included the Navajos that Jacob Hamblin was complaining about, including Tódích’íi’níí Nééz’s band. Some Mormons failed to distinguish between Navajos living on the reservation and those living off the reservation, but this became a major problem as time passed on.

While Hamblin’s group was returning home from Fort Defiance, they stopped at a Hopi “town.” They “met the principal chief of the Navajos, those chiefs who were not at Fort Defiance, and some minor chiefs not affiliated with the Navajo Agency at Fort Defiance.”

Out of this meeting Hamblin was introduced to a Navajo “principal chief,” named Hastele, who lived “on the frontier, nearest to the river,” presumably the Colorado River or Little Colorado River. It was concluded that if the Mormons had any other problems, Hamblin was to contact Hastele to help settle matters to keep peace between the Mormons and the Navajos.

---

119 Crampton and Miller, “Journal of Two Campaigns by the Utah Territorial Militia,” 150.

120 Hamblin, A Narrative, 125.
By the end of the 1860s hostilities in Utah Territory, the Hopis became disenchanted with the Mormons. The Hopis liked the Mormons, but their chief, Lololma, rejected the Mormons’ request to establish a mission at Oraibi. Most of the Hopis did not think the Mormons were the people prophesied of, and Lololma became dissatisfied with the Mormons, learning that they practiced polygamy, which was in direct violation of Hopi beliefs. Another complaint surfaced during a trip to Washington, D.C. Lololma interviewed several other religions to determine which church he would admit. He invited the Mennonites because, like the Hopi, they did not believe in war.121

Wishing to strengthen their ties with the Hopi Indians, Jacob Hamblin invited Teuve, “a man of good report among his people,” and his wife to join him on his trip back to Utah.122 Hamblin hoped Teuve would return to his people and give a positive report about his trip. During November 1870, Teuve left his homeland with his wife and accompanied Hamblin to St. George, visiting other LDS settlements in southern Utah and spending time learning about them.123 Crossing the Colorado River was still in direct violation of traditional Hopi belief, but Teuve prayed for protection and crossed the river safely.

During his stay in southern Utah, Teuve and his wife met with Brigham Young in St. George, Utah. Teuve was shown the spinning mill in Washington, Utah. He was so impressed


122 There is no indication by Hamblin that Teuve was a Hopi Leader; see Hamblin, A Narrative, 127; Elkins states that Hamblin invited Teuve and his wife, enticing them with promises “to pay for the work Tuba performed, furnished him a home and food, and to return to his village a year later.” He also states that Teuve “was not only a chief, he was also a religious man.” See Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 110-11; also see, Leland H. Creer, “The Activities of Jacob Hamlin in the Region of the Colorado,” Anthropological Papers 33 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1958), 23-24.

by the mill that he stated he would never want to spin wool by hand again.\textsuperscript{124} They were also shown a flour mill and the cotton fields in Santa Clara. Young also gave Teuve “a suit of clothes.” Upon returning to Kanab, where Hamblin’s family was currently residing, they came across a group of about eighty Navajos coming to trade with the Mormons. They told of their hardships due to the Navajo Long Walk, which left them poor and destitute. They had hoped to rebuild their lives by trading their Navajo blankets for horses and sheep. Hamblin welcomed the Navajos and encouraged the Mormons to help build a relationship of trust by trading with the Navajos.

Teuve remained in Utah for the rest of the winter, living in a cabin that was especially built for him. Sometime during his stay in Kanab, Teuve was baptized into the Mormon Church. Teuve’s conversion brought hope to the Mormons, especially since they considered him to be a Hopi chief. “The labors of the missionaries never before seemed so fruitful. There was peace with the Navahos, Tuba and his wife provided the first Hopi converts and plans were being made for Mormon settlement into Arizona.”\textsuperscript{125} In September 1871, Hamblin took Teuve back to Oraibi while he continued on to Fort Defiance for another meeting with Navajo leaders.\textsuperscript{126} Hamblin spent the next several years welcoming Navajo trading parties and fostering a peaceful environment between the Navajo and Mormon people.

\textsuperscript{124} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 132; Sessal Allen, a Mormon who helped settle northern Arizona, recalled it a little differently, stating that when “Chief Tuve visited St. George and saw the Washington Cotton Factory he sat down and cried because he thought the Hopis were the world’s smartest people. It shook him up to find others smarter.” See Sessal Allen, interviewed by Charles Peterson, 22 Jun 1967, interview 538, transcript, DDOI.

\textsuperscript{125} Flake, “A History of Mormon Missionary Work,” 36.

\textsuperscript{126} Hamblin states that Isaac C. Haight, George Adair and Joseph Mangum accompanied him. See Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 133; Christensen stated that due to conflicts over water in Tuba City, Teuve disassociated himself from the Church and declared himself a Gentile by 1885. See Christian Lingo Christensen, “Diary of Christian Lingo Christensen,” (typescript), p. 70, Christian Lingo Christensen Collection, HBLL.
After spending over a year among the Mormons, “Tuba’s warmth toward the Church increased, and he spent more and more time at Moenkopi with Andrew (Gibbons) and the other Indian missionaries.”127 By this point in time, all hopes of having the Hopis move to Utah were gone. Young complained that the Hopis were too “superstitious.” Young’s meeting with Teuve again impressed upon him the desire to extend the Mormon settlements into northern Arizona, especially with Teuve serving as a liaison between the Mormons and Hopis.

Since 1864 Hamblin had been frequenting the area known as Lonely Dell. In John D. Lee’s journal, he recorded a conversation he had with Hamblin on November 15, 1871. Hamblin told Lee that the area was an ideal location for a number of ranches and that he should settle the area.128 Following his advice, Lee took his family to the crossing the next month and began a new life there. As Lee began to settle in, the Church decided to colonize Arizona and officially asked Lee to operate a ferry across the Colorado River. By January 11, 1873, the ferry was completed and operational.129 Lee’s Ferry was important to Mormon colonization of Arizona, becoming the lifeline between southern Utah and northern Arizona.

With the return of Teuve to Hopi land, the Mormons brought a colonizing party led by John L. Blythe and Andrew Gibbons.130 A non-Mormon journalist named John Hanson Beadle recorded his travels to Moenkopi in 1872, stating that sometime after Teuve and his wife returned from Utah, “a portion of the Oraybes have seceded from the main body, and established

127 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 181.


a new settlement, to which they invite white men, and propose more friendly relations.” The Mormons were well aware of the Moenkopi area and by 1873, Teuve invited the Mormons to come and live by the Hopi village of Moenkopi. According to Hopi tradition, Teuve invited the Mormons to settle near his village in order to receive protection from marauding Paiutes and Navajos. Regrettably, events did not go according to plan.

A member of this Mormon colonizing party of 1873, Mormon missionary Andrew Amundsen, wrote a detailed account of their journey to the northern Arizona Territory. Arriving at Lee’s Ferry on April 22, they were greeted by Lee and his family. Lee received word that federal authorities were coming to arrest him either for his role in the Mountain Meadows Massacre or for practicing polygamy. Preparations were made to join the Blythe party heading to Moenkopi.

The group reached the Moenave/ Mønkøpi area on May 1, an area described as a sandy place with a good many springs. Hopis had vacated the area to avoid Navajo and Apache raids. Hamblin left the group and traveled to a nearby Indian village, returning with several Indians;

---


132 Harold Courtlander. The Fourth World of the Hopis (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987), 192; the Arizona Republic newspaper contends that Teuve invited the Mormons to establish a settlement in the Moenkopi area as an arm of protection against the Navajo Indians. See Arizona Republic (Phoenix), 24 July 1932.

133 Cornelius states that Lee received word that officers were on their way to arrest Lee, and so Lee decided to join the Mormon company going down to Moenkopi. See Cornelius, “Mormon Scouts,” 408; Anderson states that officers were coming to hunt down polygamists. See Anderson, “Events at Lee’s Ferry,” 25; in a dissertation by John Q. Ressler, he states that federal marshals were hunting him down for his role in the massacre. John Q. Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance, Landscape Change, and the View of the Environment in an Oasis on the Western Navajo Reservation, Arizona” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970), 109.
Teuve, two women, two children, two Paiutes, and a Navajo. By May 3, the Mormons began searching for land to farm and began farming on May 5. The group spent the following days planting crops, while being visited by local tribesmen. Meanwhile, an exploration party was sent to check out the surrounding area. They learned that the Navajo and Hopis had been at war, but were now at peace.

By May 13, a Mormon oxen train arrived with fresh supplies and a company of about one hundred wagons. They came to northern Arizona with instructions to establish a settlement on the Little Colorado River at Moenkopi. A meeting was held and Horton D. Haight was called to preside over this new mission among the Hopis. A letter was also read from John W. Young, which stated that Hamblin was to settle the Moenkopi area and to visit the local Indians. During this meeting an “Indian prests, named Sti-ti-a-ny spoke a little,” it was interpreted by Ira Hatch that Sti-ti-a-ny was glad to see the Mormons and that he would like them to settle the area so that they, the Indians, could herd the Mormon livestock.

The next month was spent exploring the surrounding area in more detail. Amundsen recorded going from the Moenave area to the Moenkopi area and finding some Hopis farming; Teuve was said to be one of those farming there. The Mormons eventually decided to split into two camps, forming one at Moenave and one at Moenkopi.

---

134 Andrew Amundsen, “Andrew Amundsen Journal” (typescript), p. 6, Andrew Amundsen Collection, JSBC; an accompanying Mormon missionary, William Henry Solomon, recorded that the Hopis were anxious to have people settle among them for protection from “hostile Navajos.” See, William Henry Solomon, journal entry of 12 May 1873, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon: From his Original Journal,” unpaginated, typescript, Journal of William Henry Solomon Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter abbreviated as HBLL.


Lee originally established himself at Moenkopi and eventually moved to Moenave.\textsuperscript{137} While at Moenave, Lee met Teuve and concluded he had lived there only for a short time in the summertime. Teuve reported that some Paiutes farmed in Moenave and some Navajos also lived in the vicinity.\textsuperscript{138} Lee’s interactions with Teuve were friendly and he even gave Teuve an iron stove as a friendly gesture.\textsuperscript{139} Their friendship was cut short in 1874 when Lee was finally captured, imprisoned, and eventually sentenced to death in 1877 for his role in the Mountain Meadows Massacre.

The group of one hundred wagons that arrived on May 13 quickly became discouraged by the arid conditions and doubted that they could settle the area. The group decided to return to southern Utah. Hamblin, who was acting as the guide, tried to convince them that there were better lands further on but was unsuccessful at convincing them to stay. A few members of the company that had arrived on May 1 took a group of wagons further south and also became “discouraged and demoralized, and returned,” to southern Utah. The remaining companies at Moenkopi and Moenave followed suit. “They all returned to Utah and the great effort to settle the country south of the Colorado was, for the time being, a failure.”\textsuperscript{140}

William Henry Solomon, a member of one of the companies that abandoned Arizona and returned to southern Utah, recorded in his journal that while in southern Utah the companies received word from the

\textsuperscript{137} Ressler states that Jacob Hamblin originally occupied the house and ranch where Lee was living in Moenave, but eventually traded it over to Lee. See Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance, Landscape Change,” 109-110; Fullmer states that Hamblin sold the land to Lee; this land was next to Moenkopi. See Fullmer, \textit{Already to Harvest}, 125.


\textsuperscript{139} Whiteley, \textit{Deliberate Acts}, 36; Sekaquaptewa recalls seeing the stove in her youth. The stove was the first in Oraibi; see Sekaquaptewa, \textit{Me and Mine}, 236.

\textsuperscript{140} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 135-136. Hamblin has this group coming in the spring of 1874.
Church that these Arizona settlers were to remain in southern Utah until “it was policy to
restart.”  

A small detachment of men from Haight’s company stayed in and around Moenkopi. Apple trees were planted and construction on a stone house was commenced. By August 23, 1873, Moqui Indian Agent William S. Defrees visited John D. Lee and informed Lee of his plans to establish a Hopi Agency at Moenkopi, giving warning to the Mormons not to become too comfortable at Moenkopi (see Appendix B for the subsequent list of Hopi Indian Agents). The brother-in-law of Teuve, Taltee also came to visit John D. Lee on September 6. During the visit Lee was informed that all the Hopis at Moenkopi had returned to Oraibi, except for himself, his son, Teuve and Teuve’s wife. Taltee invited Lee to gather his family and relocate at Moenkopi so that they could be united together to prevent any troubles with the Navajos. The invitation was declined by Lee since he had not harvested his crops at Moenave. It was not long before troubles with the Mormons began, and “In January 1874, an event in Utah was to alter Defrees’ plans to establish the Hopi Agency at Moenkopi and to have a profound effect upon events in the Moenkopi area.”

In Jacob Hamblin’s account, he states that “The Navajos carried on a peaceful trade with our people until the winter of 1874-75, when a circumstance occurred which greatly endangered our peaceful relations with that people.” Even though Hamblin indicates that this occurred

---

141 Solomon states that a party traveled further on to the Little Colorado River to explore the area, but found that the river had dried up and felt there was not a good place to settle. While waiting to hear from the Church and never receiving word from them, they decided it would be best to return home to Utah. See Solomon, journal entry of 13 May 1873, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon.”

142 David M. Brugge, “The Moenkopi Boundary Problem – Final Report,” 1967, p. 12, David M. Brugge Collection, Center of Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Hereafter anything from the David M. Brugge Collection will have the following abbreviation, DMBC.
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during the winter of 1874-75, this actually took place during the winter of 1873, when six Navajo men traveled to Utah territory to trade goods at the request of the Mormons as a peaceful demonstration that they would be welcomed among the Mormons.\footnote{144 Bert Tallsalt, a descendant of Atsidíík’áak’éhé, indicates that there were five Navajos altogether on the trip. See Bert Tallsalt, “The Lone Survivor of the Navaho Trading Expedition to Utah Territory,” \textit{Western Folklore} 18 (April 1959): 117; another descendant of Atsidíík’áak’éhé, Tso claims that there were six Navajo men in the party. Two are named as Atsidíík’áak’éhé and Lįį'yilchįįh Biyáázh. See Curley Tso, “Curley Tso,” in \textit{Navajo Stories of the Navajo Longwalk}, ed. Broderick H. Johnson (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1973), 92; Hamblin states that there were only four Navajo men involved. See Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 136; Kildare states that only three Navajo men were involved; Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 173. Gibbons states that there were four Navajo men in all. Also see Kildare, “Chief Scarbreast, Master Killer,” 22.}

The Navajo men left the area now known as Inscription House, Arizona, which is about fifty miles northeast of Tuba City. At the request of Hamblin, promising safety for trading parties, these Navajo men traveled to Utah with pack ponies loaded with saddle blankets. While trading with Mormons the Navajos received a horse. One of the members of the party, Atsidíík’áak’éhé, also made horse bridles that were exchanged with Ute traders for deer and buffalo hides.\footnote{145 Atsidíík’áak’éhé means Wounded Smith. This name was given to this individual after the events which are about to unfold here; Fullmer states that the Navajo men were trading with some Utes on the east fork of the Sevier River. She states that Atsidíík’áak’éhé was originally called “Swiftwind.” See Fullmer, \textit{Already to Harvest}, 123, 130; Tso also stated that this trip was done annually and at times they even ventured into Ute territory to trade with the Utes, see Tso, “Curley Tso,” 92.}

On their return home a snowstorm came along and forced the Navajos to seek refuge in an abandoned home. They stopped and spent the night in an abandoned home near Richfield, Utah, at an area called Grass Valley. The storm is said to have lasted three days, and during this time the Navajo men became hungry and decided to kill a calf owned by property owner, Mr. McCarty. McCarty did not care for Indians, and when he learned that the Navajos killed a calf on his property he became very angry and formed a vigilante group to punish them.\footnote{146 Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 136; Gibbons states that it was actually a barn that they stayed in. See Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 174.}
Catching them at nightfall, one of the white men came to talk to the Navajos but they could not understand each other. The Navajos tried to communicate by sign language the best they could, but to no avail. The Navajos did notice that the white men arrived armed with rifles strapped to their horses and built a camp some distance away. It was concluded by Atsidíík’áak’éhé that the white men were there to kill them. One of the other Navajos said that the white men seemed to be friendly and did not think there should be any cause for alarm. While the other Navajos fell asleep, Atsidíík’áak’éhé stayed awake all night to keep a close eye on the men outside.

By sunrise the white men began target practice on an old tree stump. With the assumption that the white men were not hostile, two Navajos went outside to join in shooting. The target practice among the two groups lasted for some time before Atsidíík’áak’éhé heard a barrage of shots going off. He looked outside the cabin and saw his two friends fall over.

The Navajo man in charge of the trading party decided to put his hands up and exit the house to try and find out what was going on. As soon as he appeared at the door he was shot several times. The Navajos closed the door to prevent further casualties. During this incident only two of the Indians had grabbed their bow and arrows before entering the cabin. As the white men tried to force their way into the cabin, one was wounded with an arrow, which stopped them momentarily. Angered, the white men set the cabin on fire. Contemplating what to do next, the Navajos noticed a white horse close to them in back of the cabin. As the heat became unbearable, the surviving Navajos ran for the door knowing that they would be gunned down, hoping that at least one of them would make it to the horse in back of the cabin.

---

147 Tallsalt, “The Lone Survivor of the Navaho Trading Expedition to Utah Territory,” 118.
The first Navajo man grabbed at the horse but was shot before he could mount. The horse took off running with the Navajo man severely wounded. The second Navajo ran out soon after the whites shot their rifles, knowing that it would take some time to reload. He was shot before he could escape. The third Navajo was hit right before he landed in the saddle and rode off wounded.148

Atsidíík’áak’éhé grabbed the white horse he noticed earlier and made his escape and was also wounded. Atsidíík’áak’éhé ripped his shirt off and used it as a bandage to help stop the bleeding from his abdomen. He reunited with the other wounded Navajos. The first man was slumped over on his horse badly injured. Atsidíík’áak’éhé asked if he could make it home, and his reply was no, but he would provide enough time to help Atsidíík’áak’éhé escape. Atsidíík’áak’éhé came upon the other wounded Navajo and the same scenario played out, the wounded man said he would help slow down the white men.

Atsidíík’áak’éhé took his horse through the woods and up the side of a mountain before his horse became too tired to travel any further. He dismounted his horse and continued on by foot. At this same time, Atsidíík’áak’éhé noticed dark clouds coming in and it began snowing, which covered his tracks.149 He soon stumbled upon an overhanging ledge. Finding a narrow opening, he crawled to the back rear and covered himself with some twigs and sticks. Tired and wounded, Atsidíík’áak’éhé fell asleep but was eventually awakened by the sound of hooves. His pursuers were yelling but he was unable to understand what they were saying.

By the next morning, Atsidíík’áak’éhé made sure that it was safe to come out of hiding. He noticed his stomach had grown to an enormous size due to internal bleeding. He found some

148 Tso, “Curley Tso,” 95.
149 Ibid., 97.
edible roots and herbs to apply to his wounds and this helped reduce the swelling somewhat. He began his long trek home using a makeshift crutch, having to stop constantly to rest and treat his wounds. He eventually made his way to the Crossing of the Fathers, where he gave thanks for his life. Atsidíík’áak’ëhé began walking towards Navajo Canyon in hopes that some family members might still be there harvesting a late crop, but he found no one. Wounded and exhausted, he located a deserted hogan and built a fire, hoping that someone would come and find him. He had spent 24 days walking to reach this spot.150

Back at Inscription House, the family members of the Navajo men became worried because the day they were to return had passed. Family members held a ceremony to find out what happened to their family members. A medicine man told them all had died but one who was barely alive. A search party set out and found Atsidíík’áak’ëhé. They brought him home and prepared a healing ceremony and nursed him back to health.151

In Fort Defiance, Arizona, Indian Agent Arny received word about the problem brewing between the Mormons and Navajos. He hired Lorenzo Hubbell, who acted as a Spanish interpreter to accompany a Navajo man named Tótsohni Hastiin, or commonly known as Ganado Mucho, to verify these rumors.152 Tótsohni Hastiin was asked to go because he was

---

150 Tallsalt, “The Lone Survivor of the Navaho Trading Expedition to Utah Territory,” 119; Elkins contends that Atsidíík’áak’ëhé (Swiftwind) only walked about 160 miles. See Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 124; Hamblin states that he was told Atsidíík’áak’ëhé took thirteen days to reach home, see Hamblin, A Narrative, 142; Fullmer also states it took him only thirteen days to walk home. A direct route from Grass Valley to Inscription House is about 313 miles; going by Fullmer and Hamblin’s account, Atsidíík’áak’ëhé would have to travel 24 miles per day. If Tallsalt’s estimate that it took 24 days to travel the same distance, Atsidíík’áak’ëhé would have had to travel 13 miles per day, which seems more reasonable. See Fullmer, Already to Harvest, 123.

151 Tallsalt, “The Lone Survivor of the Navaho Trading Expedition to Utah Territory,” 119.

considered “the head chief of the Navajo nation.” Under the investigation of Tótsohnii Hastiin and Hubbell, they returned and reported that the incident was indeed serious and that the Navajo families of the murdered were quite upset.

The unfortunate incident created an excitement among the Mormons and the Navajos. When Brigham Young learned what had happened, he requested Hamblin to visit the Navajos to convince them that the Mormons had nothing to do with the incident. Around this same time another Mormon settlement company was being sent to Arizona led by John S. Blythe and Ira Hatch who were to join up with the remainder of the Haight Company of 1873. Hamblin traveled with the company until they reached Kanab. Fearing that war might break out, Hamblin left Kanab riding solo on January 28, 1874. Fifteen miles out of Kanab Hamblin was overtaken by his son, Joseph, bringing a note from Hamblin’s LDS bishop requesting him to return to Kanab fearing for Hamblin’s safety. Hamblin told his son to return home, telling his

---

153 Tótsohnii Hastiin is probably better known by his Spanish name, Ganado Mucho, meaning “Many Cattle;” James S. Brown, a Mormon missionary, called this Navajo man, Totoso-ne-Huste. See James S. Brown, Life of a Pioneer: Being the Autobiography of James S. Brown (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon & Sons Co., Printers, 1900), 473; in the Deseret News, it stated that Totoso-ne-Huste’s Spanish name was Garaju Namunche, and that he was the head chief of the Navajo Nation. See, Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 29 August 1877; Ganado Mucho was well known for his interactions with the Mexican and American governments before the Navajo Long Walk of 1863-1868. His leadership position continued even during the 1868 Navajo Treaty. Ten Navajo men were selected to represent all Navajo people; they were selected out of the thousands of people held as prisoners at Fort Sumner. Those ten then added two more men to join their ranks; Ganado Mucho was one of those added. The twelve men then selected Barboncito to be the main representative of the twelve and, ultimately, all the Navajo people sent to Fort Sumner. Ganado Mucho’s role was to be an area representative near the southwestern portion of the 1868 Treaty reservation boundaries. He did not stay within the reservation boundaries when he returned home after the Fort Sumner experience; he returned to an area outside the boundaries near towns now known as Ganado and Klagetoh, Arizona. Eventually his authority covered the western part of the 1868 treaty reservation. After the death of his friend Barboncito in 1870, Ganado Mucho took over his role as the leader of the Navajo people. For a biography on Ganado Mucho, see Virginia Hoffman and Broderick H. Johnson, Navajo Biographies (Chinle: Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1970), 155; for a general history of Ganado Mucho’s role in the 1868 treaty and appoint as a chief, see Robert W. Young, A Political History of the Navajo Tribe (Tsaile: Navajo Community College Press, 1978), 41-43.
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bishop that he would not return and continued his travels south into Arizona. He continued on until reaching the Mormon settlement Paria, where he decided to spend the night. Here his son again came with word from his bishop advising him to return or he might die at the hands of the Navajos he was going to visit. Ignoring the letter he continued his travels but with two new travelers who were on their way to Mowabby, which is north of Moenkopi.156

Whether or not these two travelers continued with Hamblin on his trip to visit the Navajos or if they were picked up at Mowabby is uncertain, but two brothers with the last name of Smith continued traveling with Hamblin.157 They arrived at Oraibi hoping to learn of the Navajos from the Hopis. Hamblin states that only one Paiute family and one Hopi woman remained at Oraibi. They learned that the Navajo families of the dead were quite upset, but the “older men” wanted a meeting.158 From here they went in search of the Indian named Musher, who was camped about 12 miles east of Moenkopi. Unable to find him at his home, they did come across a Navajo man on his way to the Mowabby area; he pointed Hamblin in the direction to travel to hold council with the Navajo families.

As “peacemaker,” Hamblin rode to meet with the Navajos by early February 1874. Upon his arrival, runners were sent out to inform expectant Navajo parties that the Mormons had finally arrived. While waiting, Hamblin started inquiring about the whereabouts of Hastele, the

156 Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 138. It is believed that the two men were mining at Mowabby. Mowabby is the name given to a Navajo camp in the surrounding area. The mining camp at Mowabby is currently known as Copper Mine, Arizona, about forty-five miles north of Tuba City/ Moenkopi, Arizona. Authors unfamiliar with the locations being spoken about have mistaken Mowabby as being the same location as Moenave or Moenkopi, but it is indeed a separate location. Paria is also spelled Pariah, Parea, or Pareah.

157 Brugge states that the Smith brothers were called J.E. Smith and Edward Smith. See Brugge, *Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City–Moencopi Area*, 14.

158 Hamblin also states that at this time Teuve was living at Moenkopi, but had left in fear of the Navajos greatly excited over the death of their men in Utah. See Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 138.
Navajo mediator appointed at Fort Defiance, but no answer was given. Hamblin and the Smith brothers were given accommodations for the night, and by the next day, the Navajos who had been sent for began to gather in the Navajo camp, belonging either to Táchii’níi or Peokon. 159

Peokon was the son of Tódích’ií’níi Nééz. 160

By noon people were ready for the talks to begin inside a “lodge” of some sort. 161 In all, there were twenty-four Navajos inside the lodge including Hamblin and the two Smith brothers. A few Navajos gathered at the entrance peering in. Hamblin and the Smith brothers were seated furthest from the entrance; these seats were typically reserved for the “guests of honor” and was not some tactical ploy to deter the guests from fleeing as Hamblin suggested. “Feeling trapped when given the places of honor at the rear of a forked-pole hogan with 24 Navajos between themselves and the entry,” 162 Hamblin noted that if they had to fight their way out, it would be impossible due to where they were sitting. 163

---

159 Táchii’níi (Red Forehead Clan) is phonetically spelled by Hamblin as Ketchene; see Hamblin, A Narrative, 139-140; John R. Young, a son of Brigham Young and Arizona settler, stated that this was Táchii’níi’s camp. See John R. Young, “The Navajo and Moqui Mission,” Improvement Era 17, no. 3 (January 1914): 247; in another account by Young, he stated that they were at Peokon’s camp. See John R. Young, “In Memory of Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, Interpreter and Scout of Southern Utah,” Improvement Era 25, no. 10 (August 1922): 886; Fullmer also states that this was at Peokon’s camp. See Fullmer, Already to Harvest, 124; Solomon calls Táchii’níi “Cochenia.” Solomon, journal entry of 6 February 1874, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon.”

160 Tietjen, Ernest Albert Tietjen, 25; according to Brugge, it is suggested that Peokon could be “a poor spelling of Bii’aghaani, ‘Backbone,’ a Navajo known to have lived in the area.” See Brugge, Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City–Moencopi Area, 14.

161 Hamblin describes this as a twenty by twelve foot lodge. The lodge was constructed of logs with one end set into the ground and the top end leaning to the center of the lodge and fitted together, with the lodge covered in about six inches of dirt. From the description it seems he might be describing a Navajo male hogan. With all hogans, the center is reserved for the fireplace, just as Hamblin describes, with the smoke escaping through a hole in the center part of the roof. Hamblin also states that there is only one entrance. All hogans are designed as such. See Hamblin, A Narrative, 137; Brugge believes that this was a forked-pole hogan. See Brugge, Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City–Moencopi Area, 15.

162 Brugge, Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City–Moencopi Area, 14-15.
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The Navajo council began by stating that they had lost good Navajo men under the guise of Jacob Hamblin’s talk of peace and trade, since Hamblin had told the Navajos that the Mormons were friendly and wanted to live peaceably next to them. He had promised the Navajos if they traveled to Utah to trade with the Mormons they would do so unharmed. The council argued that Hamblin broke his promise because Atsidíík’áak’éhé’s party was attacked by the Mormons. Out of the group of Navajos that were killed, two of them were the sons of Táchii’ni, and another was a son of Tódích’ii’nii Nééz. The Navajo speaker warned the Americans that if they wanted to live they should leave, but Hamblin “need not think of going home.” The Smith brothers told Hamblin that they would not leave without him, and as a precaution, the brothers armed themselves with their revolvers as the Navajos continued speaking.

After the charges against Hamblin were stated it was time for Hamblin to defend himself. Telling of his long acquaintance with the Navajos and efforts to keep peace between their people, he pleaded with the council that they would not kill him for something that he had no power to control.

The younger Navajos began talking against Hamblin again and brought in Atsidíík’áak’éhé to stir up animosity among the people. Feeling desperate, the Smith brothers prepared their revolvers, but Hamblin told them to remain calm. Hamblin’s Paiute interpreter

---

164 Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 163; Tietjen states that all four killed were the sons of Táchii’ni. See Tietjen, *Ernest Albert Tietjen*, 44; Brugge states that only two of the Navajos murdered were sons of Táchii’ni. See Brugge, *Historic Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City–Moencopi Area*, 14; also see Kildare, “Chief Scarbreast, Master Killer,” 22.
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suddenly stopped interpreting and “sat trembling, apparently with fear.” A short delay ensued before another Paiute interpreter could be found.\textsuperscript{166}

After much debate, the Navajo council decided that instead of a “blood revenge,” a payment of cattle and horses should be made for payment for their dead. The lone survivor and his fellow band “demanded ‘blood money’ from the Mormons.”\textsuperscript{167} The price was one hundred head of cattle for each of the three Navajos killed and fifty for Atsidíík’áak’éhé. All Hamblin would have to do is sign a promissory note saying that he would pay this amount and then he would be free to return home. Hamblin correctly concluded that signing the promissory note would be an admission of guilt and so he declined to sign.

One of the young Navajos in the group threatened that maybe Hamblin would pay if he was stretched over a bed of hot coals. Hamblin responded, “Let the Americans pay for their own mischief; I will not sign a writing to pay you one hoof.”\textsuperscript{168} The Navajo council again conversed among themselves and then asked Hamblin if he knew who Hastele was. Hamblin affirmed that he did. Hamblin told the council that in all difficulties, including this council, he knew he was required to speak through Hastele. An invitation was then offered to the council to have Hastele and any of the council members come to Utah so that they could learn the truth concerning what had happened. The council members again conversed among themselves and it was concluded that Hamblin would return to Mowabby in twenty-five days to see if it was okay to send a party

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., 142.

\textsuperscript{167} Bill P. Acrey, \textit{Navajo History: The Land and The People} (Shiprock, AZ: Department of Curriculum Materials Development, Central Consolidated School District No. 22, 2005), 85.

\textsuperscript{168} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 143.
of Navajos to Utah to satisfy their need for the truth. The council ended with a tentative peace restored.\textsuperscript{169}

The Navajos were not completely unreasonable or bloodthirsty as Harold Weight’s “Jacob Hamblin and the Death Council of the Navaho,” may suggest. The part of the story that is usually left out is that after the council, food was then brought in for Hamblin and the Smith brothers. Telling the group of Navajos he was feeling sick, Hamblin stepped out for a breath of fresh air and a Navajo woman came up to him and asked if there was something else she could get for him. Remembering that he liked milk, she went and got him some fresh goat milk. After drinking it, he returned back into the hogan and fell asleep until daybreak when there was enough light outside to gather their horses and return home.\textsuperscript{170}

While Hamblin held council with the Navajos, the Blythe Company continued towards Arizona. They left Kanab on February 7, but were held up for several weeks by a snowstorm and they resumed their travel on February 23.\textsuperscript{171} Short on supplies, Ira Hatch traveled north to Parowan, Utah, to obtain additional stores for the company. Meanwhile, Hamblin returned from his council with the Navajos, and met the Blythe Company at Lee’s Ferry, on their way to Moenkopi. Hamblin told the group that it was safe to make a settlement at Moenkopi, but suggested a smaller party of men only. The women and children were advised to wait until

\textsuperscript{169} For more information on the non-Navajo side of the story, see Harold Weight, “Jacob Hamblin and the Death Council of the Navaho,” \textit{Calico Print: Tales and Trails of the Desert West} 9 (July 1953): 8-11, 26; also see Jacob Hamblin, interviewed by Peter Gottfredson, “Jacob Hamblin Statement on Navajo Troubles at Grass Valley,” photocopy, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah; for the Navajo side of the story see, Tallsalt, “The Lone Survivor of the Navaho Trading Expedition to Utah Territory,” 117-119; also see Tso, “Curley Tso,” 92-108.

\textsuperscript{170} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 146.

\textsuperscript{171} Part of this company coming from Kanab, Utah, consisted of John S. Blythe and wife, Ira Hatch, Ole Anderson, William Henry Solomon, and John Everet. They were later joined by Jacob Hamblin, John Mangum and wife, Orval M. Allen, Frank Gilespie, John D. Lee, and several others. See Solomon, journal entry of 7 February 1874, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon.”
matters were settled with the Navajos. The last piece of advice given to Blythe was that they should not talk to the Navajos about the current difficulties Hamblin was having with them. William Henry Solomon indicated in his journal of the trip that Hamblin set up a time to meet with the Navajos again at the end of the twenty-fifth day and he was to bring Ira Hatch along with him. However, Hamblin found out that Hatch was still in Parowan gathering supplies and “Hamblin said, on account of the absence of Ira Hatch, he could not fulfill his promise. He then went back to Kanab, leaving us in a quandary as to whether it was wise to resume our journey.”172 The Blythe Company deliberated what they were going to do. They made the decision to continue on to Moenkopi.

While at Lee’s Ferry, John D. Lee decided to accompany the Blythe Company to Moenkopi, taking with him a herd of horned cattle. As the company moved further south, they made camp at Bitter Springs. Solomon recorded that while camped there three Navajo men (including Táchii’ni) and one woman came searching for Hamblin. Hatch had returned from Parowan with supplies and met with the Navajos, informing the Indians why “Hamblin had not fulfilled his word.” John R. Young related that Hamblin never made it back to Mowabby as scheduled and never met with Táchii’ni at the end of the twenty-fifth day. Young states that the Navajos had learned that Hamblin secretly visited the Hopis and then hurriedly returned home without visiting the Navajo chiefs as he had promised.173

---

172 Solomon, journal entry of February 1874, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon;” Fullmer states that Hamblin was on his way back to visit the Navajos at Moab, but left to go north to Paria. Hamblin also left a note stating that he thought it would be best if the Mormon party waited until they heard from the Hopis and Navajos. See Fullmer, Already to Harvest, 121.

173 Solomon, undated journal entry, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon”; John R. Young indicates that at the end of the twenty-five days, it was just an “unhappy misunderstanding.” Hamblin maintained that he kept his promise, while the Navajos affirmed that he secretly visited the Hopis without visiting them. See Young, “The Navajo and Moqui Mission,” 247. In the account by John Blythe, Fullmer states, “Previous to Jacobs’s arrival at the ferry, Ira in company with two others went to Paria for supplies and did not arrive in time to fill the appointment and
Hamblin’s own account relates that as it got closer to the time appointed to reconvene with the Navajos, he found it impossible to make the trip because of health problems. Hamblin made his way back to Mowabby for the next council but only found Táchii’nii and a “deputation” from the Hopis waiting for him. Táchii’nii renewed his demands for livestock from the Mormons. Hamblin stated that he would have to talk to the Mormon leaders in Utah and could make no promises. Following their meeting, Hamblin visited the Hopis. He asked them to tell the Navajos that he had arrived as promised but found no one there and if they wanted to parlay further they needed to come visit him in Utah.174

Meanwhile, Hatch met with the Navajos at Bitter Springs and they came to an agreement to meet again in ten days for a council.175 At the conclusion of this meeting, the Blythe Company continued their travels to Moenkopi, which they found unoccupied. The Hopis had returned to their homes on the mesas because they feared hostility between the Navajos and Mormons.176

The next day, Teuve and three other Hopis came to visit the pioneers. Teuve invited the use of their homes at Moenkopi until the Mormons could build their own. Blythe took residence in Teuve’s house. Teuve explained to them that at Oraibi they had plenty of snow and they would remain closer to Oraibi for the upcoming season and were not planning on coming back to

with Hamblin in Kanab, no one met with the Indians.” During Táchii’nii’s visit to Blythe’s camp, Táchii’nii became quite upset in learning that Jacob Hamblin would not keep his appointment. See Fullmer, *Already to Harvest*, 121, 122, 124; Elkins also portrays that Hamblin came for the scheduled council, only to find that the Navajos were not present. After waiting several days, Hamblin decided to return to Utah. Hatch stressed concern that Hamblin may have gone to the wrong location or had been misinformed by his interpreter. See Elkins, *Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary*, 126.

174 Hamblin, *A Narrative*, 156.


176 Fullmer, *Already to Harvest*, 123.
Moenkopi that year. The Hopis also showed the Mormons the best places to farm. Teuve showed the land Hamblin had sold to Lee, but explained that if the Mormons planted anything, Teuve would claim anything grown. He issued a warning that the Mormons could not use the water from Moenkopi Wash and any produce grown using this water would be taken by the Hopis. The Mormons were only allowed to use the water from the surrounding springs for this planting season because the following year the Hopis were planning on returning to Moenkopi. Hence, the Mormons could stay in the area and use whatever water the Hopi people could spare. As soon as the planting season began, the Mormons disregarded Teuve’s warning and began irrigating with water from Moenkopi Wash.  

At the end of the ten days, accompanied by company leader Blythe, Hatch visited the Navajos as promised. Teuve is said to have been their guide to Táchii’níi’s camp, but along the way they ran into a Navajo man that guided them to the camp. Knowing that they would get to their destination, Teuve returned home. In returning to the same hogan where Hamblin’s council had been held, most authors portray the incident as “Ira and Blythe were put on trial for their

---

177 Ibid., 125. Fullmer states that this is when the Mormons began planting fruit trees and grapevines.

lives.\textsuperscript{179} Hamblin placed full blame on Blythe and Hatch stating that they had disregarded his advice to not talk with the Navajos about the problems that he was having with them.\textsuperscript{180}

Just as Hamblin and the Smith brothers were allowed to sit at the end of the hogan, furthest from the door, so were Hatch and Blythe. The Navajos blamed the Mormons for killing their men and the Mormons blamed the deaths on other Americans. To intimidate the Mormon men, a Navajo man took a butcher knife and cut off the buttons to Blythe’s coat, and threateningly placed the knife across his throat to frighten him. Peokon urged the council that something had to be done. After a “long heated discussion,” Átsidi K’aak’éhii was brought in and he showed his wounds to the Mormons. It was then decided that there needed to be some sort of restitution made. Since Ira Hatch had married Peokon’s sister, Sarah, they decided his life should be spared. The Navajos chose Blythe as a sacrifice to avenge the death of the other three Navajos who died in Utah.

Before being put to death, Blythe calmly stated, “Tell them I wish to pray, that then I will be ready to die.” After he had finished praying, the Navajos asked for an interpretation of his prayer. Hatch stated that Blythe asked the “great Father” not to punish the Navajos because “they knew not what they were doing.” He reiterated that the Mormons had not killed the Navajos and actually were the best friends the Navajos had. To prove this, he was willing to die

\textsuperscript{179} Young, “The Navajo and Moqui Mission,” 247; Fullmer states that Blythe and Ira Hatch began making their way to Táchii’nii’s camp on April 2, 1874. She also states that Teuve was used as a guide to Táchii’nii’s camp. See Fullmer, \textit{Already to Harvest}, 125.

\textsuperscript{180} Hamblin, \textit{A Narrative}, 156-157; Young also affirms this by stating, “A statement in regard to the breaking up of the Navajo and Moqui Mission, which was brought about by the unwise talk of brethren laboring at the Moencopy, as Brother Hamblin affirms in his biography.” See Young, “The Navajo and Moqui Mission,” 247.
in hopes that this would open the eyes of the Navajos to the truth and that “his blood might bring 
peace and friendship to the two nations.”  

This prayer created a division between the Navajo council. After a long discussion 
Peokon asked his brother-in-law, Hatch, if he would take a group of Navajos to show them who 
killed their kinsmen. Hatch replied no, arguing that this would only lead to more bloodshed. 
Furthermore, the Mormons did not seek to avenge the murder of George Albert Smith, Jr., “the 
son of one of our chiefs,” at the hands of the Navajos. This angered the Navajos who insisted 
that Hatch and Blythe go to their leaders and request payment in the form of cattle for the deaths 
of the Navajo kinsmen. If nothing was delivered within thirty days, they threatened to kill all the 
Mormons “on this side of the river.”  

William Henry Solomon mentioned that the reason the 
Navajos pressured the Mormons for retribution payment of livestock was, “They said they knew 
no difference in Mormons and other Americans and therefore held us to be responsible for the 
difficulties which occurred in Utah and demanded as retribution 200 head of horses and horned 
stock.”  

As Blythe and Hatch returned to Moenkopi, the Mormons held a council trying to decide 
what to do. They ended up writing a letter to Brigham Young asking how to handle this 
situation. The letter was carried to Utah, which was then telegraphed to Salt Lake City. The 

---

181 Young, “The Navajo and Moqui Mission,” 247; Elkins states that Hatch and Blythe were threatened by 
being burned to death; see Elkins, Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 125-127. 

182 Young, “In Memory of Ira Hatch,” 886; also see Solomon, undated journal entry, “Autobiography of 
William Henry Solomon.” 

answer came that Young should travel to Moenkopi and rescue the Mormons there until friendship with the Navajos could be reestablished.\textsuperscript{184}

Meanwhile, Atsidiik’áak’éhé was completely healed; he could not stop thinking about what had happened and he wanted to get even. Revenge was “all he thought about.” In retaliation for what had happened to him, Atsidiik’áak’éhé gathered five other Navajos to return to Utah to exact his revenge. They came upon a sheep camp near “White Face Mountain” in Utah. Atsidiik’áak’éhé showed no mercy, killing two white men, two women, and two children; if you can excuse the pun, to bury the hatchet.\textsuperscript{185}

Through the Paiute grapevine, word reached the Mormons in southern Utah about the need to rescue the Mormons at Moenkopi before the Navajo killed them. Andrew S. Gibbons, Thomas Chamberlain, and Franklin Hamblin quickly gathered six men each to go to the Moenkopi area, including Jacob Hamblin. Upon arriving at the Moenkopi area, the settlers there “were fearful of a massacre.” “The women and children in the company ran out to meet the rescuers, crying and laughing and praising the Lord, near-hysterical with joy at their deliverance.”\textsuperscript{186} Hamblin took five men with him to visit the Hopis at Oraibi on his way to the Navajo Agency headquarters located at Fort Defiance, but the Hopis persuaded him not to go any further. They claimed that the Navajos would kill him if they captured him, and he decided to return to Moenkopi and assist in taking all of the Mormons back to Utah. Blythe insisted that a

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid. Solomon states that it was not thirty days, but they were given two and half months to make the retribution payment.

\textsuperscript{185} Tso, “Curley Tso,” 101.

\textsuperscript{186} Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 177; Elkins states that John R. Young, along with a 60-man mounted guard, traveled to Moenkopi to assist the settlers back to Utah; see Elkins, \textit{Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary}, 127-28.
small group stay behind at Moenkopi to show their strength, to show that they were not afraid so Blythe and several men stayed at Moenkopi.\footnote{Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 174.}

On March 3, 1874, Hamblin wrote a letter to the Navajo agent in Fort Defiance to beg for assistance and to plead his case stating that trouble had arisen as a result of Navajos who were killed by “strangers.” In accordance to the 1871 peace treaty Hamblin made with Barboncito, an invitation was given for the Navajo agent to send two or three Navajo headmen accompanied by a Spanish interpreter to settle the matter in Utah. Hamblin pleaded for assistance, stating that the Mormons had a settlement at Moenkopi.\footnote{Jacob Hamblin to Navajo agent, 7 March 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.}

On March 28, Hamblin’s letter was received and answered by the Navajo agent W.F.M. Arny. He told Hamblin to send a Mormon delegation to Fort Defiance and Arny would gather the current Navajo leaders of the Navajo Reservation, Ganado Mucho and Huero, and try to gather the Navajo families affected by the Grass Valley incident. With this meeting Arny was hoping to keep peace, stating that “arrangements can be made to protect the Mormons, miners and settlers who may be off the Moquis and Navajo lands, and define where such persons can settle without being molested by the two tribes.”\footnote{W.F.M. Arny, Navajo agent, to Jacob Hamblin, 28 March 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.}

Arny wrote a second letter to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Colonel L. Edwin Dudley in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Arny accused the Mormons of being “anxious to encroach and settle upon the Moqui and Navajo lands” and “that they are willing to pay for a peace with them.” The Mormons were said to “demoralize” the Indians and John D. Lee of Lee’s Ferry was
encouraging the Indians to steal from “Gentiles.” Arny wanted Hamblin to come to Fort
Defiance to hold a meeting with the Navajos “to find out fully the intention of the Mormons in
their encroachment upon our Indians.” As for the murdered Navajos from Grass Valley, Arny
blamed the Mormons and felt that the incident could be used against them “to prevent the
settlement of the Mormons too near to either the Moquis or the Navajo reservations.”

By the spring of 1874 a party of Navajos traveled to Utah to check out the scene of the
killings. Upon returning to Kanab from Moenkopi, Hamblin found Hastele with a party of
Navajos, a Mr. Boyd and two interpreters from the Navajo Agency all waiting for him. Feeling
his family had been neglected for too long, Hamblin sent Ammon M. Tenney with Hastele to
travel north to the Grass Valley. Later, after reconsidering, Hamblin had a sudden attack of pain
in one of his knees, which he viewed as a heavenly sign to go. He caught up with Tenney and
Hastele and accompanied them to the Grass Valley.

There, Hamblin requested the assistance of local Mormons. Helaman Pratt and Mr.
Thurber, the local LDS bishop in Richfield, Utah, responded to the request. Hamblin, Tenney
and Hastele arrived before the two Mormons from Richfield. While they were waiting, a number
of travelers passed by. When Pratt and Thurber approached, Hastele supposedly stood up and
proclaimed “they are good men, men of God.” As the two Mormon men dismounted, Hastele
greeted them in “true Navajo style.” Before Hastele could be taken to the spot where the
Navajos were killed, Hastele told Hamblin that he did not need to go any further, believing that
since the Mormons had gone out of their way to show them the truth, then they must have been

190 Ibid.
191 Hamblin, A Narrative, 158.
192 Ibid., 159.
telling the truth and was glad about it, because this showed to Hastele that the Mormons were truly their friends. Now he would return to his people and report to them what had transpired and Hastele began making his way back to Arizona, while Hamblin stayed to show Boyd and the two interpreters from the Navajo agency the place where the Navajos were murdered.193

Tensions abated somewhat and in April John W. Young sent a letter to the Mormon settlements east of St. George, Utah, stating that Jacob Hamblin, Ira Hatch, Thales H. Haskell, Samuel Knight, and Ammon Tenney were called as missionaries to assist John S. Blythe in forming a Mormon settlement at Moenkopi. Even though these “missionaries” were asked to return to northern Arizona, their main purpose was to help “maintain peace, and in cultivating more extended friendly relations with the Indians.”194 According to a family member of the Hatch family, Richard Ira Elkins states in his book Ira Hatch: Indian Missionary, 1835-1909: PU-AM-EY that Blythe supposedly received another letter stating that the colonizing party was “to have a paper drawn up, and have Chief Tuba sign it, regarding the land he gave us prior to our previous departure.” This was to explain to the Indians that this did not give the Mormons ownership of the land; only the government could do so. After a survey of the land, Blythe was then required to send a copy to the Mormons in St. George and one to the government officials at Fort Defiance.195 There is no indication that this occurred or any suggestion that Blythe ever returned to Moenkopi, and it was not until December 1875 when another Mormon group finally embarked to Moenkopi.

193 Ibid., 160.

194 John W. Young to the Brethren at the Settlements S.E. of St. George, 6 April 1874, photocopy, John W. Young: Letters, HBLL.

Concurrently, Moqui Indian Agent William S. Defrees wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, reporting that the Hopis living at Moenkopi had vacated the area because of the recent trouble between the Navajos and Mormons (see Appendix C for subsequent list of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs). He reported that the Mormons were already settled at Moenave and at another settlement fifteen miles away, and that the Mormons were contemplating a settlement at Moenkopi. He wanted to thwart the Mormon colonization plan by relocating more Hopis to the Moenkopi area. The Indian agent also felt apprehensive about the problems that could occur with the growing number of Mormons and the need to create an Indian reservation to “shut out these Mormons.”

Defrees suggested that the creation of a reservation would block Mormon expansionism southward and prevent them from settling the Little Colorado River.

As the wound of the Grass Valley incident continued to fester, Mormon residents at Moenkopi sent a petition to the New Mexico Superintendent of Indian Affairs Colonel L. Edward Dudley and Navajo Agent Arny on April 30. They reaffirmed their innocence and stated that the guilty party was not Mormons but “gentiles” who lived in Utah. The Mormons also stated that the Navajos demanded the payment of 192 horses, 100 cattle and “other property;” the Mormons felt it was unreasonable and unjust to pay these fines for something they had no part in. The Mormons were optimistic that their letter would help avert the “threatening evil of an Indian war.”

---

196 William S. Defrees, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Edward P. Smith, 8 April 1874, photocopy, JSBC.

197 John R. Young to Superintendent of Indian Affairs and U.S. Indian Agent, 30 April 1874, typescript, JSBC.
Several days later, Hamblin wrote a letter to the “Chiefs of the Navajo Nation” reminding them of the peace treaty he made with Barboncito at Fort Defiance in 1871. He reiterated that the incident in Grass Valley was not caused by Mormons, but by a “stranger” and another request was made for the Navajos to send a delegation to Utah to resolve the matter. Until then, he asked them “to keep on your own side of the River Colorado, and we will keep on our own side, until this thing is amicably settled and well understood by both parties.”

Nine days later agent Arny wrote another letter about the Grass Valley incident to Superintendent Dudley on May 12. Arny held a meeting with the grieving Navajo families and through this they came to several conclusions. The Navajos promised not to go to war until peace could be established and as long as the Navajo agency could provide them with corn and beef, “which dire necessity requires them to have and which they can get by depredation on the settlements if not furnished to them.” These Navajo families lived off of the reservation: Arny felt that they only lived off of the reservation because the Navajo agency did not have enough provisions to care for them. In addition, many of the Navajo herds had died due to a harsh winter season, leaving the Navajos famished.

Whether or not Arny had sufficient proof to support his next claim is uncertain, but Arny finally agreed that McCarty was not a Mormon. Nevertheless, he insisted McCarty had the assistance of four Mormons who helped attack and kill the Navajos at Grass Valley and took their horses and property.

---

198 Jacob Hamblin to Chiefs of the Navajo Nation, 3 May 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.

199 W.F.M. Arny, Navajo agent, to Superintendent of Indian Affairs Col. L. Edwin Dudley, 12 May 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.

200 Tietjen, Ernest Albert Tietjen, 45. Tietjen states that rumor indicated that a member of the McCarty party was a Mormon named “Clinger.”
involved were also involved with the Mountain Meadows Massacre. A request was made that two relatives be sent to Washington, D.C., to help calm the Indians and enable the U.S. government to work things out with the Navajos. If Arny’s plea was ignored, he believed that war was imminent.

On June 3, Arny became frustrated in learning that Superintendent Dudley was absent and Arny turned to the New Mexico commanding officer, Col. J. Irvine Gregg to step in and assist him. A company of New Mexico soldiers was requested to accompany Arny to Lee’s Ferry to meet with the Mormons and Navajos, claiming that this trip would help avert war. Dudley returned and wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs contending Arny did not have authority outside of the Navajo Reservation and that Arny was not the appropriate man to handle this situation. Dudley actually thought that Arny’s request for an armed escort would just cause more hostility among the Navajos and said there was no need for an escort.

As Hamblin returned from showing the remaining party the Grass Valley scene, he finally made his way back home to Kanab. There he found Hastele awaiting his arrival. What they discussed is uncertain, but as a result of their discussion, Hamblin and Ammon Tenney decided that they should go to Fort Defiance to state their case in the matter of the murdered Navajos. They arrived on August 21, 1875. While there they came across a Mr. Daniels who was sent by the U.S. government to inspect the Indian agencies. “Learning of the Utah difficulty with the Navajos, he made an effort to throw blame on the ‘Mormons.’” By chance Átsidí

---

201 W.F.M. Arny, Navajo agent to Col. J. Irvine Gregg, 3 June 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.

202 L. Edwin Dudley, Superintendent of Indian Affairs to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Edward P. Smith, 19 June 1874, photocopy, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: Correspondence, HBLL.

203 Hamblin, A Narrative, 160.
K’aak’éhii happened to be at Fort Defiance and was examined by Mr. Daniels. Mr. Boyd and the two interpreters who accompanied Hamblin and the Navajo party to the Grass Valley gave a favorable report exonerating the Mormons of any wrongdoing. Feeling that peace had been reestablished between the Navajos and the Mormons, Hamblin made his way back home to Utah.

In September a delegation of Navajos traveled to Salt Lake City and met with Brigham Young. A Mormon missionary familiar with the Navajo language, James S. Brown, was called to assist in interpreting Navajo, but arrived too late to assist. Nevertheless, Young asked Brown to visit the Navajos and Hopis in Arizona and establish friendly relations with them and teach them the gospel. Young also knew Brown could survey northern Arizona to prepare the area for Mormon colonization.204

---

204 Brown states that he was called to teach the Indians the “truth.” See Brown, Life of a Pioneer, 449; also see Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 182.
Chapter 3

Expanding the Zion Curtain: James S. Brown and the Founding of Tuba City

To lead the new exploring party to the Little Colorado River, Brigham Young chose James S. Brown, giving him permission to choose who would go with him, but warning him not to choose any “babies.”¹ At a General Conference held on October 9, 1875, missionaries received their official notice to serve in this new mission. Mormon historian Charles Peterson argued that Young called three men to succeed where others had failed: to fulfill his hopes of settling the region of Arizona and northern Mexico. Brown was called as a missionary to the Hopis and Navajos, Lot Smith to colonize the Little Colorado, and Daniel W. Jones to colonize Mexico (see Figure 10).²

By December 1875, Brown arrived in Moenkopi. After exploring the area he decided to construct a missionary station a short distance away from Moenkopi near Musher Springs, named after a resident Navajo. The construction of a stone fort began but none of his missionaries were too excited about staying in such an arid environment. Brown described the place as having a deserted farm and stone “huts” nearby.³


² Charles S. Peterson, “‘A Mighty Man was Brother Lot’: A Portrait of Lot Smith – Mormon Frontiersman,” The Western Historical Quarterly 1, no. 4 (October 1970): 397; since northern Arizona is the focus of this thesis, Daniel W. Jones’s colonization mission will largely be ignored. For further reading on Jones’s mission, see Daniel W. Jones, Forty Years Among the Indians (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor, 1890).

³ Brown, Life of a Pioneer, 454.
Ira Hatch and Thales Haskell traveled to Oraibi and came back with Teuve and his wife, who were “highly pleased to see their old Mormon friends.” Several days later Brown took four men with him on an exploration trip up the Little Colorado while he left the rest to build the fort. The cold weather made it difficult to lay the foundation and delayed construction. After exploring, Brown left his men on January 1876 to return to Salt Lake City to report to Young on his accomplishments in Arizona. By March 8, he returned to his men and found them progressing. They had finished the stone fort and dug an irrigation ditch about three miles long with a dam and reservoir. They plowed the ground and planted wheat.4

The Mormons renamed Musher Springs to Tuba City in 1878. When analyzing the events surrounding the establishment of the Mormon settlement at Tuba City, four variations of the story emerge. Comparing the accounts from the Hopis, Navajos, Mormons, and the U.S. government, offers historians the opportunity to ascertain what actually occurred and provide an understanding of the various perspectives of the participants involved.

The Mormon Account of the Founding of Tuba City

Mormons had a missionary zeal to convert Indians to Christianity and wanted to preach their version of faith to the Hopis. Among missionaries Teuve would exclaim, “I am a Hopi!” and the Mormons came to understand this was an expression of righteousness or desire to be righteous, understanding that the word “Hopí” meant “righteous, peaceful, cooperative.”5

---

4 Ibid., 454, 458.

5 Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 68; George S. Tanner and J. Morris Richards, *Colonization on the Little Colorado: The Joseph City Region* (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1977), 130; Hopi author Harry C. James states that the word Hopi is an abbreviated version of the word Hopitu-shinumu which Hopis use to call themselves,
mind of Mormon missionary Andrew Gibbons, there was a bond of appreciation since the
Mormons called themselves “Saints” and saw themselves as a righteous people. In their minds it
only seemed natural that Teuve would want to be associated with them. The role of Teuve also
becomes elevated during this time, from a member of the Oraibi Hopi population to “chief” of
the Oraibi people. Teuve was either elected by the Hopi council or through Mormon meddling,
knowing that without Teuve they did not have official claim to the land because Teuve may not
have been the “chief” that they actually needed.

Mormon settlers of the time and modern historians have all designated Teuve as a
“chief,” but this term can be misleading. It is uncertain what type of “chief” Teuve was. Among
the Hopi there are several leadership positions that can fall under this term of “chief.” The Hopi
people have no legislative body, but do have a council of “chiefs” of the ceremonial societies or
Clan Chiefs headed by the Village Chief. Usually each community has a Village Chief and this
person is the designated leader from the Bear Clan, to which Teuve did not belong. There is also
a War Chief who is in charge of the military aspects and policing of the Hopi people. Each
village also has a religious and secular leader, or Crier Chiefs.6 It is possible that Teuve was a
Clan Chief, meaning he would have been a lead representative of the Water or Corn clan he
belonged to but he had no authority to donate Hopi lands to the Mormons.

meaning “People of Peace.” “As a whole they are well integrated, well balanced, highly intelligent, honest, hard-
working – a people truly at peace with their environment and desirous of peace with their neighbors.” But,
throughout the book James calls the Hopi people, “little people of peace.” Typically against the idea of war, the
Hopi did engage in war to defend themselves and at times to take revenge on weaker tribes. An example of this is
when U.S. soldiers used Hopis to attack Navajos. See Harry C. James, The Hopi Indians: Their History and Their
Culture (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, LTD., 1956), 37.

6 James, The Hopi Indians, 105-107.
Moenkopi is typically referred to as a daughter settlement of Oraibi and was governed under the authority of the Oraibi council and the Bear clan. The first recognized kikmongwi, or “village chief” of Moenkopi has been identified as a woman named Mashilaywi of the Short Corn clan. This is a good example of someone not of the Bear Clan governing a Hopi village, but she was given the authority to govern Moenkopi by the Hopi council at Oraibi and not by Teuve.

Early Mormon journals and accounts do not designate Teuve as a chief in their early interaction. It is not until after Tuba City is colonized that Teuve gains this title, perhaps because “Chief” Teuve authorized the Mormons to settle the land and the Mormons promised to give Teuve “horses, plows, and scrapers necessary to build dams and ditches and plow the land for farming.” Recounting this monumental moment, historian Helen Bay Gibbons states that “In recognition of growing warmth of Hopi-Mormon relationships, Chief Tuba gave the land outright to the Mormons for settlement and as a missionary base.” It is said that Hamblin was overcome with such emotion that he told Teuve, “You are a fine man and a good saint. I shall

---


8 Courtlander, The Fourth World of the Hopis, 192; Chuka, a Hopi, also states that the first chief of Moenkopi was Nashilehwi, of the Corn clan, spelled just a little differently from Courlander’s spelling. Chuka states, “She had brothers there during that time, but they were not [made chief]. They were the helpers of that woman. That’s how they worked, all together.” Chuka, “Women as Chiefs,” in Hopi Voices: Recollections, Traditions, and Narratives of the Hopi Indians (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 134-135.

9 Tanner and Richards, Colonization on the Little Colorado, 130.

10 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 176.
write Brother Brigham of your kindness and ask that the town, when built, shall be called ‘Tuba City’ so the world will remember you and your good works forever.”¹¹

It was through this remembering that the Tuba City/Moenkopi area which was once a “land of tortured rock, hot sun, and wild winds strange and awesome” became home to a cluster of sandstone homes for the Latter-day Saints.¹² Even though Indians continued to graze their sheep and cattle on the land surrounding the little settlement, it was through the Mormon colonization that the Tuba City region blossomed into an oasis in the desert.

The Hopi Version

Hopi tradition acknowledges the Hopi settlement of Moenkopi occurred when “Teuvi of the Corn Clan took his family and went there to live.”¹³ The reason he left the protection of the main Hopi settlements at Oraibi remains contested. The general idea is that there was a disagreement between the clans in Oraibi and Teuve was expelled. Hopi author Albert Yava indicates that “the name Teuvi means Thrown Away, and they may have called him that because he was ‘thrown away’ by the Oraibis and had to leave the village.”¹⁴

---

¹¹ Phoenix Gazette (Phoenix), 1 August 1969; a Deseret News article about the dedication of a bronze monument to Chief Tuba (Teuve) and the Hopi Indians in Tuba City quotes Elder George Albert Smith, Sr. Smith states that Chief Tuba aided the early Saints and “protected them from hostile Apaches and Navajos.” The land, which is now known as Tuba City, was given as a gift to the Mormons by Chief Tuba. See Deseret News (Salt Lake City), 12 May 1941.


¹⁴ Yava, 116-117; Courtlander also concurs about the translation of “Tuvi, meaning outcast or rejected one.” See Courtlander, The Fourth World of the Hopis, 192; the Arizona Republic does not expand on Teuve, only
Some forty miles from Oraibi, the Hopis used Moenkopi to grow cotton because they feared Paiute and Navajo raids on food crops. Teuve’s invitation for Mormons to settle at Moenkopi during 1873 “was to act as a protection against such raids, thus enabling Hopis to plant food crops there.” Teuve also likely converted to Mormonism for the advantage and protection they offered.

As Brown was trying to work out the problems with his missionary company and the colonization companies, the Mormons were still considered to be the first Christian group to gain a foothold among the Hopis. The Mormons at Musher Springs had considerable contact with Teuve “and some other Oraibi Hopis who were beginning to spend more time at the small farming colony of Moencopi.” “Here they persuaded a man of the Pumpkin Clan named Tuvi and his wife to adopt their religion, the first Hopis to join the Mormon Church.” Due to this stating that he was considered “a fugitive from the Hopi tribes farther east.” See Arizona Republic (Phoenix), 24 July 1932.

15 Louis Sr. Numkena, “Moencopi and Tuba City,” in Hopi Voices: Recollections, Traditions, and Narratives of the Hopi Indians, ed. Harold Courtlander (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 123; Sekaquaptewa states that it was a hazard to spend long periods of time at Moenkopi because of Navajo raiders. After the Mormons established a settlement at Tuba City, Hopis began living at Moenkopi year-round. Sekaquaptewa, Me and Mine, 37.


17 Mormon missionary William Henry Solomon stated that “The Indians in the Oribi [sic] villages were friendly and seemed anxious to have the people settle among them for protection from hostile Navajos.” See William Henry Solomon, journal entry of 1 June 1873, “Autobiography of William Henry Solomon: From his Original Journal,” unpaginated, typescript, Journal of William Henry Solomon Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter abbreviated as HBLL.


contact and friendship, Teuve was baptized a member of the Mormon Church on March 25, 1876.\textsuperscript{20}

Oraibi had become a center of conflict and was at a crossroads due to changes occurring from contact with Mormons and Americans. One faction wanted to distance themselves from whites while the other welcomed change resulting from white contact. Those who supported Christianity were expelled and they traveled to Moenkopi and settled there.\textsuperscript{21} The word for Christian in the Hopi language is “Ka-Hopi,” meaning, “Not a Hopi.” Oraibi Hopis used this derogatory word to refer to Teuve.\textsuperscript{22}

In an account by a descendent of Lololma, the division between Lololma and Teuve occurred when Mormons were making a return trip to Utah and stopped at Oraibi. The Mormons apparently informed the Hopis that a “small epidemic” had been plaguing America. They asked Lololma permission to vaccinate the Hopis, but it was declined. “So they went around and find [sic] somebody that could give them permission to do this.”\textsuperscript{23} Upon entering a kiva, the Mormons found Teuve and another man weaving and asked them to give them permission to vaccinate the children. Both told them, “No, we not the chief. We can’t do that.” The Mormons went back and forth between Lololma and Teuve asking for permission, doing so three or four times. Finally, Teuve finally gave the Mormons permission. An announcement was made and a

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{20}{Gibbons, \textit{Saint and Savage}, 181-182.}
\footnotetext{22}{James, \textit{The Hopi Indians}, 41.}
\footnotetext{23}{Robert Sakiestewa, interview by Charles S. Peterson, 13 September 1967, interview 149b, transcript, Doris Duke Oral Indian History, Manuscript Collections, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. Hereafter anything from the Doris Duke Oral Indian History Collection will have the following abbreviation, DDOI. Sakiestewa stated that Lololma was his grandfather.}
\end{footnotes}
number of Hopi children were brought to the kiva to be vaccinated. As the vaccinating began, an old Chief came and stopped everything. Lololma was informed of what had taken place and Teuve and the other Hopi with him at the kiva were evicted from Oraibi. Teuve headed to Moenkopi and the other man headed to New Mexico to live among some other Pueblos.

In a similar account, Teuve was said to be a counselor to Lololma and that when the Mormons asked permission to vaccinate the children, Lololma asked Teuve what to do. Teuve advised that it would be beneficial and as the Mormons began, they took out a pocketknife and scraped down the side of a child’s arm, which made him cry out in pain. This alarmed Lololma and he told them to stop immediately. Teuve and Lololma began arguing over the matter and as a result Teuve was kicked out of Oraibi. This supposedly occurred at the same time the Mormons were going to Fort Defiance. When the Mormons returned from Fort Defiance, they picked up Teuve and his wife and returned with them to Utah. After spending several years in Utah they returned to Arizona, relocating at Moenkopi. The only recorded incident of Teuve and his wife spending several years in Utah living among the Mormons would have taken place in November 1870, when Teuve was accompanied by Jacob Hamblin. Hamblin was returning from Fort Defiance and returning to St. George.

As Teuve gave the Mormons permission to live in Moenkopi, they built him a stone house. Supposedly, Teuve placed a stone marker on one of the walls of his new house. This was to remind the Mormons “who that land belongs to.”

---

24 Emil Pooley, interview by D. Corydon Hammond, 4 September 1967, interview 74, transcript, DDOI.
26 Emil Pooley, interview by D. Corydon Hammond, 4 September 1967, interview 74, transcript, DDOI.
When James Brown decided to move the Mormon camp closer to Musher Springs, it put them in closer proximity to the site of Navajo cornfields, which created another obstacle for amicable Mormon-Navajo relations. Those cornfields belonged to a Navajo man named Bilindal chinni who resided in a stone house near his cornfields before the Mormons arrived. One day he came upon some cattle tracks in his cornfield and followed them to a Mormon camp northwest of his place. Upon finding the Mormons, Bilindal chinni ordered them to leave, “which they promised to do,” but soon found out through a Paiute that they had just moved to Moenkopi. He then went to find them and saw that they were in the process of building houses of stone. Bilindal chinni asked them they what they intended to do. The Mormons replied that they wanted to stay the winter, since it was already the fall season. Bilindal chinni complained that the Mormons eventually moved up around his farm and settled there. Ultimately the Mormons “took possession” of his farm and “forced him off of it.” The Navajo man tried to fight to retain his property, but failed to push them out and soon abandoned his property out of disgust for the Mormons.

In an affidavit of a Navajo man named Atsidí, the area headman and father to Tódích’íi’nii Nééz, he stated that there had been Navajos living in the Tuba City/Moenkopi area

---


28 In an interview with Bilindal chinni, he complained about Mormons taking away his farm, which was “laid right in the middle of the present village of Tuba City, and they have never paid him for this property.” See Bilindal chinni, Affidavit, JSBC; James B. Williams, “Affidavit,” John S. Boyden Collection, HBLL. Hereafter anything from the John S. Boyden Collection will have the following abbreviation, JSBC; Atsidi’s (Et-zit-tee) affidavit also collaborates with Bilindal chinni’s story. See Et-zit-tee, affidavit, 1 Aug 1898, Typescript, JSBC.
well before the Mormons (see Figure 11). The Mormons built a dam up the Moenkopi Wash. Doing so put them into competition for the limited water supply, competing with Navajo dams above their own. The Mormons complained about this constantly, but “Somehow, they made an agreement for the Navajos to use the water first and then let the water run down for the Mormons to use.” There are other stories that collaborate with this agreement between the Navajos and Mormons, wherein the Navajos had first rights to the area’s water. There is also plenty of evidence that the Mormons wanted to get along with their Native neighbors, but it was their expropriation of limited water sources that upset the Hopis and Navajos the most.

The Government Version

It is believed that Jacob Hamblin came to the Moenkopi area and asked the Hopis for “permission to plant that season, and to water his stock, which was granted, and that Hamlin (Hamblin) sold, or claimed to have sold, the land to other Mormons, who refused to vacate, and have excluded them from Moqui Indians.” When the spring season arrived the Hopis returned

---

29 Et-zit-tee, affidavit.

30 David M. Brugge, interview of Joe Dale in “Moenkopi Survey,” photocopy, in “Preliminary Survey of Indian Land Use-Moenkopi Area, 1967,” David M. Brugge Collection, Center of Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Hereafter anything from the David M. Brugge Collection will have the following abbreviation, DMBC.

31 Author William Haas Moore stated that “When Ganado Mucho had welcomed the Latter Day [sic] Saints to the area, he had also warned them not to appropriate the springs. His warnings had been ignored.” This probably refers to: Brown, Life of a Pioneer, 473. See William Haas Moore, Chiefs, Agents & Soldiers: Conflict on the Navajo Frontier, 1868-1882 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 264.

32 E.A. Hayt, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Indian agent William R. Mateer, 14 August 1879, photocopy, JSBC.
to the area to plant their crops as they had done in the past, but “the Mormons said, oh no! we have bought this place from Mr. Hamlin and you can’t plant here.”

No matter how the Mormons originally came into possession of the Musher Springs area, in the eyes of the United States the Mormons had settled on unsurveyed public lands and they were viewed as squatters.

It just so happened that at the same time, sometime during December 1875 through February 1876, the new Hopi agent assigned to the area, W. B. Truax, continued the previous agents’ attempts at encouraging the Hopis to farm at Moenkopi in order to deter Mormon immigrants from settling along the Little Colorado.” As a result Truax wanted to establish a reservation for the Hopis to protect them from encroaching Mormons and prevent the Mormons from moving into present-day Arizona.

Incorporating the Four Accounts

The varying accounts help illustrate the need to incorporate multiple sources into history to help uncover the past. Currently, the Mormon story has dominated the academic field. Incorporating the Navajo and Hopi points of view can change the perception of how Tuba City was truly established. It is more than likely that Teuve invited the Mormons as a shield of

---

33 William R. Mateer, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs E.A. Hayt, 1 May 1879, photocopy, JSBC.

34 W.A. Jones, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, 4 December 1902, photocopy, United States Indian Affairs Office: Papers, Manuscript Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.

35 David M. Brugge, Historical Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City-Moenkopi Area (Window Rock, AZ: Research Section, Navajo Parks & Recreation Department, The Navajo Tribe, 1972), 16.
protection and allowed Jacob Hamblin to reside in the area on a temporary basis. The Navajos and Hopis probably welcomed the Mormons as a new source of trade. Unfortunately, miscommunication or deception allowed land to be taken over by a new and larger group of Mormons. This new competition for land and water put off the Indians, which is apparent in the eventual dissatisfaction with the Mormons, and it did not discourage Mormon colonization of Arizona.

When Brown left Salt Lake City after meeting with Young, he was accompanied by four other companies. The leaders in charge of those companies included Lot Smith, William Allen, Jesse Ballenger, and George Lake. These men were called to establish settlements on behalf of the Mormon Church and while on their trek to northern Arizona, Brown left the party to travel ahead to prepare for their arrival at Musher Springs.36 Lot Smith was the first of the companies to arrive at Moenkopi on March 11, 1876. They were then led further south along the Little Colorado River to a predetermined town site Brown had already selected. While camping with the Smith, Lake, and Allen companies, a disagreement arose between Brown and Lot Smith as to who held the ultimate authority over the companies. Brown provided a letter from Brigham Young that stated Brown was the president of the Arizona Mission. Smith openly opposed Brown’s authority, while Lake and Allen remained neutral, but ultimately failed to support Brown. Smith was very defiant in everything Brown did due to the fact that he was under the impression that he was in charge of the four companies coming to colonize Arizona. Tired of dealing with the conflict, Brown informed the four companies as to the locations that were selected for them to settle and decided to return to Musher Springs.37

36 Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 186.

While back in Musher Springs, Brown had to deal with the problems of having a small band of missionaries under his leadership and trying to assist the large number of Mormons traveling through Musher Springs and continuing south to colonize the Little Colorado River. Brown continued exploring the surrounding areas and even traveled into New Mexico.\(^{38}\) His trip to New Mexico lasted from May 17 to July 3. All summer the settlers tended and harvested their crops. Brown also visited the local Indians to keep on good terms with them. A group of Navajos accused the Mormons of taking some of their livestock but apparently did not tell the truth, as revealed after a delegation of Navajos traveled to Salt Lake City and met with Brigham Young in August 1876.\(^{39}\)

Not wanting to return to Arizona, Brown told Young that he would only return if he was commanded to do so. Young told Brown to not only return but to ask for financial assistance from a number of Utah settlements on his way back. At the request of Young, Brown was also to ask for volunteers to help settle Arizona because “the rich valleys south and east of the Colorado offer homes for hundreds of those who desire to extend the curtains of Zion in that direction.”\(^{40}\)

In returning to Musher Springs from Utah, Brown found that much had been accomplished in his absence. The stone building was almost complete, there was a dam with a three mile reservoir, and some of the missionaries had begun to plow the land. Brown took time to explore the surrounding area. Meanwhile, as the Mormons set up at Musher Springs, the U.S. government was considering closing the Moqui Pueblo Agency that served the Hopis. But by

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 462-464.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 464-465.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 465-466.
September 25, 1876, Hopis complained about encroaching Navajos to their agent, W.B. Truax. The Navajos encroached from the east, the Mormons encroached from the west at Musher Springs settlement, and the Smith, Allen, Lake and Ballenger colonies along the Little Colorado River encroached from the southwest. Navajos and Mormons both caused a considerable amount of angst for the Hopis. Truax pleaded with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs not to close down the Moqui Pueblo Agency. Truax embellished his case to make his office seem more vital than it actually was.

On November 14, Navajo Indian Agent Alex G. Irvine argued that something had to be done to protect the Hopis because the Mormon settlements would soon “crowd the Indians out of their homes.” Note was taken that the Navajo and Hopi Indians were also at peace and had been for the past few years. Both Navajos and Hopis had an increasing population and he requested that a reservation be established to protect the Indians from the Mormons moving onto Indian lands. Nevertheless, despite the Hopi and Navajo Indian agents’ pleas, the Moqui Pueblo Agency closed.

Meanwhile, Brown returned to Musher Springs during February 1877. The settlers prepared for the upcoming planting season. At midnight on March 23, Brown learned their reservoir had failed. Their dam had given way and the raging waters destroyed Hopi crops downstream. To calm the angry Hopis Brown promised to “make good the damage.”

---

41 W.B. Truax, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 25 September 1876, photocopy, JSBC.

42 Alex G. Irvine, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Q. Smith, 14 November 1876, photocopy, JSBC.


44 Ibid., 469.
Brown set about learning the Navajo language in preparation for his visit. Feeling that
his personal studies were unsuccessful, on June 4 Brown traveled about twenty-five miles up
Moenkopi Wash to Navajo headman Hustelso’s camp. Brown asked Hustelso for permission to
live among the Navajos in order to learn the Navajo language. Learning Navajo was not easy but
he tried to absorb all he could. Although Hustelso was friendly to Brown, the rest of his camp
was not. Sixteen days after arriving, Brown felt he had learned enough Navajo and left
Hustelso’s camp to continue exploring northeastern Arizona and northwestern New Mexico.45

While Brown was out exploring, the Mormons dedicated the St. George Temple in April
1877, a visible reminder that the Mormons planned to stay in southern Utah permanently.
Andrew Gibbons and his sons William and Richard accompanied Teuve and his wife to St.
George in March. “The temple was finished! Standing pure-white and cool against the gray and
vermillion background of the St. George hills, it seemed to beckon one to worship.”46 Teuve
was wearing the suit Brigham Young had given him years before for the occasion. During the
April general conference, the temple was dedicated and opened to faithful Mormons. On April
10, Gibbons escorted Teuve and his wife through the temple to receive their endowments.47


46 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 192.

47 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 192, 195; in a supposed interview with Christensen, Teuve stated that his
wife was originally called Tellesh-inm-ki, who was supposedly a descendant of an “Aztec royal lineage.” She was
desired by a Mexican man, but a Hopi challenged the Mexican to a duel. Unfortunately, the Mexican got the upper
hand and killed his Hopi challenger. Teuve intervened and killed him, thereby winning the rights to Tellesh-inm-ki.
Saddened by the experience she renamed herself Co-chee-ni-men, meaning she was bereaved about the death of the
first Hopi challenger. According to the account, being married in the St. George Temple only “reminded my wife of
the tragic death of Pal-la-ka, (the first Hopi challenger who died) and no man could fill his place in her heart, and
thus we both go down to the grave mourning.” Eventually, she left Teuve and married a younger man. See Christen
Lingo Christensen, “Hopi Legends,” Improvement Era 24, no. 6 (April 1921): 518; Sekaquaptewa states that
Talasnimka was her grandmother’s sister and briefly mentions her. She states that “I also remember my great aunt
in her old age. After the death of her husband, Tuba, she lived in Bacabi with some of her nieces and later in a little
house that was built there for her.” See Sekaquaptewa, Me and Mine, 238.
Following their temple work, Gibbons took Teuve back to Moenkopi the next day and after dropping Teuve off at Moenkopi he returned back to St. George to join his family.

Brown continued with his exploration through Arizona and New Mexico. As he neared Fort Defiance on June 29, Brown was greeted by Ganado Mucho. Brown scheduled a meeting to talk to the tribe. Brown told the Navajos that the Mormons wanted to teach them the gospel and to help improve their general condition. According to Brown, Ganado Mucho told him that he was glad the Mormons were at Moenkopi and that the Navajos wanted to live in peace with the Mormons.

After 1868, many Navajos, including Ganado Mucho, increased their livestock herds and needed vast grasslands for grazing. He understood that the 1868 Navajo Reservation was too small to handle all of the livestock the reservation Navajos owned, not including livestock the off-reservation Navajos owned. Many reservation Navajos periodically left the reservation to graze their livestock.48 With this in mind, Ganado Mucho gave Brown a warning:

We want to live with you in peace and let your animals eat grass in peace. But water is scarce in this country, there is barely enough for our numerous flocks and increasing people, and our good old men do not want your people to build any more houses by the springs; nor do we want you to bring flocks to eat the grass about the springs. We want to live by you as friends.49

Ganado Mucho told Brown that he wished to visit the leader of the Mormons and wanted to be accompanied by twenty-five or thirty men and one or two women. It was agreed upon that the Navajo party would meet up with Brown at Moenkopi in one month.

---


After Gibbons finished exploring the area he returned to Utah to spend time with his family. His brief stay ended when he agreed to continue his mission to the Indians at Moenkopi, arriving on July 11, 1877. Greeted by Teuve, the duo toured the Hopi villages to “teach more of the gospel.”\(^{50}\) Gibbons gave a positive report on the progress going on in Moenkopi. Several days later Brown came back. On returning to Musher Springs on July 15, Brown was greeted by a group of Navajos, Paiutes, Hopis and three Mexicans. Brown talked with the group until “quite late” that very night and successfully prevented any new problems with the local Indians from occurring.\(^{51}\)

The following month Ganado Mucho and company arrived at Musher Springs on August 8 and reached Salt Lake City twenty days later. Several days later the group met with Daniel Wells, a counselor to Brigham Young. Normally they would have met with Young, but he had passed away the day before. Brown does not mention what was discussed or how or when the Navajos returned home, but he states that during the meeting with Wells, Brown was to be released from his missionary work in Arizona. He was officially released by the new president of the Church, John Taylor.\(^{52}\)

\(^{50}\) Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 196.


\(^{52}\) Ibid., 476.
With the release of James S. Brown there was a void in the mission’s leadership. A new leader was called during a stake conference being held in Kanab on December 8, 1877. During the conference Andrew S. Gibbons was appointed by Erastus Snow to take charge of the “Indian Mission at Moencopi.” Arriving back at Moenkopi on January 1, 1878, Gibbons began making preparations for the New Year. Just as centuries before, the Hopis returned to Moenkopi to plant crops during the month of February, or in Gibbons view, “Hopi braves began to arrive from Oraibi ‘desirous to imitate our example in farming.’”

The new Hopi Indian Agent William R. Mateer noticed the growing friendship between the Mormons and Hopis and he became quite concerned about their relationship. In a monthly report dated February 24, 1878, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mateer stated that the Hopi chief at Oraibi, named “Lo-lu-lul-a-my” has been trained to distrust the U.S. government due to the Mormons. As a result, Mateer kept a close eye on the Mormons at Musher Springs.

While bedridden during March, Gibbons heard “some frantic screams and yells.” Too sick to see what was going on, Gibbons had to wait for someone to come and report to him that the Moenkopi dam had failed. The dam water rushed down “flooding over all the Indian crops.”

---

1 Helen Bay Gibbons, *Saint and Savage* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1965), 197.

2 William R. Mateer, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra A. Hayt, 24 February 1878, photocopy, John S. Boyden Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter anything from the L. Tom Perry Special Collections located at the Harold B. Lee Library will be abbreviated as HBLL. Hereafter anything from the John S. Boyden Collection will also have the following abbreviation, JSBC; David M. Brugge, “The Moenkopi Boundary Problem-Final Report,” photocopy, p. 14, David M. Brugge Collection, Center for Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, NM.
Of course, the Indians became quite upset, taking their complaints to the new mission leader, Gibbons. To pacify the Indians, Gibbons promised to make good the damages.³

After recovering from his illness, Gibbons set out to proselyte among the Hopis. During his labors he came across Mateer, who had apparently fallen ill, lying alongside the trail. Gibbons transported Mateer to Sunset, where Mormons cared for him and Gibbons continued traveling around the Hopi country. On his way home in May, Gibbons came across Mateer and Indian trader, Thomas V. Keams. To show his appreciation Mateer called a large group of Hopi and Navajo Indians for Gibbons to preach to. Following this, Keams allowed Gibbons admission into his trading post for a shopping spree.⁴

Even though Mateer showed some compassion towards Gibbons, it did not deter him from carrying out his duties as a Hopi Indian Agent to protect the tribe. By May 13, Mateer wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, reporting that there was some concern about the Navajos becoming more aggressive towards the Mormons. The Hopis “seem greatly rejoiced that they have some protection here from the Navajos this year.” Mateer concluded that the Hopis should be moved “along the Little Colorado River so that they could have plenty of water for irrigating purposes.”⁵

Foreseeing problems arising between the Mormons and the Indians, Mateer contemplated how to handle the situation. On June 5 Mateer held a council with the Hopi chiefs and their counselors to talk about removing them to Indian Territory, now known as Oklahoma. The Hopi

---

³ Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 198.

⁴ Ibid., 200; For more information on Keam, see Laura Graves, Thomas Varker Keam, Indian Trader (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998).

⁵ William R. Mateer, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra A. Hayt, 13 May 1878, typescript, JSBC.
laughed at his suggestion, not wanting to leave the land of their fathers. Mateer then suggested that they move along the Little Colorado River to be closer to a water source, also suggesting “the necessity of early action in the matter or their best lands would all be occupied by Mormons, Mexicans and Americans.” The Hopis briefly considered the offer but then complained that they “only gave the Mormons permission to settle on their lands along the River until such time as they would want it.” They saw the necessity of doing something soon to stop the Mormons or “their best lands would be taken away from them.” Mateer reported that the Hopis “now see the dilemma into which they have fallen by not preventing them from occupying the land.” The Hopis expressed a strong desire to have their lands deeded to them by the government, giving them legal rights to the land.⁶

Despite Hopi efforts, the Mormon settlement at Musher Springs continued to grow. A healthy competition emerged between Musher Spring’s James Brown and Sunset’s Lot Smith. But it was Brown who was geographically located in a better spot which boasted of having better soil and water which encouraged Mormon settlement. Since it was located near the Hopi Indian villages and closer to the Navajos, Musher Springs became the “natural headquarters for the Mormon Indian mission.”⁷ Most importantly, the existence of the spring made the community viable. “At this point among the broad mesas and red, yellow and blue deserts, springs gushed forth and man and beast came to drink.”⁸

---

⁶ William R. Mateer, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra A. Hayt, 5 June 1878, photocopy, JSBC.


⁸ Arizona Republic (Phoenix), 24 July 1932.
Musher Springs was officially settled by the Mormons in 1875 and served as a way station for Mormon settlers as they moved on to the Little Colorado to take up residence.\textsuperscript{9} For Mormons who traveled to parts of Arizona, New Mexico, and Mexico, Musher Springs became an “important oasis.” It was almost at the halfway point between Mormon headquarters in Salt Lake City and their southern settlements lying in Mexico. Travelers could stop at Musher Springs and make repairs, buy supplies, or just rest.\textsuperscript{10}

By September 1878, Utah visitors led by Erastus Snow, the president of all the southern missions, arrived and announced Musher Springs was selected for an official Mormon colony.\textsuperscript{11} With the assistance of Teuve, Snow laid out a new town site, which came to be called Tuba City in honor of Teuve. The Mormons and several Hopis moved into the new town site, despite the disapproval of the Hopi council at Oraibi, who objected to the idea of Teuve giving the Tuba City land to the Mormons.\textsuperscript{12}

The Mormons tried to ameliorate conditions and befriend the Hopis, hoping it would allow them to stay at Tuba City. The Mormons noticed that the Hopis grew cotton and used it to weave blankets and clothing. The Navajos also herded sheep to obtain wool for the same purposes. The Mormons saw this as a perfect opportunity to help the Indians and benefit themselves. John W. Young decided to build a cotton and woolen mill in either Tuba City or


\textsuperscript{12} Rex C. Reeve Jr., and Galen L. Fletcher, “Mormons in the Tuba City Area,” in \textit{Regional Studies in LDS History: Arizona}, ed. H. Dean Garrett and Clark V. Johnson (Provo, Utah: Department of Church History and Doctrine, Brigham Young University, 1989), 143-144.
Moenkopi (see Figure 12). Construction began in May and the mill was completed by November of 1879 at Moenkopi. It has been described as having a one hundred ninety-two spindle machine, which first started spinning in January 1880.

Most of this was possible because of the Mormon operation at Lee’s Ferry that expanded to include colonies around Moenkopi and the Little Colorado River. “These Mormon settlements helped increase trade in the western section of the reservation and the Navajos carried out extensive trade with them in horses, blankets, and wool.” The Navajo blankets and wool were shipped to Salt Lake City and sent out east or further west on the transcontinental railroad. Ten years later with the construction of a woolen mill at Moenkopi, increased production enabled them to send large amounts of wool to Salt Lake City.

The Mormons were optimistic with the possibility of creating an industry at Tuba City. “In operation the mill was actually a success but the enterprise failed because of inability to dispose of the product at a profit.” Even before the mill was established, the market for wool was unstable. The price of wool in 1876 had declined so much that the Mormons in Tuba City were asked not to purchase wool and not to ship that wool to Salt Lake City because it was not worth the cost of having to transport it so far. Moreover, Indians began to refuse to bring in

13 James states that the mill was located in Tuba City. See Harry C. James, *The Hopi Indians: Their History and Their Culture* (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, LTD., 1956), 33; Gibbons only makes brief mention of this, saying that it was not a successful venture. See Gibbons, *Saint and Savage*, 209.

14 David M. Brugge, *Historical Use and Occupancy of the Tuba City-Moenkopi Area* (Window Rock, AZ: Research Section, Navajo Parks & Recreation Department, The Navajo Tribe, 1972), 17.


16 *Arizona Republic* (Phoenix), 24 July 1932.

17 Brigham Young and Daniel H. Wells to Elders Smith, Lake, Ballinger, Allen, 15 July 1876, typescript, “Lot Smith,” Leonard J. Arrington Papers, Special Collections & Archives, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, UT. Hereafter anything from the Leonard J. Arrington Papers collection will have the following
their wool and the mill did not have the skilled people necessary for its operation. Christian Lingo Christensen, a Mormon missionary from Tuba City, also complained that local non-Mormon Indian traders united together with wool buyers in Albuquerque and with the Hopi Indians against the Mormons, which affected their wool industry. 

Eventually, the Mormons and Indians abandoned the mill, which fell into disrepair.

Gibbons was soon released from his leadership role in Tuba City, receiving a call in October 1879 to help build new settlements in New Mexico. Out of coincidence or as a result of Gibbons’ leaving, by 1880 missionary work among the Hopis ended. Brigham Young’s belief that a more “civilized” tribe would be more receptive to the gospel failed. Overall, there were only a handful of Hopis that converted to Mormonism, but “no more than a dozen.”

---

18 Judd, “Tuba City, Mormon Settlement,” 39; James, The Hopi Indians, 80. James states that the Hopi Indians did not take to the mechanical aspect of work that was required by the cotton mill.

19 Christian Lingo Christensen, “Diary of Christian Lingo Christensen,” typescript, p. 70, Christian Lingo Christensen Collection, HBLL.

20 Samuel E. Shoemaker also states that even though John W. Young built the mill, in 1895 ownership was claimed by Young, Mr. Nebeker, and Joseph Tanner. See Samuel E. Shoemaker to Major Constant Williams, 17 February 1895, typescript, Lot Smith Papers, Manuscripts Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, UT. Hereafter anything from the Lot Smith Papers collection will have the following abbreviation, LSP. According to the affidavit of W. R. Johnstone, a missionary from the World’s Gospel Union, Johnstone claimed he rented the mill from Ashton Nebecker, but later learned that Nebecker did not own the mill. Bishop Brinkerhoff told Johnstone that he had the deed to the mill and had given Nebecker the right to lease the building to Johnstone. He was told that J. W. Young was the original builder of the mill, but was in court over the deed to the mill and the court had assigned Bishop Brinkerhoff control over the deed until the case was settled. See W. R. Johnstone, Affidavit, 2 August 1898, typescript, “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection, HBLL; hereafter anything from the “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection will have the following abbreviation, MDTC.

21 Gibbons, Saint and Savage, 209.

22 Charles S. Peterson, “The Hopi and the Mormons, 1858-1873,” Utah Historical Quarterly 39, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 193; Flake states that Teuve and his wife were “faithful and dependable members but other than
conflict over land between the Hopis and Mormons turned Mormon missionary efforts to the Navajos.  

Meanwhile, Teuve visited Hopi Indian Agent Mateer, indicating that the Mormons encroached upon Hopi farms at Moenkopi and interfered with their seasonal planting. Teuve insisted that he had given Jacob Hamblin permission to plant and water his stock only for a single season. “He states that his father planted there when he was a boy, as well as many other Oraibis, and that it is their ground.” In a monthly report to Commissioner Hayt, Mateer inquired what could be done to protect the Indians’ “rights to lands, which they have cultivated for a century or more.”

Commissioner Hayt responded and expressed concern about the reports of the Mormons “intruding” upon Hopi farming lands at Moenkopi and the complaint by Teuve that he was being “compelled” to herd Mormon sheep along with his own. The Commissioner stated that since the Hopis were not on the reservation, there was nothing the U.S. government could do to protect them from the Mormons. He requested that Mateer approximate the lands occupied by the Hopis, to look for farmable lands with grass and water, and estimate how much land the Hopis would need for their own reservation.

---


24 William R. Mateer, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs E.A. Hayt, 1 May 1879, photocopy, JSBC.

25 E.A. Hayt, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Indian Agent William R. Mateer, 14 August 1879, photocopy, JSBC.
The new Hopi Indian Agent E.S. Merritt also liked the proposal to move the Hopis to the Little Colorado River or to Moenkopi. Merritt told Hayt that there was no way to convince the Indians to move there other than by force. It was his opinion that “nearly all the reports written by Agents during the past few years regarding the Indians in New Mexico & Arizona are written from interested motives and do not show the real condition of the tribes.”

He concurred that the Hopis needed a reservation but suggested the size needed to be increased from earlier proposals. He also opined that the Hopis did not need an Indian agent and could govern themselves because they were a peaceable tribe.

As Merritt was relieved of his position, Navajo Indian Agent Galen Eastman was brought in and given authority to manage the Moqui Pueblo Agency. When reviewing Merritt’s plan to remove the Hopis to Indian Territory, Eastman noted on March 20, 1880, that it would be next to impossible to relocate the Hopi away from their traditional homes and did not think it was an idea worth pursuing. Eastman also became alarmed when he learned that the Mormons lived on Hopi lands and asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to take action to ensure the creation of a Hopi reservation.

---

26 E.S. Merritt, Acting Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 23 February 1880, typescript, JSBC.

27 Galen Eastman, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 20 March 1880, photocopy, JSBC.
Navajo and Mormon encroachment began to wear down the strength and morale of the Hopis, despite their persistent resistance.\textsuperscript{28} Navajo herders continued to threaten the Hopis, who retreated back closer to the immediate vicinity of their mesa villages.

The first Hopi Indian Agent sent to live among the Hopis was Jesse H. Fleming. He was joined by Thomas V. Keam, a former government interpreter who established a trading post at Ponsekya (Keams Canyon). The Hopi liked both of these men who “made attempts to stop the depredations of the Navajo Indians, but as the closest military establishment was Fort Wingate”\textsuperscript{29} no lasting benefit resulted. Fleming may have even done damage, kidnapping Hopi children and forcing them to attend school. When the BIA proposed to ship the Hopi children further away to Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Hopis protested and enlisted two resident white men to help them avoid doing so. When Fleming went to arrest the two men, they told him he did not have any authority to do so since the Hopi did not reside on a reservation. Agent Fleming became livid about the incident and wrote the BIA central office in Washington D.C. and threatened to quit if he did not get a reservation. The BIA office then asked Fleming to send a legal description of the area to be considered for a reservation. After the creation of the 1882 reservation, Agent Fleming sent a cavalry unit to escort the two white troublemakers off his reservation.\textsuperscript{30}


\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 286.

\textsuperscript{30} John Redhouse, \textit{Geopolitics of the Navajo Hopi Land Dispute} (Albuquerque: Wright Productions, 1985), 5.
When Fleming heard that the government was closing the Moquis Indian Agency, he wrote a letter to persuade them otherwise. Fleming indicated that the Hopis probably did not need an agency to keep them in control, but they needed an Indian Agent to protect them from “other tribes & from Mormons & ruthless Americans.” Fleming foresaw that to “Abandon this Agency now, & given them no further protection, & we shall soon see a suffering people driven to the wall…it is impossible to do them justice or to protect them from the impositions of unprincipled men.”

To better assist the Hopis he suggested a reservation be created in their behalf.

By 31 July 1882, Indian Inspector C.H. Howard was sent to examine the Navajo reservation. His first impressions of the area’s situation were that “half of the entire Navajo people are living off the Reservation.” Eight thousand Navajos living off of the reservation caused conflicts with American citizens living around the reservation. Whites complained of Indian depredations and overgrazing and asked “that something ought to be promptly done.” Howard thought that forcing the Navajos back onto the reservation would simply create more problems than it would solve. He recommended that a new Indian reservation be set apart for the Navajos in Arizona that would also include the Hopi villages around Oraibi. He neglected to mention, however, the Moenkopi and Tuba City areas in his recommendations which would only create further problems in the years to come for the Indians and Mormons living there.

He spoke to the Hopis and Navajos around Oraibi before submitting his report. He highlighted that one of the main problems that faced the Hopi Indian agents was that they had no authority over the Navajos. Since the Navajo Indian Agent was located seventy miles away at

---

31 Jesse H. Fleming, Indian agent, to Secretary of the Interior, 27 March 1882, typescript, JSBC.
32 C.H. Howard, Indian inspector, to Secretary of the Interior H.M. Teller, 31 July 1882, typescript, JSBC.
Fort Defiance, Hopi agents lacked the supervision to keep the Navajos from getting into trouble with the Hopis and Mormons. Howard reiterated the need for a new Navajo reservation in order to protect the Hopis.

Howard also suspected that the Mormons supplied the Navajos with “arms and Ammunition.”\(^3^3\) His claims were not completely unfounded. Over the years of traveling back and forth from southern Utah to Hopi land, Mormons had occasionally traded ammunition for food. Missionaries at Oraibi also fixed the few weapons that the Hopis and Navajos owned. For 25 years Mormons had been supplying resident Indians with ammunition through trade, especially during the Mormon Wars of the 1860s.

Hopis and Apaches informed Howard that they were interacting with the Mormons and he advised that “This indiscriminate mixing of Mormons and Indians on this extreme frontier, the sale of arms and ammunition, and the sale of intoxicating liquors—perhaps the most crying evil of all—cannot be regulated without a Reservation.”\(^3^4\) Inspector Howard proposed that the Navajo Reservation be extended one hundred miles west of its current boundary and incorporate the Navajos and Hopis of Moenkopi and Moenave. Agent Fleming stated that a separate reservation needed to be created for the Hopis.

At the request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Hopi Indian Agent Fleming recommended a prescribed area for a Hopi reservation that included the main Hopi villages around Oraibi and excluded the Hopi lands of Moenkopi and Moenave. Fleming complained

\(^3^3\) C.H. Howard, Indian inspector, to Secretary of the Interior H.M. Teller, 29 November 1882, typescript, JSBC; Mormon missionary Thales H. Haskell states that an Indian came to their camp and traded some antelope skins for some ammunition from Jacob Hamblin on October 28, 1859. On December 15, 1859, another trade took place between some Navajos and Marion J. Shelton for ammunition. See Thales Hastings Haskell, “Southern Indian Mission, 1859-1860,” HBLL.

\(^3^4\) Howard, 29 November 1882.
that the most desirable Hopi lands “have been taken up by the Mormons & others.” He lamented that the Navajos had taken possession of Hopi springs and invaded their crop land.

Instead of combining the recommendation by Fleming for a Hopi Reservation and Howard’s advice that the Navajo Reservation be expanded, the government acted upon Fleming’s suggestion, which “forced the two tribes into a conflict that might have been avoided.”

By December 13, Commissioner Price reported to the Secretary of Indian Affairs about the growing need for a reservation to protect the Hopis. Since the Hopis had no reservation, “they are subject to continual annoyance and imposition” and eventually driven from lands they have occupied for centuries. The commissioner reminded his boss that the local Indian agents had no authority over whites there since there was no reservation. It was hoped that the Hopis would be “separated from the evil example and annoyances of unprincipled whites who appear determined to settle in their midst.” Even though the commissioner stated that the Mormons were the problem, the only solution considered was the expulsion of the Mormons and establishment of an Indian reservation.

On December 16, 1882, President Chester A. Arthur signed the Executive Order of 1882 establishing a 2,477,780 acre Hopi Reservation (see Appendix D). The creation of a reservation did prevent Mormon settlers from taking additional lands but it did little to halt the Navajos from confiscating Hopi lands.

---

35 Jesse H. Fleming, Indian agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 4 December 1882, photocopy, JSBC.


37 H. Price, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, 13 December 1882, photocopy, JSBC.
Commissioner Price informed Fleming that with the prescribed area now an Indian Reservation, Fleming had the authority “in dealing with intruders and mischiefmakers…you will take immediate steps to rid the reservation of all objectionable persons.” Some historians have argued that agent Fleming was not really interested in protecting the Hopi Indians from “intruders,” but was more interested in kicking out the Mormons and other white intruders.

Indian Inspector Howard soon learned of the newly formed 1882 Hopi Reservation. On December 27, 1882, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior asking him to make an adjustment to the new reservation boundaries. Howard pleaded with the Secretary to include farming lands used by the Navajo and Hopi Indians in Moenkopi Wash and the Mormon villages of Tuba City, Moenkopi, and Moenave. Including this proposed area in the 1882 reservation would give the local Indian agent authority to properly regulate their interaction with the Indians. Howard blamed the Mormons with furnishing arms and ammunitions to the Indians. Howard forwarded correspondences between Navajo leader, Ganado Mucho, and John W. Powell from 1882 wherein Ganado Mucho said Navajo people and herds were increasing and because water and grass resources were limited, the Navajo needed to expand their reservation to include lands on the Little Colorado River, “on which there is no white man.”

---

38 H. Price, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Indian agent Jesse H. Fleming, 21 December 1882, typescript, JSBC.


40 C.H. Howard, Indian inspector, to Secretary of the Interior H.M. Teller, 27 December 1882, typescript, JSBC.

41 Ganado Mucho, extract notes of Council, 2 November 1882, Interview by Major John W. Powell, photocopy, JSBC.
Unfortunately, the surveying and making of reservation boundaries did not occur in a timely fashion. No one knew where one reservation ended and the other began. The Secretary of Interior did nothing to stop Navajos or Hopis from living wherever they wanted. Most of the Hopis lived in villages and farmed at the south end of Black Mesa. Few owned livestock. Navajos, meanwhile, owned herds that moved across the land all around the Hopi villages. For a while the Navajos and Hopis lived peaceably on 1,822,000 acres of the original 2.4 million acres set aside primarily for the Hopis.42

---

42 Eventually, however, the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute consumed much of the twentieth century. The discovery of coal in 1909 on Black Mesa and then the discovery of oil and gas just added to the problems. Partially settled in 1941 when disputed title and mineral rights areas were allocated to both tribes, this joint settlement led to a Congressional decision in 1958; it allowed a lawsuit to be filed by both tribes. It was known as Healing v. Jones (a.k.a. the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute). The court ruled in 1962 that the land was to be used by both tribes in a Joint Use Area. In 1974, Congress passed the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act. Unable to come to an equitable agreement, the federal courts in Tucson, Arizona, partitioned the disputed lands on February 10, 1977. This forced the relocation of 3,500 Navajos and about 100 Hopi Indians; this would eventually be known as the Navajo Relocation Act.

Despite the long history of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute, there have been only three main published works on these events. The first was in 1980 by a newspaper journalist named Jerry Kammer, who wrote The Second Long Walk: The Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1980). Kammer provides only a very brief summary of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute prehistory; the main focus of his work deals with the 1977 court decision that partitioned the Joint Use Area and how each tribe dealt with it. In 1993, Emily Benedek, a magazine journalist, wrote, The Wind Won’t Know Me: A History of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1993). Her book focuses on the reaction towards the Navajo Relocation Act and the refusal of some Navajos to relocate during the mid-1980s. The final publication was in 1993 by David M. Brugge, who wrote The Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute: An American Tragedy (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994). Brugge was an anthropologist hired by the Navajo Tribe to assist in research for the land dispute beginning in 1958 through 1974. His work is more encompassing, but all three books focus on Navajos and Hopis and neglect any mention or discussion of the Mormons before the 1882 reservation.
Chapter 5
Friendship and Foes: Atsidí and Lot Smith

It has long been known to this office that the relations between the non-reservation Navajo Indians residing principally in the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona and their white neighbors have been greatly strained, and from newspaper reports and other information received, it is evident that serious trouble must eventually result unless further precautionary measures are taken by the government to avert it.

– T.J. Morgan, Commissioner of Indian affairs

Relations between the Mormons and Indians of northern Arizona were already strained by the time Lot Smith and other settlers came to colonize Arizona. As time progressed, Lot Smith became a symbol of Mormon trouble. In 1892 events spiraled out of control until one fateful day he was gunned down by the Navajo Headman Atsidí. This incident has been portrayed as being a pivotal point in Mormon-Indian relations in a fight over land and water rights. The Navajo man who killed Smith was a good friend. What happened to cause one friend to turn on another?

Legends have always surrounded Lot Smith. In one, Smith became quite angry with one of his plural wives. He was so angry he chased her down with a red hot branding iron and branded her like one of his horses. While there is no proof to substantiate this, there are numerous incidents that do provide insight into Smith’s character. In separating fact from fiction, one must not “judge him too harshly” and “should try walking a few miles in his boots.”

1 T. J. Morgan, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Secretary of the Interior, 2 March 1892, photocopy, John S. Boyden Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter anything from the L. Tom Perry Special Collections located at the Harold B. Lee Library will be abbreviated as HBLL. Hereafter anything from the John S. Boyden Collection will have the abbreviation JSBC.

Another harsh story about Smith is about a Hopi boy accused of stealing wheat from a fellow Hopi woman. The boy was caught in possession of the wheat and Smith took it upon himself to punish him by using a chain to whip him. He also happened to be a new convert to the Mormon religion. An old friend and fellow Mormon, Sullivan “Sully” Calvin Richardson (or S.C. Richardson) recounted that this was done as an “object lesson of what should be the standard justice between the two peoples. It brought good will; and its effects were lasting.”

Atsidí

In addition to learning about Smith, one must also study Atsidí. Friends called him Atsidí Néez Biye’ (Son of Tall Smith), family knew him as Ashiiké Łání (Many Boys), and whites called him by his Anglican name, Charley Etsitty. Most knew him simply as Atsidí. The boy never met his father, who died before Atsidí’s birth while escaping some enemies. Atsidí was born around 1800 in the Black Mesa area. In Diné culture one introduces himself by his clans. He would have stated that he was Tó Dích’ii’nni (maternal clan: “Bitter Water clan”), born for Kinyaa’áanii (paternal clan: “Standing House clan”).

Nothing much has been recorded of Atsidí’s earlier years until the Nidahadzid dąą or “The Fearing Time.” The Fearing Time is better known as the Navajo Long Walk, where

---

3 S.C. Richardson, “Remembrances of Lot Smith: From Writings of 1900 to 1931,” p. 4, Mesa, AZ: Privately Printed, 1936, photocopy, Sullivan Calvin Richardson Papers, 1910-1940, Manuscripts Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, UT; hereafter abbreviated as USHS. Richardson moved from Utah to Brigham City, Arizona, at age 17, in 1878. By 1885, he was called by the LDS Church to relocate to Mexico. During his time in Arizona and Mexico he worked as a carpenter and school teacher.

4 Baa’ Yazhi was a daughter of Atsidí. See Baa’ Yazhi, interviewed by Aubrey Williams and trans. by Bernadine Whitegoat, 17 Feb 1961, interview 761, transcript, Doris Duke Oral Indian History, Manuscript Collections, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. Hereafter anything from the Doris Duke Oral Indian History Collection will have the abbreviation DDOI.
Navajos lived in fear due to constant attacks by enemy tribes and federal troops in the mid 1860s. Johnson Etsitty, a son of Atsidí, recalled that his father “lived during the Fearing Time…He used to mention when they had war with the other enemies with bows and arrows. The Hopis and the Utes fought them.” Atsidí’s family moved regularly during this time through Shonto, Coalmine Canyon, and Bodaway. By the time the Navajo Long Walk began, his family was living near Bodaway.

When Kit Carson marched his troops to Oraibi and the surrounding area, it is believed that Atsidí and his family were captured and made the trek to Hwéeldi (Fort Sumner) in 1863. “My father went to Fort Sumner. He was kind of a well-grown man at that time,” Asdzáán Áshįįhi, his first wife, accompanied him. Atsidí had two children then, one daughter and one son. It is unknown whether or not the daughter went to Hwéeldi but his son, Tódích’ii’nii Nééz, hid out near Navajo Mountain and did not go. Atsidí was accompanied by his maternal grandparents and several siblings. Atsidí’s mother was captured by Hopi scouts and Spaniards.

---

5 Johnson Etsitty was a son of Atsidí. See David M. Brugge, interview of Johnson Etsitty, in Moenkopi Survey, found in “Preliminary Survey of Indian Land Use-Moenkopi Area, 1967,” photocopy, David M. Brugge Collection, Center of Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Hereafter anything from the David M. Brugge Collection will have the abbreviation DMBC.

6 Baa’ Yazhi, interview.

7 Brugge, Johnson Etsitty interview.

8 Ashiihi Nez was a grandson of Atsidí. See Ashiihi Nez, interviewed by Audrey Williams and trans. by Bernadine Whitegoat, 17 Feb 1961, interview 51-1 AN, transcript, Edge of the Cedars State Park Museum Library, Edge of the Cedars Museum State Park, Blanding, UT.
during a slave raid.\textsuperscript{9} She escaped her captors and made her way toward Hwéeldi to meet up with her family, but decided to hide out around Navajo Mountain instead.\textsuperscript{10}

During the Hwéeldi period, Atsidi’s second wife, Gomaa’a Yazhi Bitsii’ and her family lived around the San Francisco Peaks and also journeyed to Hwéeldi. Gomaa’a Yazhi Bitsii’ was a baby at the time. One other sibling made the trip to Hwéeldi and her mother gave birth to another child upon arrival. Gomaa’a Yazhi Bitsii’ s maternal grandfather, Ashiihi Nééz, also made the trek to Hwéeldi with the family. While there, Ashiihi Nééz began farming to keep his family from starving. Under the supposed protection of the United States Army stationed at Hwéeldi, one day as Ashiihi Nééz and a grandson were out farming they were attacked by a raiding party. Ashiihi Nééz saved his grandson’s life and in the process was killed on his little farming patch.\textsuperscript{11}

Fort Sumner, a 40 square mile reservation created to hold 5,000 Indians, held double that amount — some 500 Mescalero Apaches and about 8,500 Navajos. The internment camp faced serious issues. It was located in a poor place. The alkaline water was barely drinkable and there was scarcely enough wood to support the troops stationed there. Government officials had hoped the Indians could become self-sustaining but crops did not yield sufficient food to prevent starvation. Worse still, the Mescalero Apaches and the Navajos — two long-time rivals — shared the space and feuded constantly. Comanche raiding parties also caused fear. What little supplies reached the fort did not meet demand. The reservation was meant to be the first

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{9} Mrs. Billy Sawyer is another daughter of Atsidi. See Mrs. Billy Sawyer, interviewed by David M. Brugge and trans. by Bernadine Whitegoat, 11 Dec 1960, interview 779, transcript, DDOI.

\textsuperscript{10} Inez N’eschii is another daughter of Atsidi. See Inez N’eschii, interviewed by Audrey Williams and trans. by Bernadine Whitegoat, 17 Feb 1961, interview 50-1 IN, transcript, Edge of the Cedars State Park Museum Library, Edge of the Cedars Museum State Park, Blanding, UT.

\textsuperscript{11} Mrs. Billy Sawyer, interview.
reservation west of Indian Territory but it was nothing but a failure. In 1868 the government signed a treaty with the Navajos promising them that they could return to a reservation on their ancestral lands.

After their term as prisoners, Atsidí joined his people in traveling to Fort Defiance to await promised annuities from the 1868 Treaty. After leaving Fort Defiance, Atsidí and family returned to the Carrizo Mountain, Arizona area (because his wife’s family had a farm there) instead of the newly established 1868 Navajo Reservation.

By the mid 1870s, Atsidí left the Carrizo Mountain area and “came by the way of Ganado and the lower end of Oraibi to the lower mesas and back into Tuba City,” eventually settling near Blue Canyon. There Atsidí’s eldest daughter married a man from Shonto. Atsidí’s daughter and son-in-law moved back and forth between Blue Canyon and Shonto before Atsidí decided to move to Shonto to be closer to her. While there he found Navajo Mountain to be a “desirable” place for winter grazing range and was one of the first permanent residents.

Atsidí was an active headman in the 1860s. It is uncertain exactly when Atsidí became a Naat’áanii, but it was at least by the 1870s when Atsidí moved into the Tuba City area. Typically a headman’s influence was within his band or community, but some Navajos claim Atsidí’s influence included the area surrounding Tuba City and Blue Canyon. A headman is expected to care for the members of his community. A Diné resident from the Grey Mountain

12 John Walker, interviewed by Aubrey Williams and trans. by Maxwell Yazzie, 10 Feb 1961, interview 755, transcript, DDOI.


14 Billy Sawyer is the son-in-law of Atsidí. See John Samson, interviewed by Aubrey Williams and trans. by Maxwell Yazzie, 14 Jan 1961, interview 702, transcript, DDOI; Billy Sawyer, interviewed by J. Lee Correll, 10 December 1960, Interview 660, transcript, DDOI.
area recalled that Atsidí served his community well and many people remember him for his role enticing Navajos to send their children to school.\textsuperscript{15} During the early 1880s Atsidí tried to help quell the problems occurring between the Navajos and Hopis. He helped mark the Hopi-Navajo boundary to halt Navajo encroachment onto Hopi lands.\textsuperscript{16}

The area that Atsidí moved to was occupied by Mormons who had been using the land to grow hay. Atsidí decided to purchase the land for the price of seven horses, saddles, blankets, beads, and some money from John Adams in 1887,\textsuperscript{17} although “it is unclear how the Mormon who sold the land to them gained title to this land.”\textsuperscript{18} Another Mormon named Lot Smith may have already been living in the area by the time Atsidí became his next-door neighbor.\textsuperscript{19}

Lot Smith

Lot Smith has been remembered as a man who had many friends and enemies and who was known for his mercurial temper. Born 12 May 1830 in Williamstownship, New York, to Williams O. Smith and Rhonda Hough, Smith joined the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and gathered with Brigham Young and the Saints in Winter Quarters in the fall of 1846.

\textsuperscript{15} Biliin Tlishini, interviewed by Aubrey Williams and trans. by Maxwell Yazzie, 12 Jan 1961, interview 697, transcript, DDOI.

\textsuperscript{16} David M. Brugge, interview of Herbert Zonnie, in Moenkopi Survey, found in “Preliminary Survey of Indian Land Use-Moenkopi Area, 1967,” photocopy, DMBC.

\textsuperscript{17} Brugge, interview of Johnson Etsitty; David M. Brugge, interview of Frank Goldtooth, in Moenkopi Survey, found in “Preliminary Survey of Indian Land Use-Moenkopi Area, 1967,” photocopy, DMBC; also see Etzit-tee, affidavit, 1 Aug 1898, Typescript, JSBC.


\textsuperscript{19} Brugge, interview of Frank Goldtooth.
While encamped at Winter Quarters, the federal government asked Young to authorize a company of five hundred men to support American efforts in the Mexican War. Smith, large for his sixteen years of age, lied about his age and joined the Mormon Battalion becoming one of the youngest Battalion members.\textsuperscript{20} The battalion marched from Leavenworth, Kansas, to San Diego, California. When they reached California, Smith was mustered out of service in July of 1847.\textsuperscript{21} After receiving his discharge papers, he remained in California looking for work. Along with several other Saints, Smith ended up at Sutter’s Mill and panned for gold in the spring of 1849. Amassing several thousand dollars, he decided to rejoin the Saints in the Great Basin in Salt Lake City. Smith, age 19, learned his family had moved to Farmington and decided to join them there, where he bought a farm for a thousand dollars and donated another thousand to the Church.\textsuperscript{22}

As Mormon population in Utah Territory grew, so did animosity between the populace and the non-Mormon federal authorities in the territory. In 1856 President James Buchanan authorized 2,500 federal troops to march on the territory in order to replace Brigham Young as governor. News of U.S. soldiers marching against them caused the Mormons to prepare to defend themselves. Young commissioned John D.T. McAllister to raise a company of soldiers to harass and delay the soldiers in Johnston’s Army, named after their leader Colonel Sidney Albert Johnston. Young instructed them to burn grass, steal livestock, and harass the troops but not to kill any soldiers. Lot Smith, Robert T. Burton, Warren Snow, and Orrin Porter Rockwell helped

\textsuperscript{20} N.S. Ashcroft, “Lot Smith,” Little Colorado [Arizona] and Lot Smith Source Materials, Special Collections & Archives, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Hereafter anything from the Little Colorado and Lot Smith Source Material collections will have the abbreviation LCLS.


\textsuperscript{22} Ashcroft, “Lot Smith.”
cut supply lines, burned supply wagons, rustled livestock, and burned the grass needed to feed military livestock and horses. Their efforts effectively slowed down the army, forcing it to return to winter at Camp Scott (Fort Bridger). In the spring, peace negotiations effectively ended the Utah War.23

After the Utah War, Smith was appointed Sheriff of Davis County, but this was short-lived as he was to take on larger roles. At the request of President Abraham Lincoln to Brigham Young, Young was to call to arms a group to help protect railroad and telegraph lines. Smith was selected to head a company of cavalry in 1862.24 During his watch, Indians along the Snake River began to cause trouble, forcing Smith to make an offensive attack on the Indians and successfully defeating them.25 Smith’s military career helped him gain the popularity needed to reach the office and serve one term in the Utah Territorial Legislature.26 Smith’s skills as a politician dimmed when compared to his military acumen. As a militia man, he participated in nine different expeditions against the Indians of Utah. His reputation as a military leader captured the interest of Brigham Young once again, who felt Smith could endure the harsh living of Arizona and his military experience would help protect his colony against Indian attacks.

23 For more information about the Utah War and Lot Smith’s role, see LeRoy R. Hafen, The Utah Expedition, 1857-1858: A Documentary Account of the United States Military Movement under Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, and the Resistance by Brigham Young and the Mormon Nauvoo Legion (Glendale, CA: A. H. Clark Co., 1958); also see Margaret M. Fisher, Utah and the Civil War, Being the Story of the Part Played by the People of Utah in that Great Conflict, With Special Reference to the Lot Smith Expedition and the Robert T. Burton Expedition (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1929).

24 Charles S. Peterson, “‘A Mighty Man was Brother Lot’: A Portrait of Lot Smith – Mormon Frontiersman,” The Western Historical Quarterly 1, no. 4 (October 1970): 395.


In 1875 Young called Smith and three others to lead four pioneer companies to settle in Arizona. Each company was organized into a United Order.27 Where a number of others had quit, “The character and standards of Lot Smith were shown when so many who were called to settle Arizona, were returning to Utah.”28 Smith took his wife Alice Ann and their children with him.29

Smith led the “Sunset” company, Jesse O. Ballanger led the “Brigham” company, William C. Allen formed the “St. Joseph” company, and George Lake directed the “Obed” company. Young instructed Smith and the other leaders that in all of their interactions with the Indians the Mormons should treat them “with Kindness and present before them an example which they can imitate with propriety and mutual advantage.”30 If any desired baptism they should be taught the gospel and welcomed into the faith. The four captains were reminded again in September that the settlements should be watchful, give no offense, treat the Indians with kindness, and show them “in every way possible that you are their friends and superiors.”31

---

27 A United Order was modeled after the New Testament church which had “all things in common.” It was designed to eliminate poverty and increase self-sufficiency.


29 Virginia Smith, “Biography of Captain Lot Smith,” LCLS.

30 Brigham Young and Daniel H. Wells to Elders Smith, Lake, Ballinger, Allen, 15 July 1876, typescript, “Lot Smith,” Leonard J. Arrington Papers, Special Collections & Archives, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, UT. Hereafter anything from the Leonard J. Arrington Papers collections will have the abbreviation LJAP.

31 Brigham Young to Elder Lot Smith and other presidents of companies, September 1876, typescript, Lot Smith folder, LJAP.
Smith, Allen, Lake and Ballinger were set apart as leaders to pilot their companies to Arizona and each company was to be outfitted with fifty men and small families. Out of these four settlements, St. Joseph’s was the only to secure a claim to the land. The other three settlements were never surveyed and the Mormons only had squatter’s rights. One may ask why the Mormons never applied for legal rights to all the lands that they settled. There is no definite answer, but Young told Smith that James S. Brown felt that “as to country not already occupied or claimed from the Little Colorado to the San Juan river [sic] there is none worth having.” These leaders may have felt no need to gain legal rights to these lands because few Americans valued the deserts where the Indians lived.

Soon after the colonization of these settlements, the Mormons in Sunset, Obed, St. Joseph’s, and Brigham were complaining about the inhospitable land and the lack of water. Young sent a letter in the summer of 1876 to persuade the Saints to stay in Arizona “to fill that whole country south with settlements of Saints, in time even to Old Mexico.” He also stated that if the Saints in Arizona should find any suitable areas for settlement, they should secure the land to expand the kingdom of God. Young did warn the United Orders that this expansion should not happen until each settlement was firmly established and had a sufficient population.

32 John Benson, “Lot Smith” (Logan, UT: Utah State University Library, 1957), LCLS.
33 Brigham Young to Elder Lot Smith, 20 July 1876, typescript, Lot Smith folder, LJAP.
34 Young, 20 July 1876; also see, Young and Wells, 15 July 1876.
35 Young, September 1876.
36 Peterson, “‘A Mighty Man was Brother Lot,” 402.
Lot Smith advocated ranching as a survival technique and his ranch became synonymous with quality livestock and large herds of cattle, horses, and sheep. He frequently made trips outside the territory to procure pedigreed horses.\textsuperscript{37}

Early in January 1877, Young addressed the four settlements on the Little Colorado River. Young reminded the captains that they should continue to treat the Indians with kindness and warned disgruntled settlers to stay at their posts to strengthen the Arizona settlements, even though he conceded that “the first settlers of a new country very often fail to select the most desirable places for settlement.”\textsuperscript{38} Nevertheless, the Obed settlers dispersed when an epidemic occurred. At the Sunset community, Levi Savage was called as Bishop and Lot Smith was called as Stake President of the Little Colorado Stake. The other Mormon colonies of Taylor, Woodruff, Tonto Basin, Tuba City and Snowflake were all included under Lot’s ecclesiastical leadership.\textsuperscript{39}

Others also became disillusioned with the LDS United Order settlement plan, the southern land, and their leaders. Some blamed the people who deserted Sunset, who left contested claims to property that led to “threats of blood-shed.” One way these disgruntled Mormons tried to get what they wanted was by having Arizona officers arrest Lot Smith for practicing polygamy.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{38} Brigham Young to Brothers Smith, Ballanger, Lake, and Allen, 10 January 1877, typescript, Lot Smith Correspondence, USHS.

\textsuperscript{39} Benson, “Lot Smith;” see also, Wilford Woodruff to Elder Lot Smith, 23 October 1882, typescript, Lot Smith folder, LJAP.

\textsuperscript{40} Richardson, “Remembrances of Lot Smith,” p. 6.
Young’s death in 1877 provided another obstacle for the struggling communities in general and Lot Smith. In Utah Peace Officers Association Historian Ray Haueter’s article, “Early Law Enforcement: Lot Smith: Outlaw or Lawman, Which?,” he and others have pinpointed 1877 in particular. Young’s death shook Smith, who, by one account, seemed to ‘go to pieces.’” Smith had been considered a maverick before Young’s death, doing things his own way. After Young’s death, Smith became “more arrogant and uncontrollable, violating territorial and federal laws whenever he cared to.”

Smith became a strong and forceful leader at Sunset. S. C. Richardson from the Brigham City settlement in Arizona recalled, “I have met a number who claim he was cruel at times. But I always tell them they did not know the real Lot Smith.” Smith’s family has also portrayed him as the “best friend” to the Indians, claiming that Smith learned their language and also Spanish so that he could better communicate with them. One of his wives, Alice Mary Baugh Smith, stated that during their time in Tuba City, Smith was “great friends” with Teuve and with “all the Indians.” Some have argued that Smith “Always followed Prest. Brigham Young’s policy, to feed and not fight them.” Smith’s wife Alice also stated, “My husband always fed them and was kind to them,” and that “they thought lots of him.”

Conditions worsened for the Arizona colonies. Numerous reports reached Mormon officials in Salt Lake City from disgruntled settlers under Smith’s leadership. “They complain bitterly of your treatment of them in the settlement of their accounts.” In 1882, for example, the

---


42 Richardson, “Remembrances of Lot Smith,” p. 3.

43 Ashcroft, “Lot Smith.”

44 Alice Mary Baugh Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch,” USHS.
Pipkins (or Pitkins) family complained that Smith appraised their property too low when they first came to the settlement and appraised it too high when they left. As a result the Pitkins family could not afford to take most of their possessions home with them.

The family also claimed that they brought in a wagon worth $125 and when they left they were given an old wagon appraised at $50. Smith allegedly forced Pitkins to sign a bill of receipt with an iron rod over his head. The Pitkins family was just one of many with similar complaints. Wilford Woodruff stated that, “There is hardly any man speaks well of you, who leaves your settlement. They generally go away dissatisfied.”

No doubt some of the difficulties between Smith and the “disgruntled” Mormons leaving Sunset were due to Smith’s inability in keeping proper records of the United Order’s bookkeeping accounts. As the secular and ecclesiastical leader of Sunset, Smith came under the impression that what the Mormon settlers came with is what they should leave with and any increments belonged to the Church, but since Smith did not keep proper records of what settlers originally contributed nor their increments, it only caused more complaints to be sent to Church leaders in Salt Lake City. “Usually the charges were the same: settlements were made without aid of accounts, and the withdrawing member felt that he had received no interest on his investment or credit for any labor above family receipts during his sojourn in the Order.”

Due to the number of problems Smith and the other colonies were having, the new Church President Wilford Woodruff kept a close eye on Smith. In 1884, Woodruff asked Smith

---

45 Woodruff, 23 October 1882.

46 Peterson, ‘‘A Mighty Man was Brother Lot,’’ 402.
if he had plans to abandon the Sunset settlement. Smith decided to remain at Sunset, but things continued to worsen for him.

During the summer of 1884, two Mormons by the name of Ernest Tietjen and Lewis Burnham were called by Mormon Apostle Brigham Young Jr. to investigate a dispute between Lot Smith and the local Indians. Upon arriving to the area, Tietjen and Burnham encountered a Navajo man and conversed with him for some time before informing him that they wished to hold a council to hear the Indians’ version of their dispute with Smith. The following night about twenty-five Navajos gathered. They related that 1883 had been very dry, resulting in a shortage of water and grass. Smith allegedly ran off the Indians’ sheep and horses and also fabricated a frightening story to keep superstitious Indians away. Navajo livestock suffered and died while “Smith’s grew fat.” A Navajo man finally disproved Smith’s story and revealed it as a lie.

Concluding the council, Tietjen and Burnham requested that they all meet with Smith at his residence in Moenkopi. Upon telling Smith their purpose, Smith wanted to show off his best horses to everyone. One of his boys corralled the horses and Smith took his rope and caught one of the horses and began bragging about its fine quality. While doing this Smith lost control of the horse and it whirled him around and kicked him in the stomach. The Indians laughed, but the kick knocked Smith unconscious for two hours. Later, he finally met with the Navajo council and Mormon investigators. The Navajo leader presented his side of the story. He stated that they have nothing more to say, since they felt “the great Spirit” had punished Smith for his lies and “wished to be friends with Smith if he will not mistreat us anymore.” Smith consented to this and shook hands with the Navajos. Tietjen concluded that “From all we could learn, the

47 Wilford Woodruff to Lot Smith, 26 February 1884, typescript, Lot Smith folder, LJAP.
Indians tried very hard to live up to our counsel, but Lot Smith was a very hot headed man and did not always live up to his teachings.”48

Mexico, 1885

The following year in 1885, Church members had to deal with the issue of polygamy. As early as 1862 Congress passed the Morrill Act, one of the first anti-polygamy acts attacking the Church’s belief in plural marriage. Twelve years later in 1874 the Poland Act was passed and allowed for the indictment of men involved in plural marriage. The following year the courts convicted George Reynolds of cohabitation. The Supreme Court heard and upheld the decision in 1879. Concurrently, Mormon missionaries ventured into Old Mexico proselytizing and scouting for ideal locations for Mormon colonies. In 1880, the Mormons made plans to establish several colonies there. In 1882 the Edmunds Act was passed, which intensified the antipolygamy crusade against the Mormons. The President of the Church, John Taylor, and other Church Authorities began going “underground,” hiding from law enforcement officials. Many of those men in danger of being arrested for polygamy moved to Mexico to hide out, including Lot Smith. Tuba City represented the halfway point between Salt Lake City and the Mexican colonies. Smith spent a little while in Mexico hiding out but not much is known of his whereabouts. When Smith returned to Arizona he went to Tuba City, where discontent between

48 Gary Tietjen, The Tietjen and Berryhill Families of Western New Mexico (Privately Published, ca. 1950), 56-57.
leaders and followers resumed. New complaints about Smith as “a volatile, temperamental man who frequently got into disagreements” resurfaced.49

During Smith’s time in Mexico the Church appointed Joseph H. Richards as the interim “caretaker” over the Little Colorado Stake.50 Church leaders in Salt Lake officially released Smith as Stake President of the Little Colorado Stake on December 18, 1887, with Jesse N. Smith being called as the new Stake President of the Snowflake Stake and the stake was renamed as the Snowflake Stake.51

With numerous settlers abandoning Sunset and with Lot Smith in Mexico, the United Order fell apart and finally collapsed in 1886. The remnants of Sunset were transferred to the Snowflake Stake. Smith moved to Tuba City where he continued to raise livestock. One of Smith’s wives recorded that “Lot was a strong brave man who had never been pushed around. He was suffering from the affairs and failures at Sunset. And he was making every effort to succeed here.”52

When new complaints against Smith arose, the Church decided to investigate further. In July 1886, Erastus Snow, Brigham Young Jr., and George Teasdale held a preliminary hearing examining the complaints against Smith’s tenure at Sunset. The hearing found evidence of favoritism and irregularity of accounting by Smith and recommended a full scale investigation.53


50 Ibid., 160.


52 Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch.”

53 Peterson, “A Mighty Man was Brother Lot,” 404.
They appointed a committee to review the records kept at Sunset. The investigation lasted over a year and involved numerous properties from Sunset to Mormon Lake. Smith’s personal livestock fell under suspicion as accusations were made claiming Smith branded livestock as his own that was actually Church owned or seized from other Mormons.

Smith’s records were so bad that the investigation had to reconstruct a fiscal history of Sunset using statements and accounts from past members of Sunset. After a complete assessment of the Sunset claims, the committee began distributing property and funds to their rightful owners. Out of all that was inventoried, about $85,000 worth, Smith argued that he deserved most of the property and livestock and that the settlers of Sunset should receive a small portion. The committee refused his proposal but did eventually compromise by offering Smith $51,000 in assets, while the remaining $34,000 was split between the remaining forty-seven Sunset families. Historians have argued that Smith actually acquired less than he put into the settlement and that Smith’s business sense had actually helped the people of Sunset become wealthier and more prosperous. Smith’s negative reputation resulted from disgruntled settlers seeking gain at Smith’s expense. “Their settlement may have been just, but in a personal sense their verdict appears to have been strongly tinctured with hostility.” Even though Sunset failed miserably in its religious function, it could still be considered a secular success in ranching, due to Smith’s success in bringing excellent breeding to Arizona.54 With his “Sunset” troubles behind him, Smith retreated to Tuba City. Smith built three homes to accommodate his polygamous wives. He built one near Moenkopi, one in Tuba City, and the other in Pasture.

54 Ibid., 405-06.
Canyon Wash (one mile east of Tuba City and a tributary of Moenkopi Wash). A fourth wife was also living at Moenave.

During 1885-86, the trading firm of Stone and Dittenhoffer established a small trading post in an abandoned house of John W. Young. The previous occupant was Tom Hubbell, a trader who did not get along with the Hopis and who decided to sell out to Ed Stone. Things seemed to be going good for the trading post and soon after they were able to hire an old prospector named “Scully” to help out at the post. One day outside a tent that was erected to conduct business, Scully bought some wool from Atsidi’s brother. Atsidi’s brother argued over the price Scully was offering and decided to take his wool back. Scully became upset and tried to stop Atsidi’s brother and the two got into a scuffle, during which Scully pulled out his gun and shot Atsidi’s brother dead. Afterward, Scully skipped town and left Stone to deal with the situation. Soon thereafter, an agreement was made where Stone and Dittenhoffer were to vacate the premises within ten days. It is possible that they were evicted due to the death of Atsidi’s brother, but one account implies the real reason was that Lot Smith, as the presiding local LDS leader, never wanted a gentile-owned trading post near him. In January 1887, Smith

55 Arizona Republic (Phoenix), 24 July 1932; Lot Smith states that Alice Ann lived at Moenkopi, and Mary lived up Pasture Canyon. See Lot Smith to Wilford Woodruff, 5 March 1889, typescript, Lot Smith Outgoing Correspondence, USHS; Peterson also stated that Lot Smith owned two homes at Tuba City and one at the Mormon reservoir. See Peterson, “’A Mighty Man was Brother Lot,’” 409.


57 In John Q. Ressler’s thesis he states that the house was built by John W. Young, but Ashton Nebeker claimed he owned the house John Q. Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance, Landscape Change, and the View of the Environment in an Oasis on the Western Navajo Reservation, Arizona” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970), 112; Godfrey states that Stone moved into the abandoned Mormon Fort in 1885. See Godfrey, Hopi Agricultural Report, 29-30.


59 Ibid., 11.
led a large armed force into the store and confiscated everything in it at gunpoint. Stone, his wife, and one of their visiting friends were all held prisoners until the local authorities came to save them.\(^6^0\)

Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr. became fearful that Smith would kill all three prisoners. He raced over to Tom Hubbell’s ranch, asking for assistance. Hubbell, the county deputy sheriff, gathered five or six armed Navajos who were working for him and hurried to the trading post. Hubbell called out to Smith and demanded of him to release the prisoners. Smith replied that if Hubbell entered the trading post unarmed they could talk it over. Doing so, Hubbell procured the release of the prisoners. Word reached the authorities at Flagstaff and a posse came to arrest Smith. They discovered he had gone into hiding along the Little Colorado River.\(^6^1\)

Dittenhoffer brought suit against Smith and the Mormons for damages, but the Mormons “not relishing a trip to Prescott, comprised with Dittenhoffer” by paying him $800 in cash. Subsequently Dittenhoffer moved to Red Lake, Arizona in 1887. When Smith took control of the Dittenhoffer store, he also seized the land and water associated with the property — land and water the Hopis claimed as their own. When Smith chased Dittenhoffer away, he also chased the Indians away.\(^6^2\) “It was then that the Mormons began in good earnest to take by force the lands

\(^{60}\) Fred P. Slattery, Affidavit, 2 August 1898, JSBC; Chas Hubbell to Major Constant Williams, 12 July 1898, “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection, HBLL; hereafter anything from the “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection will also have the abbreviation MDTC. According to Chas Hubbell, this took place in 1887; according to Joseph Hyrum Lee, Lot Smith seized the Stone and Dittenhoffer store and “kept Mr. and Mrs. Stone prisoners in it.” See Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., “Excerpts from the statement of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., for P.T. Reilly,” typescript, LSP; Ressler states that Dittenhoffer and Stone were evicted at gunpoint. See Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance,” 116.


\(^{62}\) Lee states that Stone’s property was worth about $5,000. See Hubbell, 12 July 1898; Lee, “My Wonderful Country,” 11.
cultivated by said Moquis; and that the Mormons built their first dam in 1888.”

Smith claimed the house as his own and had one of his wives reside there. This particular incident resulted in a Hopi-Mormon dispute that continued until the Mormons were kicked out of Tuba City.

Smith’s arrival in Tuba City led to hostility because Smith drove away the Indians and stole their land. Sometime during 1887 Smith fenced about 160-200 acres of “prime farm land at the mouth of Pasture Wash right in the midst of Hopi fields.” In February 1888, a Hopi named Qua-che-qua led a group of Hopis to meet with Mormon leaders to complain of their treatment by Smith and others, “which included having guns drawn on them, being kicked and cuffsed, and having their sheep killed.” The Church found Lot Smith in the wrong, but did nothing to find a solution to the disagreement.

Over the years Smith had earned a reputation as a short-tempered, violent man. By 28 December 1891, Smith reported that it had been a cold winter and the Mormons of Tuba City had been having difficulty with the Indians and that it was “our fault.” He explained that the Mormons used to have a good influence on the Indians but now the “Gentiles” had more

---

63 Slattery, “Affidavit;” Hubbell, 12 July 1898.

64 Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance,” 113; according to Lee, his father had the rights to the land and water, but leased them to Lot Smith. See Lee, “My Wonderful Country,” 14.


66 Hubbell, 12 July 1898.


influence on the Indians. Smith’s family blamed the Indians as being part of the problem because they were slow learners and some of the Navajos were “the kind which knew no law.”

The Smith family portrayed Lot as someone who was “feared by the Navajos.” Smith had the reputation of being hard to deal with and “especially so if it came to a confrontation with firearms,” because Smith had a reputation of being “the deadliest shot” in the territory; that is until 21 June 1892. One of the plural wives of Smith, Alice Baugh Smith, declared that Lot Smith was friends with Teuve and his wife, “and they were great friends of my husbands as were all the Indians.” Smith had fed them and was kind to them, and had allowed them to stay at his house. These Indians were said to have trusted Smith enough to even leave their valuables behind at times for Smith to watch over.

Sometime during the end of May or the beginning of June 1892, twenty citizens of Tuba City signed a petition and sent it to the Governor of Arizona, stating that they had purchased all the land they resided on and were lawful citizens. Their petition complained that the Navajos were trying to push them out of Tuba City and since they were 100 miles from any other whites, the Mormons had no one to protect them. They claimed that the Navajos insulted their women, seized their land by physical force, and killed their cattle. The Mormons testified they had been kind to the Indians, and put forth a request demanding the government intercede and protect their life and property. Another letter sent to the governor admitted that the allegations could not be

---

69 Lot Smith to George Reynolds, 28 December 1891, typescript, Lot Smith Outgoing Correspondence, USHS.

70 Smith, “Biography of Captain Lot Smith.”

71 Prince A. Melick, “Alma Smith: Pioneer Arizona Rancher, Son of Lot Smith, Saviour of the Mormon People,” Lot Smith Collection, Special Collections and Archives Department, Cline Library, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.

72 Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch.”
fully substantiated if an investigation took place but warned if nothing was done there would be “serious trouble.”

The Death of Lot Smith: 1892

Historians have portrayed Smith as a victim of circumstance killed by Navajos over land and water rights. Mormons have been portrayed as victims who could only “helplessly” watch their “little herds” dwindle under the hands of the villainous Indians. Since Smith’s property extended into Indian lands away from Tuba City, it became the “symbol of trouble to the Indians” that shot him in the back. Smith is portrayed as being shot in the back by Indians as he was trying to defend his land. Lot Smith’s death represents a watershed mark between Mormons and Indians in northern Arizona. During this time period few Mormons erected fences to protect crops from livestock and settlers had to watch their crops very closely. Judge Tillman Hadley of Tuba City recounted how one section was “fenced by the Mormons and the improvements were within that fence. Lott Smith claimed the Reservoir Canyon area and Moenave and the valley here. These places were settled by the Mormons then.” Not wanting the responsibility of watching other people’s livestock, Smith fenced some of the land he was

---


74 Even though Peterson claims to be somewhat unbiased, one has to question why a noted historian neglected to include a number of sources that help paint a different picture of what really happened. See Peterson, “‘A Mighty Man was Brother Lot,’” 412.

leasing to keep livestock off of his property. Indians had lived in this area and had used this same land and water for Indian livestock before the Mormons’ arrival but since Smith had taken over the property, “he had refused to allow any livestock but his own to drink from the spring and had threatened to kill any others he found near the water.”

In June 1892 Atsidí visited his brother Tl’izílání Ha’dilch’álí (Talkative Man of the Many Goats Clan) in Pasture Canyon to help with some silversmith work. The land that Tl’izílání Ha’dilch’álí lived on is the same that he and his brother Atsidí purchased five years earlier from the Mormon, John Adams. It also happened to be next to Lot Smith’s property, which he had confiscated from Stone and Dittenhoffer in 1887. Atsidí brought his family and a flock of sheep for his visit. One day while the sheep were grazing, they entered Smith’s land. The Smith family contended the Navajos took down their fence and allowed the sheep to enter Smith’s property to use the spring. Atsidí claimed that the sheep got inside Smith’s field by accident.

Smith had been constructing three reservoirs in Pasture Canyon known as Lower, Middle and Upper. On June 21, 1892, Smith had been working at “Upper Reservoir,” while other Mormons were working on an irrigation ditch at “Lower Reservoir,” near Smith’s main property. Tl’izílání Ha’dilch’álí was between Smith’s property and Upper Reservoir. While he was passing by his pasture while returning home for lunch, he noticed a herd of sheep had entered his

---


77 In an interview with one of Atsidí’s daughters, she states that her father Atsidí was in the Tuba City area visiting his brother to make belts. See Mary Shepardson and Blodwen Hammond, The Navajo Mountain Community: Social Organization and Kinship Terminology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 41-42; also see Billy Sawyer interview.

78 Pasture Canyon is known as Mormon Reservoir and generally as Middle Reservoir. Mormon Reservoir usually describes the location of the Mormon dam on Moenkopi Wash.
As Smith neared, Tł’ízíłání Ha’dilch’ali’s children were supposedly taking care of the sheep, and when they saw Lot Smith they quickly disappeared into the brush to hide “from this fiery bearded demon who had suddenly appeared.” Angered by what he saw, Smith tried to chase the sheep out, but failed to do so. His solution was to return home and retrieve his pistol.

During this same time Tł’ízíłání Ha’dilch’ali’s wife noticed what had happened and tried to remove the sheep from Smith’s property with the aid of her children. While she was doing so, Smith returned and tried once again to herd the sheep off his property. Increasingly frustrated at

---

79 Smith’s wife indicates, “In the Spring of 1892 there were some strange Indians came and turned the cattle loose and let their sheep in the pastures. My husband had gone to Flagstaff, Arizona to get a mowing machine to cut the lucern crop and he saw the sheep grazing in the pasture. He had never had any great trouble with the Indians before about this because when he told them not to let their sheep in the pasture they would obey him. He made a trip down to see about it and was returning when he was shot in the back....” Alice Mary Baugh Smith’s comments reflect that Smith did not know his killer and states that Lot Smith was leaving for Flagstaff instead of returning after working on some of his fields as reported by others. See Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch;” Lee states that Lot Smith was working at the lower reservoir and instead of taking his dinner with him, he would ride over to the house of Diantha, one of his plural wives. Lee states that Smith rode there, ate, and was returning to work at the reservoir when he passed by the pasture owned by Lee’s father but leased out to Smith. At this pasture was a spring where Smith noticed some sheep belonging to Atsidí had entered his property. See Lee, “Excerpts from the statement of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., for P.T. Reilly”; Lydia Ann Brinkerhoff, the mother-in-law of Steven Heward, states, “One day as we were leaving the Relief Society, we heard shots from the hill east of town. They tell the story: As Indians were camped nearby and tended their sheep about an inclosed pasture wherein Lot Smith kept his milk cows, they became neglectful and often permitted their sheep to go under the fence and feed in the meadow.” See Lydia Ann Nelson Brinkerhoff, “Autobiography of Lydia Ann Nelson Brinkerhoff,” HBLL; in an interview with Mrs. Cummings, she states that “the Indians had been stealing Lot Smith’s sheep, and he went out on horseback to see them and try to reason with them. On his way back to town the Indians shot him.” See Mrs. B.F. Cummings, interview, 22 July 1946, interview FMC I, 511, transcript, The Austin and Alta Fife Fieldwork Collection, Special Collections and Archives, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

80 Haueter, “Part II,” 56.

81 Lt. R.E.L. Michie to the Assistant Adjutant General, 13 July 1892, typescript, JSBC; Al Smith, one of Lot Smith’s sons, states that Lot Smith rode four miles to his home after being shot; one interesting point is that Lot Smith’s weapon was fairly modern for the time because it was a repeating six shot pistol that required bullets to be placed into the barrel of the gun which required the handler to cock the gun to fire each shot, which was restricted by how big the barrel was. See Al Smith, interviewed by D. W. Melick, 25-26 February 1964, typescript, Lot Smith Collection, Special Collections and Archives Department, Cline Library, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ; according to a court document, Atsidí’s weapon was much older; it was a revolver which required gunpowder, it needed to be packed down and loaded with round metal balls to be used as “bullets” before it could be fired. The process was then repeated to shoot again. How many guns Smith or Atsidí had at the time is uncertain; Lee, “My Wonderful Country,” 14. Lee states that Smith already had his weapon with him when first encountering the Navajos and their sheep. Here Lee states that Smith had a saddle rifle. See, Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose, “Indictment 31” (4th Jud. Dist., Coconino Co., Terr. of AZ., 1892), Archives & Public Records, History and Archives Division, Arizona State Library, Phoenix, AZ.
the stubborn sheep, Smith raised his pistol at the sheep and killed several of them and wounded many more.\textsuperscript{82} He then pointed his pistol towards Tl’izilání Ha’dilch’ali’s wife and children and fired at them to supposedly “scare” them.\textsuperscript{83}

At this same time, Atsidí was in his brother’s house. Upon hearing the gunshots, Atsidí and his brother rushed to find out what was going on.\textsuperscript{84} They found Smith killing some of his sheep. Atsidí hopped on his horse and rode over to Smith to stop him from killing more of his sheep. By the time Atsidí reached Smith, he had fired off five more shots into the flock. Atsidí

\textsuperscript{82} Some have said that Lot Smith killed only a couple of sheep and wounded a couple while others have said he killed about six and wounded about twenty sheep. See Michie, 13 July 1892; Atsidí (Cat-chose) stated that he was not sure how many were left dead on the ground, but that 25-30 sheep died from wounds, and that he killed two of Lot Smith’s cows. See Cat-chose, interviewed by Samuel E. Shoemaker, 17 February 1895, typescript, Lot Smith Papers, USHS. Alfred Lehi, a Hopi Indian from the Tuba City area, states that Lot Smith noticed two coyotes among Atsidí’s sheep and was shooting at the coyotes, but when Atsidí came to investigate the shooting, all he saw was Smith shooting his sheep. Lehi actually blames another Indian named Rock Worm as the person who shot Smith and not Atsidí, even though he called Atsidí “a ruffian” who hated Lot Smith. See Alfred Lehi, interview by Max Hanley and trans. by Dollie Tabaha, typescript, n.d., interview tape #24, Navajo Nation Library, Window Rock, AZ.

\textsuperscript{83} An article in the \textit{Coconino Sun} erroneously stated that two boys went to help their mother; again it was two girls. “The Indian sent his squaw and two boys to drive out the sheep. While this was being done Smith, very much enraged, commenced firing on the sheep. He killed a number of them and wounded others. The Indian retaliated by firing into Smith’s cattle. This so infuriated Smith that he began firing on the squaw and her children, whereupon the Navajo fired at Smith and killed him.” See \textit{The Coconino Sun} (Flagstaff, Arizona), 15 September 1892.

\textsuperscript{84} One of Atsidí’s daughters stated that “My father’s brother lived near Tuba City. My father went to visit his brother to make belts. A white man was living at Tuba City on the east side of the canyon. The white man had cows, fenced in place, grass. My father’s brother was living up above that white man. He didn’t know his sheep went down there. My father’s brother’s younger wife ran to take the sheep out of the field. The white man came along the road on a horse. The horse jumped over the fence. The white man killed the sheep, lots of them, and then shot at the girl to scare her. My father’s brother chased him on horseback. My father came along and chased him too. My father shot the white man. Lots of white people around and they were dangerous. My sister and I went to Shonto and in Navajo Canyon.” See Mary Shepardson and Blodwen Hammond, \textit{The Navajo Mountain Community}, 41-42.
stated, “If you do not stop killing my sheep, I will kill your cows.”

Unfazed by Atsidí’s threat, Smith shot again into the flock of sheep. Atsidí then opened fire on Smith’s cow.

Angered by this, Smith turned his pistol on Atsidí and said, “You shoot another cow and I will shoot you.” Atsidí then turned his gun on another cow and shot. Smith then shot at Atsidí. Luckily enough the bullet missed, going through his horse’s mane just in front of the saddle.

Atsidí returned fire but missed Smith, the ball passing by his horse, which spooked the horse and whirled around so that Smith’s back was facing Atsidí. Smith fired another shot, which passed through Atsidí’s shirt in front of his belt. With Smith’s back to him, Atsidí fired once again, this time striking Smith with a fatal blow (see Figure 13).

---

85 Cat-chose, interview. This is an interview with Atsidí conducted in Tuba City on February 17, 1895.

86 In Michie’s final report he stated he believed that Smith had shot at Atsidí, missed, and killed his own cows. See Michie, 13 July 1892; Alice Mary Baugh Smith repeats a secondhand account stating that the Indian shot eight of his cows and then Lot Smith. See Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch.”

87 Cat-chose, interview.

88 According to Atsidí, he was unsure that his bullet hit Smith. He stated that Smith just rode off up the canyon and two days later he was told Lot Smith had expired; one rumor surrounding the death of Lot Smith argues that he was shot in the back by an ambush of Navajos. A fanciful account states that after Smith shot the Navajo sheep, dozens of armed Navajos rode up and shot him. See Cat-chose, interview; also see Melick, “Alma Smith: Pioneer Arizona Rancher”; a biography for Smith submitted to Andrew Jenson states, “In a moment half-a-dozen Navajos, who had been riding, arose and fired at his cows, shooting five, and other Indians appeared in the hills. Lot started back home on horseback and had just passed a point where there was a large rock, when an Indian, who had been riding up on the hill with a rifle on his shoulder and had watched for him till he passed this rock, fired from behind it, striking Lot.” See Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia: A Compilation of Biographical Sketches of Prominent Men and Women in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-days Saints, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: The Andrew Jenson History Co., 1901), 1:803-06; To remove doubt whether Smith was ambushed or not, Samuel Shoemaker states, “Mr. Seth B. Tanner, Stephen Hewerd, and J.B. Allen and Earnest Lee are the men who were at work at the middle reservoir, the latter informed me that he could not see Smith, and only saw one Indian fire a shot, but what Indian it was he does not know, not at what he was shooting. I deem it prudent to keep quiet until the time comes, as far as the whites are concerned”; again according to Michie, 13 July 1892, Lee did not see anything because his view was obstructed by a large hill. Even at the time that Lee provided an official coroner’s report, he stated he had no idea who had shot at Smith. Michie concluded that these rumors were just that. See Samuel E. Shoemaker to Major Constant Williams, 24 February 1895, typescript, Samuel E. Shoemaker Letters, USHS. Hereafter anything from the Samuel E. Shoemaker Letters collection will have the abbreviation SSL. Brinkerhoff states that “It was believed by some that Smith shot at the Indians, but if he did, no one was hurt,” and did not think Smith’s death was justified. See Brinkerhoff, “Autobiography of Lydia Ann Nelson Brinkerhoff.”
Mortally wounded, Smith rode his horse the long mile and a half back home. En route, Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., and Steve Heward joined him. Lee carried Smith into the home and laid him in bed. Smith asked his wife Diantha to bring him some water. When she returned with the water, Smith took the dipper and threw the water at her. He then asked her for a pillow, which she placed under his head. This angered Smith even more; Diantha asked where she was to place the pillow and Smith shouted at her to place it under his buttocks. While Smith was being tended to, a group of Navajos rode up and asked Lee to come out. They asked him whether Smith was dead yet. Lee told them no, but soon would be. On hearing the news, the Navajos rode off. On his deathbed, Smith admitted that he should have stopped when the Indians began killing his cows, but he did not think they would shoot back if he shot at them. Smith was shot around four o’clock that fateful day and it was not until ten o’clock that he passed away, leaving behind a large family.

Atsidi’s Family

Immediately after Smith’s death, the Navajos around Tuba City rounded up their flocks and gathered their families and fled to the nearest borders of the reservation, fearing retaliation.

---

90 According to Al Smith’s account, Lot Smith entered into their house with a blood-soaked shirt and "proceeded to die forthwith." See Al Smith, interview, 25-26.
91 Brinkerhoff stated that “Diantha, had just removed his boots. The men helped to take off his clothing and found that he had been shot through his breast.” See Brinkerhoff, “Autobiography of Lydia Ann Nelson Brinkerhoff”; Lee makes no mention of how big or small this “group” of Navajos was supposed to be. See Lee, “My Wonderful Country,” 9-11.
92 Michie, 13 July 1892.
from the Mormons of Tuba City.\textsuperscript{93} Atsidi’s family headed to the Navajo Mountain area, which was known for its complicated canyons allowing Navajos to escape detection. Atsidi separated from his family hoping to draw attention away from them and hid out among friends and relatives closer to Tuba City at Bóhoniidzo (Refuge).\textsuperscript{94}

The next morning, June 22, 1892, Smith’s body was being prepared for burial and off to the east side of town several hundred Navajos gathered on top of a hill, deciding whether or not they should declare war on the Mormons of Tuba City. “The young men were eager to get some war experience, but the old men whose memory of Kit Carson and Uncle Sam’s soldiers were still keen, persuaded them to desist, and the affair gradually quieted down.”\textsuperscript{95}

A coroner’s inquest convened, comprised of Edward Kelly, Seth Tanner, O.E. Bates, and T.W. Brookbank. They viewed Smith’s body and acted as witnesses for Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr.’s coroner’s report. They recorded the sworn testimony of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., Stephen Howard (also spelled Heward), and Alexander (also known as Alec) Allen, none of whom actually knew who the murderer was.\textsuperscript{96} Meanwhile, the Flagstaff deputy sheriff, Alexander Allen, gathered an

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{93} John Benson, “Death of Smith: (By a townsman),” LCLS.

\textsuperscript{94} Gus Dejolie states, “That is where the Navajos went to hide after Lott Smith was killed”; Benson, “Death of Smith: (By a townsman).” Benson states that the “renegade” Indian “fled with Navajos to reservation and apparently was protected there. Some say by agent; others by padres; some by Navajos.” See Gus Dejolie, “Field Notes-Order Survey with Grazing Committeeen,” interviewed by David M. Brugge (December 1967), transcript, DMBC; Alvin Nez states that “Bohondiidzo’i means ‘Retreat Hill,’ and is located by present-day Preston Mesa. The hill was named after an incident when either Mexicans or an enemy Indian tribe chased a group of Navajos there, finding refuge among the rocks located at top of the hill.” See David M. Brugge, interview of Alvin Nez, bound in Preliminary Survey of Indian Land Use-Moencopi Area; photocopy, in supporting materials for court case Vernon Masayesva v. Peterson Zah v. Evelyn James, “Deposition of David M. Brugge,” No. CIV 74-842 PHX-EHC, United States District Court, District of Arizona, 1992; bound in “Exhibit 2, pp DB 114-DB 227,” DMBC.

\textsuperscript{95} Brinkerhoff, “Autobiography of Lydia Ann Nelson Brinkerhoff.”

\textsuperscript{96} According to the Coconino Weekly, Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr. reported that Smith died on a Monday (June 21), and he left that night headed towards Flagstaff. This would explain the coroner’s report, which was submitted on Tuesday (June 22) in Flagstaff. According to this newspaper account given by Lee, he stated, “Only six Indians were concerned in the affray, although about two hundred of them were near at hand and many of them witnessed the shooting. Several white men were also witnesses.” These white witnesses mentioned were: Joseph Hyrum Lee,
armed posse and searched the Tuba City area looking for the killer. Due to confusion among the local authorities on whom the murderer might have been, they returned home empty-handed.

After the death of Lot Smith, the Mormons did not know who Smith’s killer was. It is unknown as to how Atsidí became the person of interest in the murder investigation, but after naming Atsidí as the main suspect, the local Indian Agent asked several influential Navajo headmen to convince Atsidí to turn himself in. Unsuccessful, the deputy sheriff then requested the aid of the United States Army to apprehend Atsidí. Indian Agent Shipley at Fort Defiance sent Lieutenant R.E.L. Michie as soon as he heard word of the incident. Michie left Fort Wingate on July 1, 1892, and arrived in Tuba City on July 8. There Michie noticed several

---

Jr., Stephen Howard (also spelled Heward), and Alexander (also known as Alec) Allen. See *Coconino Weekly Sun* (Flagstaff, Arizona), 23 June 1892; also see *Coconino Weekly Sun* (Flagstaff, Arizona), 30 June 1892; Haueter states that Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr. met up with deputy sheriff Allen in Tuba City the day after Smith was killed. From this meeting Allen supposedly told Lee to bring in Atsidí “who had tried to shoot Lot Smith once before, but had missed. There had been bad blood between them for a long time and the deputy believed that Chachos had killed Smith.” Lee refused to chase after Atsidí and told Allen to do it himself, and then made his way to Flagstaff to tell the sheriff there before journeying to tell Smith’s sons living at Mormon Lake, south of Flagstaff, what had happened. This contradicted the inquest held during this same time that stated Allen did not know who shot Smith. See Haueter, “Part II,” 57.

Another rumor surrounding Smith’s death is that his murderer was never punished; Benson states that the “Indian who shot Smith was not arrested or tried for his crimes.” See Benson, “Death of Smith: (By a townsman);” Lee also states that the Indian who killed Smith was never found or taken before a judge because people were still uncertain who the killer was even after Atsidí was accused of the crime. Lee stated that at first he thought Atsidí killed Smith, but several years later he came to believe that a Navajo by the name of Hastiin Denetsosie had actually killed Smith. To him this made sense, because according to his memory, at the time of Smith’s death Atsidí was a very sick man and was not capable physically of doing anything. The reliability of this information is up for debate considering that this statement comes from Lee over fifty years after the fact and varies somewhat from his coroner’s report and newspaper accounts taken at the time of the incident which were given by Lee. See Lee, “My Wonderful Country,” 9-11; in another account Lee states that Atsidí could not have been the killer because Hastiin Denetsosie came to Lee and stated that the “spirit” of Lot Smith had been bothering him and Hastiin Denetsosie confessed to murdering Smith in 1895-96. See Lee, “Excerpts from the statement of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., for P.T. Reilly.”

Michie, 13 July 1892.
hundred well-armed Navajo men ready for battle. The following day, Michie met with the Navajo entourage.\textsuperscript{100}

The Navajos insisted they would not give up Atsidí. Michie informed the men that he was only there to hear their side of the story. Michie told the Navajos that all men, white or Indian, had to obey the laws, even in self-defense. Atsidí had to go and state his case before the proper authorities. Upon hearing this, they began relating their grievances against the residents of Tuba City. One of the men claimed that Smith had destroyed his watermelon vines and that Smith’s son had frequently fired his gun in the air to frighten him. Their main complaint, however, charged the Mormons with confiscating Indian land. The Navajos promised Michie that they would not trespass or interfere with the Mormons and would behave themselves. The group selected ‘Charlie Etcitie’ as a representative Navajo to talk with the Mormons to settle future matters.\textsuperscript{101} The irony is that ‘Charlie Etcitie’ was an English name for the man Michie was looking for, Atsidí, the man who took Lot Smith’s life.

In conversations with Michie, the local residents of Tuba City also stated their grievances against the Navajos. They complained that Smith’s death had been premeditated but, after some discussion, agreed to promote peace.\textsuperscript{102} The Mormons agreed there would be no problems

\textsuperscript{100} U.S. Senate, Letter From the Acting Secretary of the Interior, \textit{ Transmitting Copy of Indian Office Report of the 21st Instant Relative to the Situation Among the Navajo Indians in New Mexico and Arizona}, report prepared by Mr. Stockbridge, 52\textsuperscript{nd} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} Sess., Exec. Doc. No. 152, 1892 (Photocopy) http://www.azwater.gov/azdwr/default.aspx (accessed November 16, 2009); Michie, 13 July 1892.

\textsuperscript{101} Michie, 13 July 1892.

\textsuperscript{102} The theory of a premeditated murder by Indians surrounded Smith’s death early on. When investigating the incident, Michie learned that “Mr. DeCloss had received information through an Indian that the killing of Smith was decided on in a council of the Indians some time before and the sheep were allowed in the pasture.” See Michie, 13 July 1892; in the Jenson biography of Smith, it states that a D. Claws (DeCloss) laughed at the Navajos and their plan to kill a white man; it was two hours after this that Lot Smith was shot. See Jenson, \textit{ Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia}, 803-806; Alice Mary Baugh Smith also shares this same tale about this man named Clause (DeCloss). She blamed non-Mormon traders for trying to cause hatred and suspicion of the Mormons. See Smith, “Autobiographical Sketch;” author Ivan Barrett blamed a Catholic priest named Father Neal Teel and non-
unless they decided to go after Atsidí. That night Michie heard a rumor that a separate group of
Navajos came and talked with those who had spoken with him earlier on, then returned to Atsidí
and reported what had transpired. The next day, the Navajos invited Michie to Blue Canyon,
supposedly to meet Atsidí. Upon his arrival, he discovered Atsidí was supposedly a hundred
miles north on the San Juan. Discouraged, Michie then left to go to Keams Canyon to submit his
report.  

Lieutenant Michie’s final report concluded he found no fault with Atsidí, who killed
Smith in self-defense. Michie believed “eyewitnesses” Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., Stephen Howard,
and Alexander Allen, could not have observed Lot Smith being shot. His investigation found
their view would have been obstructed by a large hill so he gave little credence to most of their
testimonies. Several other Navajos identified as eyewitnesses also apparently saw nothing and
only knew what they had been told by others. It is uncertain when they were originally
interviewed but Samuel E. Shoemaker interviewed them again in 1895.

Mormon traders seeking to provoke the Indians into taking back lands Mormons had encroached upon. See Ivan
Barrett, Major Lot Smith: Mormon Raider (Salt Lake City: Covenant Communications, Inc., 1991), 120-122;
Earnest Lee (Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr.) also spread rumors that the Navajos planned to do something to Smith because
he warned trespassers to keep their “animals away from his fields or suffer the consequences. Finding a bunch of
Hosteen Denetsosie’s cattle near his field Smith put seventeen head in a corral without feed or water until they
nearly starved to death. Denetsosie and his people hated Smith for this and bided their time to get even.” Lee
accused Denetsosie of the murder stating that “As Howard and I ran toward him, Hosteen Denetsosie came down
from the hills well away from where the shots had been fired.” In an earlier account found in, Lee, “Excerpts from
the statements of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., for P.T. Reilly,” he states that Atsidi was actually the murderer who waited
behind a hill waiting to ambush Smith and shot him in the back as he rode by. Again Michie deemed these to be just

103 Michie, 13 July 1892.

104 In a separate interview with Ernest Lee (Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr.), Stephen Heward (Howard), and J.B.
Allen (Alexander Allen), and Seth B. Tanner in 1895, they reaffirmed Michie’s report that these men did not and
could not have witnessed the death of Lot Smith. See Samuel E. Shoemaker to Major Constant Williams, 24
February 1895, typescript, SSL;

105 The Indians who were supposedly eyewitnesses were identified as mentioned Hosteen Nez Tsosi and
Hosteen Nez Tsosi Ba-ad. See Shoemaker, 24 February 1895; Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose, “Subpoena to
Hosteen Nez Tsosi and Hosteen Nez Tsosi Ba-ad, Navajos,” (4th Jud. Dist., Coconino Co., Terr. of AZ., 1896),
As far as the U.S. government was concerned, the overall feeling of the incident was that, “The Indian, it was alleged, had been under very great provocation, as the whites were determined to drive the Indians out of that area and had fired on him.” Nevertheless, the case still had to be taken to court. By October 1892, an indictment was finally produced, *Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose* (Chách’osh). Chách’osh was another name Atsidí was known by. The proceedings continued without his presence. As stated in the indictment, Atsidí, who “willfully, feloniously, deliberately, premeditatedly and with his malice aforethought, make [sic] an assault upon one Lot Smith,” was indicted for murder and soon after a warrant for his arrest was put forth.

The impaneled jury expressed their frustration with the local authorities for not apprehending “the murderer of Lot Smith…whose identity is susceptible to considerable uncertainty.” The jury requested a renewed manhunt locating the murderer because the Mormons in Tuba City “suffer greatly from the depredations of the Navajo Indians, who kill their cattle, steal their horses, destroy their dams and ditches used for irrigating their farms, and

---


107 According to Lee, Alec (Alex) Allen, the Flagstaff deputy, was sent “to serve Chachos, the Navajo who was accused of killing Lot Smith.” See Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose, “Indictment: Murder” (4th Jud. Dist., Coconino Co., Terr. of AZ., 1892), Archives & Public Records, History and Archives Division, Arizona State Library, Phoenix, Arizona; also see, Lee, “Excerpts from the statement of Joseph Hyrum Lee, Jr., for P.T. Reilly.”
threaten (not always vainly) their lives.” They wanted to bring the offender forward and punish him, hoping that it would be a “proper realization of the rights of their white neighbors.”

As the Mormons of Tuba City had requested months before, U.S. soldiers were finally sent to apprehend Atsidí. Alexander M. Stephen, a retired officer from the New York 96th Infantry, was in Arizona visiting his friend, Tom Keams, in 1881. By 1890, the army included him in the expedition. Stephen recorded his daily life among the Hopis of First Mesa wherein he came into contact with Captain Kingsbury in November 1892. Kingsbury told him he had traveled with his troops of the second cavalry to Moenkopi to investigate the troubles between the Navajos and Mormons regarding Smith’s death.

Confusion as to whether Atsidí was the Indian they were looking for helps explain why Atsidí returned to the Tuba City area and remained there unharmed. Around 1892 Atsidí even received an allotment of land west of Moenkopi, which included land he purchased several years earlier (see Appendix E). Atsidí began improving his allotment and built a home on it. Concurrently, Mormon disputes over these Indian allotments granted by Mayhugh started to surface. Indians countered with complaints of their own; that Mormons had harassed Navajos,

---


109 Lt. Lafferty states that Captain Kingsbury also investigated Lot Smith’s death. He believed that the problems stemmed from the Mormons treating the Navajos poorly and was convinced that the Navajo was justified to shoot; as a sidenote Stephen mentioned that the Indian man named Musher had “complain that the Mormons have dispossessed them of their land, etc. There is an ugly mess of troubles and difficulties out yonder.” This is the same Musher that Musher Springs is named after. See Alexander M. Stephen, Hopi Journal of Alexander M. Stephen, ed. Elsie Clews Parsons, vol. 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 997; Lt. Lafferty to Captain Constant Williams, 7 June 1895, typescript, MDTC.

110 This allotment probably took place sometime during July 2-20, 1892, because Special Allotment Agent Mayhugh was directed to visit the Moenkopi and Tuba City area to make homestead allotments for the Indians in this area and reported on doing so. See John S. Mayhugh, Special Allotment Agent to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Daniel M. Browning, 19 February 1894, photocopy, JSBC.

including Atsidi, over these allotments. The following year in 1894, additional disputes arose “over dams between Etcitty (Atsidi) and Mormons.” Local authorities attempted to arrest Atsidí a number of times, but each time Atsidí escaped to the safety of the reservation boundaries outside the jurisdiction of the local authorities.

Atsidí finally agreed to surrender to U.S. Indian Agent David Shipley. Shipley sought an assurance of a fair trial before he turned Atsidí over to the local authorities. When no trial materialized, Atsidí grew tired of waiting and left. Shipley was released as agent in 1893 and replaced by Lieutenant E. H. Plummer. In February 1895, Atsidí turned himself in at Tuba City. Atsidí sat in jail for several weeks before being transported to Fort Defiance by another new Navajo Agent, Major Constant Williams.

During his time in the Tuba City jail, Samuel E. Shoemaker interviewed him and asked if he would go to Flagstaff to the newly built courthouse to stand trial (see Figure 14). His answer was that he would only go “if I am certain to have a fair trial. I will not go willingly unless you or the agent can satisfy me that I will be fairly treated.” Shoemaker replied, “What makes you think you will not be fairly treated?” Atsidí responded, “I am a Navajo and the Americans think we have no rights and should all be killed. And I have been told that some of the Smiths sons are awaiting a chance to kill me, so I try to keep away.” Smith’s sons never did kill Atsidí, but

---

112 David M. Brugge, “Moenkopi History-Chronological Summary, 1604-1921,” DMBC.

113 The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 19 March 1896.


115 Cat-chose, interview.
two years later one of his brothers was killed by a local Mormon trader, perhaps to avenge Smith’s death.116

Atsidí told Shoemaker that all he wanted was to live free. “I could not help what I have done.” He expressed regret for Smith’s death since the two were on good terms before this incident. Shoemaker asked what made Smith turn so quickly. Atsidí informed him that Smith sometimes killed Navajo and Hopi sheep, beat Indians, or fired his weapon to intimidate Indians.117 A federal guard escorted Atsidí to Fort Defiance to await trial. Meanwhile the local newspaper The Coconino Sun reported that nothing had changed since that fateful day in 1892. An article on May 16, 1895 reported that the Navajo who was “responsible for the killing of Bishop Lot Smith is a problem that the sheriffs have been trying to solve ever since the offense took place.” According to the Grand Jury, a number of Smith’s friends and family were positive that a certain Navajo was guilty, and even if the right Navajo was “brought to trial, is rather doubtful, and it is not likely that the case will ever be brought up in court.”118 The Grand Jury submitted a report later published in the same paper indicating that Smith’s murder trial could be used as an example, “believing that an exemplary punishment will have the effect of bringing the Indians to a proper realization of the rights of their white neighbors.”119

The case finally went to trial three years after the incident. As the court hearing in August 1895 approached, Atsidí was to be transported to Flagstaff to stand trial. The Grand Jury became quite upset with the failure of Navajo Agent Major Constant Williams to deliver Atsidí

116 Billy Sawyer, interview.
117 Cat-chose, interview.
118 The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 16 May 1895.
119 Ibid.
and requested that he be forced to deliver Atsidí or be removed from office. A continued request was made to apprehend Atsidí, but he was never turned over. A continued request was made to apprehend Atsidí, but he was never turned over.

As court prepared to go back into session, a Bench Warrant was issued on March 10, 1896, for Atsidí’s arrest. On March 11, Atsidí was turned over to Flagstaff Sheriff Cameron. As Cameron escorted Atsidí from Fort Defiance to Flagstaff, he was joined by Navajo Agent Major Constant Williams, Samuel E. Shoemaker, and Henry Dodge who was to act as Navajo Interpreter. Sometime between March 12 and 17, 1896, the case Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose finally took place with everyone present. During the case, an incident over one of the jury members, Thomas Sayer, revealed he was not a citizen and was never naturalized a citizen of the United States. The legality of the Territory of Arizona v. Chat-Chose case was thus called into question. Atsidí’s attorney filed a motion for dismissal, which was granted on 17 March 1896 “on account of the illegality of that grand jury.” On March 17, 1896, the case was dismissed and all charges were dropped against Atsidí. On September 23, 1896, Atsidí was set free.

120 The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 15 August 1895.

121 The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 19 March 1896.


123 The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 19 March 1896.


125 Territory of Arizona v. Chat-chose, a Navajo Indian, Motion to Quash Indictment, (4th Jud. Dist., Coconino Co., Terr. of AZ., n.d.), Archives & Public Records, History and Archives Division, Arizona State Library, Phoenix, Arizona; The Coconino Sun (Flagstaff, Arizona), 19 March 1896; Haueter stated that Atsidí “was arrested and charged with killing Smith although there apparently wasn’t any proof against him. Everyone believed he was guilty. The Navajos said so but none of them would swear to anything and as a result he was never convicted of the killing.” See Haueter, “Part II,” 57.

126 Shepardson and Hammond, The Navajo Mountain Community, 33.
After his release, Atsidi made his way across the Arizona desert to return to his family, who was still hiding near Navajo Mountain. After killing Smith, Atsidi became known as Hastiin Daghaa’ Łichii’iisxiini which means “Killer of the Red Moustache” and “Whiteman Killer.”

Whiteman Killer’s family moved to Navajo Mountain and became permanent residents. Navajo Mountain borders the Utah-Arizona border and has become the central headquarters for present-day Utah Navajos.

\[127\] Ibid., 33. It is not known if this was an honorary name or not. Navajo naming customs could account for an honorary name, or Atsidi was just renamed as a result of a major event taking place in his life. This would not necessarily mean that it would be an honorary name.
Chapter 6
Reservation Blues

Disputes over land and water are fairly reliable indicator of the pressures being applied to the Indians and the landscape of the area by Mormons and Federal officials alike. In their way the records demonstrate the subtle shifts of power that lead to physical changes of the environment. It is also significant that gentiles seldom played a dominant role in the disputes except as Agents for the Indians.¹

The death of Lot Smith brought the fight over land and water to the forefront. It also highlighted the need to address the challenge of off-reservation Navajos. Federal officials thought that creating a new reservation that included Tuba City would solve both issues at once. Before Smith’s death he had begun claiming all of the water and land around Tuba City as his own. His was not the first contested claim between Mormons and Indians over the area’s resources. The emerging pattern stressed the Mormons gaining control over the ideal locations and allowing Indians to retain the nonideal lands for themselves. In October 1884, another land dispute arose between the Navajos and Mormons and Navajo Agent John Bowman visited Tuba City to help settle the dispute. As the Mormon population continued to increase in 1885, so did the disagreements over irrigation water with the Hopis and concerns with Navajo livestock grazing.²

One of the earliest examples of the Mormons trying to gain legal control over the waters in and around Tuba City/Moenkopi comes from the journal of Mormon missionary Christian Lingo Christensen. Upon returning from a trip, now back in Tuba City, Christensen was visited


² David M. Brugge, “The Moenkopi Boundary Problem-Final Report,” (photocopy), p. 17, David M. Brugge Collection, Center for Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, NM.
by Ruben Farnsworth and Robert Sainsberry on behalf of the Mormons on May 31, 1885. They brought a petition signed by the settlers of Tuba City/Moenkopi, because they viewed the Hopis as “stealing a little Water from us and other trespasses Common to Ignorant Indians” (copied exactly as in original). Christensen argued that they should show more compassion; in doing so he was accused of being in conspiracy with the Indians. Christensen and Ruben Farnsworth eventually visited with Teuve, he stated he was sorry for the hard feelings and believed that all of this came from “the Lack of understanding as We had no interpreter Where I (Christensen) was gone” (copied exactly as in original). The petition was read to Teuve and he declined to sign it, stating that both parties were to blame for the current situation, and that

“his people were Deaf and our people Wanted the Whole Country that them and Jacob Hamblin Who was the first Elder out here had agreed to Come no father than Moeaby [Moenave] and they now claimed the Whole Country and Water and not Willing to do or become like they used to Be….Tuba Said he had done all he could and Was not Responsible for all Indians and their Doings” (copied exactly as in original).4

The following month the Mormons needed more water for their crops and on June 15, Christensen decided to visit with Teuve once again. Teuve stated that he “felt quite ougly (ugly) about our social Relations he Said he had washed him Self against the Mormons and wanted nothing more to do with them he Said he was a Gentile” (copied exactly as in original). Christensen warned Teuve that the gentiles would take away his wife and that they probably already defiled her.5

---

3 Christian Lingo Christensen, “Diary of Christian Lingo Christensen,” (typescript), p. 70, Christian Lingo Christensen Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter anything from the L. Tom Perry Special Collections located at the Harold B. Lee Library will be abbreviated as HBLL.

4 Ibid., 71.

5 Christensen, “Diary of Christian Lingo Christensen,” p. 76.
By July 10, Christensen also wrote a letter to agent Bowman. He complained that the Hopis “Steel Water all the time But this Season on a Larger Scale. Tuba having turned against us more than usual” (copied exactly as in original). He goes on further stating that even John W. Young personally spent over $600 dollars draining a supposed swamp and that the Mormons had been sharing the water from the local Reservoir with the Hopis but we “would like to be the water masters ourselves.”

At the end of the year on December 22, Christensen and a fellow Mormon named Austin Farnsworth visited Teuve about the problems they had during the summer months. Teuve stated he “felt bad to think that he had been Beat By his friends till the Blood ran from his head in a Stream” (copied exactly as in original). He stated that he had an agreement with the original Mormon settlers regarding water rights, but the new Mormon settlers did not honor it. Teuve wanted to live in peace, and informed them that he would do all he could with his tribesmen as long as the Mormons tried to control the “Bad Mormons.”

Special Indian Agent H.S. Welton was sent to investigate another dispute between the Hopis and Mormons in June 1888. The Hopis complained that the Mormons had taken over their lands and waters at Moenkopi. The Mormons had permitted the Hopis to keep a small portion of land, but denied them water access to irrigate their crops. The main perpetrator was identified as Lot Smith, who informed the Hopis that he had purchased all of the land that the Moenkopi village sits on and ordered them off of his property. The land in question, located next to Moenkopi, was the same land that Welton suggested should be allotted to four Hopis.

---

6 Ibid., 20.
7 Ibid., 85.
With the claim of Moenkopi in 1888, Smith hoped to push out all of the Hopis, taking their land and water claims. Non-Mormon traders like Dittenhoffer and Stone also created animosity. Smith drove those he could away, laying claim to their land and water rights in 1887. The third group of people Smith needed to push out was the Navajos. As with the Hopis and non-Mormons, Smith relied upon violence to intimidate and drive them out. When Smith’s misinformation and subterfuge did not work, he began using violence to achieve his goals.

During 1892, Indian Agent David Shipley tried to deal with the troubles erupting between the Mormons, Navajos, and Hopis. Shipley viewed the Mormons as the instigators because the Mormons had, “settled on lands belonging to both the Navajos and the Hopis by prior use as well as by law.”9 The Navajos and Hopis also saw the Mormons as interlopers when it came to the conflict over land and water rights.10 This perception did not prevent Lot Smith and other Mormons from taking what they believed were theirs for the taking.

Smith’s death in 1892 brought these problems to the forefront. Meanwhile, in June 1892, Special Allotment Agent John S. Mayhugh was appointed to visit the 1882 Executive Order Reservation in order to allot lands to the Hopis. After meeting with Ralph P. Collins, the Superintendent at Keams Canyon, Mayhugh concluded that certain Oraibi Hopis cultivated lands near Tuba City and that these Indians were gradually driven from their best lands and water. He reported this to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs adding that the “most guilty in the respect being named ‘Lot Smith.’”11 The Hopis contended that Smith had also plowed up a Hopi

---


family’s crops of corn, beans, and melons that spring. The Hopis concluded that since the arrival of the Mormons, they have commenced driving the Hopi people “from the best land and have taken the water until they have little or none.”

Mayhugh felt that the injustice that had fallen on the Hopis since the Mormons’ arrival could be alleviated by locating the western boundary of the reservation. If the Hopis’ fields lay outside of the reservation, then the Hopis should be given homestead allotments. Ironically, it just so happened that Mayhugh dated his report to his superior officers on June 22, 1892, one day after Lot Smith was killed. He hoped allotments would solve the disputes between the Hopis and Mormons. The Indian allotments given out basically covered most of the disputed lands in Moenkopi Wash and Reservoir Canyon that were taken over by Lot Smith and other Mormons. Smith’s death did not solve the problem — it underscored it.

By August 4, 1892, Mayhugh began allotting lands to the Indians at Moenkopi and several weeks later the Mormons protested, contending that the area was being turned into a reservation. In January 1893, Co-say-nay-las, a Navajo man, asked Mayhugh for an allotment of land he was farming in Moenkopi Wash. Several days later a Hopi also visited Mayhugh asking for an allotment. The following day an Indian named Lay-toke-she and other Hopis who had been allotted land complained that the Mormons had destroyed allotment markers and confiscated their allotments and threatened to kill Mayhugh if he ever returned to Moenkopi. Atsidí, too, visited Mayhugh on January 26 complaining that “a Mormon had built a house and

12 John S. Mayhugh, Special Allotment Agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs T.J. Morgan, 22 June 1892, photocopy, John S. Boyden Collection, HBLL. Hereafter anything from the John S. Boyden Collection will have the abbreviation JSBC.

13 Ibid.
appropriated a spring, depriving him of water on his allotment.”14 On January 30, 1893, Mayhugh reported to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that the off-reservation Navajos, particularly those around the Tuba City and the Moenkopi areas had asked him to allot lands to them.

The following month Mayhugh reported to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that a Hopi who had received an allotment in the Moenkopi area was horsewhipped and driven from his land by Smith’s son, “Mormon Jim,” who threatened to kill any Hopi who tried to farm the Indian-allotted land.15

The acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior reiterated this same incident and reported this as a major concern of his. Mayhugh stated that the Hopi Indian who was abused was working on his father’s allotted land. Mormon Jim apparently took the Hopi’s hoe from his hand “declaring that the land belonged to the Mormons and not the Indians.”16 This Hopi, Tar-losh-mep-teah, asserted that the Mormons had taken nearly all of the allotted Indians’ land and had prohibited them from planting crops. Mayhugh visited the off-reservation Indians around Moenkopi and Tuba City to assist them in applying for allotments. He found that the Mormons were interfering with the allotments to the Indians.

In response to Mayhugh’s letter, the acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs asked for an investigation to take place, looking into the complaint that the Mormons were interfering with and trespassing upon the lands allotted to the Indians in the Moenkopi and Tuba City area. If the Mormons were found guilty, they should be warned of the “lawful rights of Indian allottees,” and


15 Mormon Jim is said to be one of Lot Smith’s sons, known as Helaman “Jim” Smith.

16 R.V. Belt, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Secretary of the Interior, 15 March 1893, photocopy, JSBC.
they would be prosecuted according to “a clause in the Indian Appropriation Act, approved March 3, 1893 (Public #125), which provides that ‘In all States and Territories where there are reservations or allotted Indians, the United States District Attorney shall represent them in all suits at law and in equity,’” if they did not desist.¹⁷ Mayhugh returned to Moenkopi in April and found that about a fourth of the Indian allotments he made in July 1892 were controlled by the Mormons. He told the Indians to remain peaceful and to start farming their allotments. If problems persisted they should report the incident.¹⁸

Oraibi Hopi Chief, Lololma, complained in July 1893 that the government had failed to protect their allotments.¹⁹ Hence, in September 1893, Indian Inspector Paul F. Faison went to Tuba City and investigated the disputes between the Mormons and Indians. He found the “Mormon Jim” story fabricated but did find a Mormon named Ashton Nebeker who claimed 120 acres of Indian lands. Nebeker claimed land that had been allotted twenty years earlier to the Indians. Faison believed that the Moenkopi Springs should belong to the Hopis and that the water from Moenkopi Wash should belong to the Mormons.²⁰

Nebeker had arrived at Moenkopi in 1893, shortly after the death of Lot Smith. Nebeker and fellow Mormon Robert Sensbury claimed the Mormon farming areas in the Moenkopi Wash which Lot Smith had appropriated. Nebeker treated Indians as harshly as Smith, forcing the Hopis to pay him for the privilege of cultivating their crops, claiming that the land no longer

---

¹⁷ R.V. Belt, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Special Allotment Agent John S. Mayhugh, 16 March 1893, photocopy, JSBC; Belt, 15 March 1893.


belonged to the Hopis.\textsuperscript{21} Faison’s report gave the Mormons hope that they could utilize all the water of Moenkopi Wash. The Mormons took legal action to make this a reality.

Lot Smith’s death exacerbated the issues surrounding the legal status of the non-reservation Navajos.\textsuperscript{22} To remedy the problem, the Bureau of Indian Affairs first recommended that the Navajo Reservation be divided into districts in order to establish an irrigation system and reliable water supply. Army Officers should travel to each district to make a preliminary topographical survey in order to make a precise contour map. These surveys should keep in view the establishing of and maintaining of an irrigation system and that ditches and dams should be designated. Finally an estimate of how much it would cost for these improvements and a report of the feasibility of developing and maintaining such an irrigation system concluded their recommendations.

This program was approved by the U.S. War Department with adequate appropriations to help develop an irrigation and water supply on the Navajo Reservation to meet current and future needs and “permit the return of all Navajos living outside the Navajo Reservation, as well as to restrain those who were in the habit of going beyond its limits to secure water and grass for their flocks.”\textsuperscript{23} In the government’s eyes, this would be the solution to the water needs for an increasing Indian population and their herds.

Meanwhile, Mormons turned to the courts to secure their water rights. In October 1893 the case of \textit{Brinkerhoff and Slattery} focused on water rights in Moenkopi Wash. The Mormons testified that they had built a dam and aqueducts as early as February 1888 to divert water from


\textsuperscript{22} George P. Hammond, “Navajo-Hopi Relations: Part II, 1882-1911” (Berkeley: Bancroft Library, University of California, 1957), 50.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 51.
Moenkopi Wash for Mormon farms, prior to the defendant, Fred Slattery, building a dam above theirs. The Mormon suit against Slattery claimed that he had impeded the waters the Mormons had been using by diverting a great portion of the water when he constructed a dam above the Mormon one. This caused the Mormons shortages between the months of April and September. The Mormons argued Slattery withheld all of the waters from Moenkopi Wash against their “wishes and consent.”

The judge ruled in favor of the Mormons because when they had appropriated the waters from Moenkopi Wash, no other “person” was using the water. The Mormons had settled on “public lands” and so they were the prior appropriators. The judge also ruled that Slattery was restricted from erecting, constructing or maintaining any dam, ditch or obstruction of the Moenkopi Wash waters, either by his own hands, his servants, attorneys, employees, or with any help from the Navajos working with or for him. The case gave the Mormons the legal precedent that they needed, showing that they held the rights to the waters of Moenkopi Wash against any other white non-Mormon settlers. Their quest for power was not over; they needed to jump one last hurdle. They had to prove in court that they had the legal rights to Moenkopi Wash against the Hopis and Navajos. They would have to wait until 1899 before their case finally went to court.

By February 1, 1894, Mayhugh had finished making allotments and traveled to Fort Defiance to obtain Indian Agent Lieutenant E. H. Plummer’s signature. Plummer was hesitant to sign off on these allotments at first but eventually did so and Mayhugh mailed these and his

report to his superiors. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported on February 15, 1894, to
the Secretary of the Interior about the trouble in the Tuba City/Moenkopi area with the Mormons
and off-reservation Indians. He contended that the Mormons were driving Indians off their lands
and that Mayhugh went to the Tuba City/Moenkopi area to assist the Indians in filling out
allotment applications on land with no prior claims. At least twelve Indians took advantage of
filing applications for allotments.\(^{25}\)

On February 19, some Mormons sent a letter to Agent Plummer stating that the Mormon-
Indian problems about the allotted lands had been settled by Mayhugh but the water rights issue
remained unsettled. The Mormons complained that Atsidi had threatened to cut their dam and
the next day they found it cut.\(^{26}\) The Mormons wrote another letter to Plummer in April 1894
complaining that some Navajos had built a dam above the Mormon dam, thus causing the water
to stop flowing to their dam. In another letter written to Arizona Representative Mark Smith
they complained that the Indians were depriving Mormons of land and water and placed the
blame, in part, on Mayhugh. By September 6, Plummer argued that it was actually the Indians
who were being deprived of their rights. The Mormons ignored the Indian allotment papers and
forced the Indians off their lands by making false charges and claiming the Indians stole
Mormon livestock. Three Hopis were also arrested within the week, on charges of breaking a
dam.\(^{27}\)

During this time Agent Plummer was replaced by Major Constant Williams. Williams
recommended that Mayhugh’s allotments be approved. Sometime in February 1895 Major

\(^{25}\) D.M. Browning, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Secretary of the Interior, 15 February 1894,
photocopy, JSBC.


\(^{27}\) Ibid.
Williams reported that on an earlier trip to Moenkopi he was shown the location where Indians used to have a dam, but the Mormons tore it down and rebuilt a dam of their own. As a result he asked Shoemaker to enter into an agreement with the Mormons on behalf of the Indians so that they could have some water for their crops in 1895. At the request of Major Williams, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs officially approved the allotments in February 1895.

In an attempt to gain legal authority to the water around Moenkopi, Shoemaker originally came in to assist the Mormons on February 20, 1895. David Brinkerhoff, J.A. Allen and Ashton Nebeker represented the Mormon citizens of Tuba City. They drew up a contract that claimed use of the waters from Moenkopi Wash. The contract stated that the Mormons would give the Indians exclusive use of the water during the months of February, March and April. The Mormons would receive the exclusive rights to the water the remainder of the year. It also stated that during the months when the Mormons had rights to the water, that Indians would be removed from their lands and restrained from further encroachments.

Several days later on February 24, Shoemaker wrote Navajo Agent Constant Williams stating that he had not signed the contract the Mormons wrote up. Shoemaker felt it necessary to speak with the Indians who would be affected by this contract first. In doing so, Shoemaker learned that the Indians did not want to be removed from the area and if they were, it would have to be by force; “I have also seen and talked to the Indians above and below the Mormon dam and they all agree to run the risk of getting water from floods, rather than surrender the land in the

---


30 “Contract [between citizens of Tuba et al. and the Indians of Moe-Copie Wash],” 20 February 1895, typescript, Samuel E. Shoemaker Letters, Manuscripts Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, UT; hereafter abbreviated as USHS. Hereafter anything from the Samuel E. Shoemaker Letters collection will have the abbreviation SSL.
reservoir for any length of time.” Shoemaker felt that the Mormon claims had been a “most unjust affair.”

After spending some time among the Mormons, Shoemaker’s attitude of assistance became one of warning against the Mormons, “I am very glad that we did not make contract with the Tuba City Gentry on the water question.” Angered by the Mormons, Shoemaker wrote a pointed letter to his superiors on March 24, 1895, wherein he reported that the Indians actually needed the water for farming purposes during the months of April, May and June. He also stated that Teuve was “pounded” by a Mormon “to such a degree that he died from the effects.” Shoemaker also estimated that there were about five thousand off-reservation Navajos in the area who relied on the water rights the Mormons were trying to take away from them. Several weeks later on April 7, 1895, Shoemaker wrote another letter to his superior reporting that he was “forced to enter into a contract with the people of Tuba City for water.” It is uncertain what the terms were, or if it was the same as the original contract written up on February 24, 1895. Shoemaker indicated that this contract, allowing some Indians water and denying it to others, would cause trouble. Shoemaker asked whether or not the Mormons of Tuba City had legal rights to the water of Moenkopi Wash. “If they cannot, and have no right to said water the problem is solved. If they can controle [sic.] the water the Indian will have to go.”

The question of Indian allotments in the Moenkopi Wash area came up again in a letter from Navajo Agent Williams to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, on May 11, 1895. It states:

31 Samuel E. Shoemaker to Major Constant Williams, 24 February 1895, typescript, SSL.

32 Ibid.

33 Samuel E. Shoemaker to Major Constant Williams, 7 April 1895, Typescript, SSL; in an affidavit by Algert, he said this probably took place in 1892 when “the Mormons recorded a water-right for the waters of the Moen-copi wash, and after that time endeavored with varying success to prevent the Navajos from putting in dams above them.” See C.H. Algert, Affidavit, 2 August 1898, SSL.
The Mormon intruders in that country are now very aggressive and some time ago obtained a decree from the courts in Coconino County giving to them the right, as original appropriators, to all the water of the Wash; this decree was made in an action against a white man, but it gives to the Mormons the right of water as against all other claimants.\(^{34}\)

Williams argued that the Indians of the Moenkopi Wash were actually the original settlers and farmers and “that their claims to the land and water should be established.” He pleaded to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for assistance to “see that their claims to the land were officially recognized.” If that happened, he would be able to have the court injunction dissolved. To help his case, Williams felt it was important to begin gathering evidence to prove that the original appropriators of Moenkopi Wash were, indeed, the Indians. By December, the Mormons claimed that Navajos had broken their dam three times; as a result, they wanted the Indians disposed of.

In August, Williams wrote another letter asking if the allotments made by Mayhugh were given approval by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Williams urged confirmation, warning that the disputes between the Mormons and Indians might lead to an armed conflict.\(^{35}\) Several months later in November, Reverend H.R. Voth, a missionary visiting the Hopis, wrote a letter to the Indian Rights Association complaining that Ashton Nebeker was causing most of the troubles at Moenkopi. The Hopis accused Nebeker of expanding his farming lands while at the same time making promises to the Navajos to pit them against the Hopis. These complaints were then forwarded to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.\(^{36}\)


\(^{36}\) Ibid., 5.
In 1896 another non-Mormon missionary named William Riley Johnson resided at Moenkopi. His son Phillip left an account of the Mormons seizing the lands by force and assaulting several Indians engaged in planting on their allotments. Word was sent to Fort Defiance requesting armed assistance to protect the Hopis, and forty Navajos stood guard while the Hopis planted their fields. Although the Mormons threatened violence, none occurred.37

In January 1896 Indian Agent Williams finally received a response to his question about the validity of the Indian allotments in Tuba City/Moenkopi. The General Land Office stated that the allotments were made on unsurveyed lands and there was no need to bother for their approval. The following year in August 1897, the Secretary of the Interior finally officially approved the allotments made by Mayhugh in 1892.38

The Navajo agency in Fort Defiance also approved a request on whether it should pay for the expenses of an additional Navajo Agency farmer to assist the Indians at Moenkopi. The Navajo Agency farmer, J.C. Tipton, was also requested to assist an Indian named Indian Jack who filed suit against Mormon Bishop David Brinkerhoff. On September 16, 1896, a suit was brought forward about a verbal agreement that was made by Brinkerhoff, who agreed to pay “Indian Jack” one hundred bushels of wheat for breaking “Indian Jack’s” dam and releasing the water for Mormon use but failed to live up to his agreement. The Navajo agent was informed that according to the Indian Appropriation Act of 1893, the Navajo agency was required to ask the U.S. District attorney to represent Indian Jack in court.39


An unfortunate incident involving the non-Mormons from Flagstaff occurred in January 1897. A “covetous” armed posse headed to an area within the eastern boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park where the Colorado and Little Colorado rivers met. The posse was led by the Flagstaff sheriff who demanded that the Navajos pay him five dollars for every hundred head of sheep they owned. If they could not, they could leave the area. Since none of the Navajos had any money, the posse forced them to pack up their belongings and leave, even though the weather was bitter cold and the ground was covered by deep snow. Sixteen Navajo families were forced to flee, heading north to the Little Colorado River. Once they reached the river, they found it to be at its highest level and cold, but they were forced to cross at gunpoint and suffered great losses. The posse marched to the Navajos’ homes and burned them before returning to Flagstaff, leaving the Navajos to wallow in the ashes.\textsuperscript{40} Such incidents prompted missionary William R. Johnston at Tolcheco, Arizona, into support of the Navajos living west of the reservation. Johnston began a campaign asking the government to extend the reservation boundaries further west to protect the Navajos there.

During the spring of 1898, trouble erupted once again between the Indians and Mormons. In March 1898, Agent Williams wrote a letter that portrayed the Mormon-Indian problem as a contest over “the lands and water-rights in the vicinity of Tuba City.” As previous agents had, he concluded that the Indians had prior use of the Tuba City/Moenkopi area and over time the Mormons had confiscated the land and water for themselves “and finally obtained a decree from the courts awarding to them all the waters of Moen-copi Wash, as being the prior and original appropriators.” To overcome this judicial decision, Williams concluded that the current Indian

\textsuperscript{40} Joe C. Tipton, additional farmer, to Acting Indian Agent Major Constant Williams, 10 April 1897, typescript, JSBC.
reservation of the Executive Order of 1882 be extended to cover the Moenkopi and Tuba City area. He reassured his superiors that “The Mormons have not acquired any title, even in equity, to the lands now farmed by them, because they have not complied with the law requiring them to actually live upon lands they intend to claim as homestead.”

Mormon settler Ashton Nebeker complained that his land had been recently allotted to several Indians and that he was being pressured off of his land by Shoemaker and the Navajos. He also contested other allotments at Tuba City. Agent Williams notified the Mormons that were still on the Indian-allotted lands that they were to be removed. Nebeker hoped to stop this through an appeal to the courts.

By May 23, Elwin E. Rogers, a Navajo Agency farmer from the U.S. Indian Services, also reported an unpleasant meeting with Bishop Nebeker about allotted lands. A group of eight Hopis and the local police were led to the allotments by Rogers and began making preparations to plant crops until Nebeker arrived and threatened “Violence and blood shed if we remain[ed] in the field.” Nebeker stated he was not going to allow anyone to use the water and that if anyone began planting, it would be a “declaration of war.”

On June 7, 1898, more complaints came in against the Mormons of Tuba City, this time by Elwin E. Rogers, who was the replacement of Samuel E. Shoemaker. He claimed that his family was being harrassed by the Mormons and that the only way to settle the issue was to move to Blue Canyon. Another Indian claimed one of Lot Smith’s sons had pulled a Navajo

---

41 Major Constant Williams, Navajo agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 7 May 1898, typescript, JSBC.

42 A.C. Tonner, acting commissioner, to Navajo Agent Major Constant Williams, 29 April 1898, typescript, “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection, HBLL; Hereafter anything from the “Mormon Difficulties at Tuba City, Arizona” Collection will have the following abbreviation, MDTC.

43 Elwin E. Rogers to Navajo agent Major Constant Williams, 23 May 1898, typescript, MDTC.
woman off her horse and claimed the horse as his. When looking into the matter, Rogers found that Smith’s son had no proof that the horse was his and had to return the horse to the Navajo woman. The son was not too happy with the decision and told Rogers that “he was going to go and take the horse if he had to kill me and the Indian to get him.”

A list of lawbreaking Mormon polygamists was also supplied to Major Constant Williams by Rogers. Other complaints by Rogers were that Mormons were running a sectarian school on public money and that there were Mormons hiding out from the Mountain Meadows Massacre in Tuba City.

On the same day, a number of people were summoned to county courthouse in Flagstaff where a judge was deciding the outcome of an injunction the Mormons brought against the local Indians and their Indian agent in Joseph H. Lee, J.A. Allen, W.J. Hunt, D. Brinkerhoff, Fred Tanner, Lehi Howard, A.B. Randal, Rial Allen, John Tanner, and R.B. Powell v. Constant Williams, as Agent for the Navajo Tribe of Indians, Laughing Singer, Sam, Interpreter, and Old Borey, Navajo Indians. The complaint was that the Navajo defendants were found guilty of building dams in a tributary of the Moenkopi Wash called Togus Jay. The judge ordered the defendants to not interfere with the water of Moenkopi Wash or any of its tributaries because the Mormons held “exclusive use” of the waters. The Mormons argued that since 1875 they had exclusive use for all the water of Moenkopi Wash and no Indians had ever used the waters from the wash.

---

44 Elwin E. Rogers to Major Constant Williams, 7 June 1898, typescript, SSL.


In his report to Agent Major Williams about the court proceedings, Rogers stated that the dam at Togus Jay was on the Indian reservation and that the Mormons were giving false statements in court. Ashton Nebeker also brought charges against Rogers who was arrested on charges of going to the Indian allotments and assisting the Indians in farming their lands.\textsuperscript{47}

In July 1898, Inspector James McLaughlin was sent to investigate the situation. He interviewed a number of Tuba City/Moenkopi residents including Mormons, non-Mormons, Navajos, and Hopis. He found the testimonies “very conflicting,” but recommended that the Indian allotments be confirmed except for five acres from Lay-toke-shee’s allotment that should be awarded to Nebeker. A part of Ah-cow-er-shee’s allotment was also awarded to another Mormon.\textsuperscript{48} Conflicts between Mormons and whites and Mormons and Indians stemmed from Mormon claims that they were the first to farm the Tuba City/Moenkopi area and that when they arrived the area was devoid of Indians. Meanwhile, Indians claimed prior settlement.

McLaughlin’s investigation shed new light on the Mormon arrival at Moenkopi Wash. In an account by Fred P. Slattery who arrived to the Moenkopi area in 1883, he stated that there were only sixteen or seventeen Hopi families living at Moenkopi. These families were all farming in Moenkopi Wash and there was not a single Mormon there at the time. According to Slattery, with Lot Smith’s arrival in 1887, Smith “began by taking forcible possession of small


\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
tracts of land lying in front of and below Moencopie Pueblo from said Moquis.”

At that time the Indians had “exclusive use of all the Reservoir Wash water and that of three springs near Nebeker’s house.”

Navajos also farmed in Moenkopi Wash and had built a dozen dams to catch the flood waters from the wash and springs in the area. The first Hopi dam was located further down the wash. Eventually the Mormons built a dam between the dams constructed by the Hopis and Navajos. Resident Chas Hubbell confirmed the notion that the Hopis had a dam about a mile up the Moenkopi Wash in 1889 before Mormons made a dam near the Hopi dam. Charles H. Algert claimed that when he first moved to the area in 1889, the Navajos also had a dam up Moenkopi Wash which they used to water their crops (see Figure 15). In 1890, Algert claimed he assisted the Navajos in building another dam. The following year Algert moved to Tuba City and noticed that the Mormons had farmed several hundred acres below Atsidi’s place and depended on the water. By April of 1891, the Navajos put in some dams to help their own crops, which caused a lot of problems.

Slattery recalled an incident between Hopi Kwatch-i-kwai and Mormon Steve Farnsworth. Kwatch-i-kwai was working on the Hopi dam when Farnsworth saw the Hopi and became upset with him and beat Kwatch-i-kwai “until he was black and blue from head to foot.” Slattery did not understand why because Farnsworth had never owned any of the land around

49 Fred P. Slattery, Affidavit, 2 August 1898, JSBC; Chas Hubbell to Major Constant Williams, 12 July 1898, MDTC. Chas Hubbell also makes the claim that by 1888 or 1889 Lot Smith came to Tuba City and began taking away the land from the Indians which they had been farming since Hubbell’s arrival in 1886.

50 Algert was a “Gentile” trader who moved into the area and continued running his business until 1903. See Algert, Affidavit; Ressler states that Algert moved into the area in 1880, originally establishing a trading post in Blue Canyon about 12 miles east and north of Moenkopi. He eventually moved closer to Moenkopi, setting up shop near Pasture Canyon, near Musher Springs. Due to a sandstorm, Algert was forced to relocate between Moenkopi and Tuba City. By 1900 Algert partnered with a man named Sam Preston at the Tuba City trading post, which is still in use. See John Q. Ressler, “Moenkopi: Sequent Occupance,” 117.
Moenkopi or in Moenkopi Wash and the Mormons never claimed any lands claimed by the Hopi or waters claimed by the Hopis and had no rights to harass Kwatch-i-kwai or the Hopis.\footnote{Slattery, Affidavit.}

Through an agreement with all parties, McLaughlin revoked all of the allotments from 1892. The lands were then resurveyed and allotted once again, this time reserving lands for Nebeker. Through the reallocation, several Hopis did not want their lands and those lands were given to Navajos. The lands the Hopi farmed were watered by Moenkopi Wash and from Reservoir Canyon. The Navajo lands were watered by nearby springs and from the Mormon Moenkopi irrigation system.\footnote{Godfrey, *Hopi Agricultural Report*, 39.} This began the process whereby the government began withdrawing the Tuba City/Moenkopi area from public domain. This still left the question of who had rights to the water.

The water issue was finally settled with a compromise between David Brinkerhoff and Indian Agent Williams on May 30-31, 1899. Brinkerhoff represented the Mormons at Tuba City while Elwin E. Rogers represented the off-reservation Navajos and Hopis around Tuba City. The agreement was that the off-reservation Indians would have exclusive water rights within the 1882 Indian Reservation boundaries, being about fifteen miles up the Moenkopi Wash from Tuba City. The Mormons would have exclusive water rights to anything beyond that, which covered Moenkopi and Tuba City.

At the request of Indian Inspector McLaughlin, two stone monuments were placed on the north and south bank of Moenkopi Wash at the boundary line of the 1882 Indian Reservation. Since this was a compromise to the litigation pending in District Court of Coconino County, Arizona, Brinkerhoff promised to drop all charges against Major Williams. It was also agreed
that Ashton Nebeker’s charges against Elwin E. Rogers would also be dropped.\textsuperscript{53} This finally seemed to solve the water problem, at least until the expansion of the reservation in 1900.

After years of complaints and suggestions to expand the reservation, the cause began to gain momentum. In November 1899, the governor of Arizona, N.O. Murphy, sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior stating that over the years there had been trouble between the off-reservation Navajos and white settlers. He blamed the government, stating that all Navajos should be forced back onto the 1868 Navajo Reservation even though the Navajos had originally occupied and used many of the lands now in dispute. If the federal government failed to force them back to the 1868 Navajo Reservation, maybe an extension to the reservation should be made. Murphy concluded that if an extension was made it would do away with further controversy, “especially if the Indians are made to understand and respect the law and remain within the limits of their increased reservation.”\textsuperscript{54}

It would not be until the following year that the federal government, upon receiving the same recommendation from Navajo Agent Williams, took action and included the former Mormon lands in a western extension for the Navajo Reservation. Relief for the expanding Native population came when President William McKinley signed an Executive Order on January 8, 1900 (see Appendix F). This withdrew 1,575,369 acres of public domain lands west of the reservation from further settlement and included Mormon holdings at Tuba City.\textsuperscript{55}

Since the lands the Mormons had settled on had been withdrawn from sale by the Executive Order of 1900, some of the Mormons had learned that they could receive financial

\textsuperscript{53} James McLaughlin, Indian inspector, “Memorandum of Agreement,” 6 June 1899, typescript, MDTC.

\textsuperscript{54} N.O. Murphy, Governor of Arizona, to the Secretary of the Interior, 20 November 1899, typescript, JSBC.

\textsuperscript{55} Locke, \textit{The Book of the Navajo}, 427; Arcey, \textit{Navajo History}, 158.
compensation for the lands they had “quit-claims” for and made improvements on. As early as 
June 1899, Inspector James McLaughlin began negotiations with the Mormons for these lands 
and claims, finding that twenty-one individuals could receive financial compensation for the 
lands they settled on. From the time it took to negotiate prices with the Mormons to the time it 
took to try and appropriate funding for the lands, three years had passed and still nothing had 
taken place. As a result, the Mormons “had given up all thought of removing and commenced 
adding to their improvements.” During a survey of Tuba City, McLaughlin suggested that it 
would be the perfect place to establish an Indian boarding school.

Soon after the Executive Order of 1900 was signed, McKinley was assassinated. In 1901 
William R. Johnston escorted two Navajo headmen to Washington to call on the new President, 
Theodore Roosevelt, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Roosevelt had spent 
considerable time in the west and was known to be sympathetic to the Indians. The meeting 
between Roosevelt and the headmen resulted in the President ordering an investigation of the 
allotments made years ago in 1892 by Special Allotment Agent John S. Mayhugh. As a result 
of the investigation, allotments of land were granted to some Navajo families and the Moenkopi 
problem was considered solved by purchasing Mormon holdings at Tuba City for $40,000 (see 
Appendix G). Then, on November 15, 1901, the President signed an Executive Order granting

56 James McLaughlin, Indian inspector, to the Secretary of the Interior, 19 November 1902, photocopy, 
United States Indian Affairs Office: Papers, USHS.

57 W.A. Jones, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, 13 November 1901, 
typescript, JSBC.

58 Locke, The Book of the Navajo, 427.
the land to the Navajos. In an Act of May 27, 1902, Congress authorized the purchase of the Mormon settlers’ lands within this new reservation boundary.

The Hopis were the only ones to petition the government over these disputed lands; “Only Hopis considered their rights to the land impaired.” A Hopi named Poli Naimkiwa stated that the Hopis of Moenkopi had petitioned against the Mormons being there, but the government had to pay the Mormons to leave. The land had always belonged to the Hopis and he saw no reason why the government should pay the Mormons.

By late 1902, when the Oraibi Hopi became aware of the government’s decision to remove the Mormons, a number of them returned to Moenkopi to reclaim lands taken from them. The Navajos also saw this as an opportune time to obtain more lands and there was a mad scramble to claim the best lands. On December 25, 1902, approval was given by the Secretary of the Interior for twenty-one land claims in Tuba City. Due to McLaughlin’s suggestion, on January 6, 1903, the Secretary of the Interior also gave approval for Mormon lands to be used to support a government Indian school that was to be relocated at Tuba City.

When the government eventually attained title to the land in 1903, it only paid the Mormon settlers for their “improvements.” Since they were considered squatters and did not

---

59 Ibid., 428.

60 Leonard Ware, to Mr. Officer, 26 Jul 1963, “Navajo Hopi Conference, August 6-7, 1963,” DMBC.

61 Godfrey, Hopi Agricultural Report, 42.

62 The Secretary of the Interior to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 31 December 1902, photocopy, United States Indian Affairs Office: Papers, USHS.

63 The Secretary of the Interior to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 6 January 1903, photocopy, United States Indian Affairs Office: Papers, USHS.
hold titles to the land they were living on, the government did not have to pay for that land. By 1903 the Mormons were asked to permanently leave Tuba City, Moenkopi, and Moenave.
Chapter 7

Epilogue

The remembering of a people relates not so much to an idealized remembering of a golden past but more specifically to the remembering of a painful past and, important, people’s responses to that pain.¹

— Linda Tuhiwai Smith

In the long-run, Tuba City was made the official administrative headquarters for the Western Navajo Reservation Agency. As Tuba City grew, it also added an Indian hospital and other minor government agencies. As for the Hopis, despite interaction and some disruption from Mormons and government officials, they remained isolated from most whites. In Elliot G. McIntire’s, “Changing Patterns of Hopi Indian Settlement,” he states that interaction with Mormons allowed the Hopis to “adapt slowly to American culture.”² The removal of the Mormons allowed the Hopis to remain in isolation and slowed down their acculturation.

The creation of the 1900 reservation may have caused more problems for the Hopis because, like the 1882 reservation, the government failed to define boundaries between the Navajos and Hopis. Since no mineral ores of significance had been located within the 1900 boundaries, no real disputes had arisen over these lands.

The main disputes after the 1900 reservation boundaries had been set included agricultural, grazing, or urban settings issues. For the agricultural issues, irrigation water falls under this category and the fight to obtain complete control over irrigation waters has continued


since 1900. As far as grazing concerns, permits were issued to help prevent overgrazing, most of which belong to the Navajos. Looking at the urban settings, “The Moenkopi Hopis feel out-of-place under Navajo jurisdiction and have a legitimate desire for a defined area within which Hopi Tribal jurisdiction prevails.”\(^3\) Having the two tribes live peaceably together is the biggest issue Brugge portrays. A division between the people has grown to where the Navajo now reside at Tuba City and the Hopi reside at Moenkopi.

One of the original purposes for the Mormon establishment of Tuba City was to convert the Indians. The Mormons in Tuba City failed largely due to “their methods and lack of long-term patience.”\(^4\) For more than a century, Mormon authors have portrayed a fanciful story of Mormons and Indians living in a peaceful coexistence. In John Alton Peterson’s *Utah’s Black Hawk War*, he concedes that “despite the bloody evidence” of Mormon atrocities against Natives, when “compared to their gentile counterparts through the West… [They] displayed exceptional restraint.” This was due to the doctrine and constant pleas from Brigham Young, but the Mormon-Indian story is complex and the Mormons “fell far short” from what they wanted.\(^5\) As abusive and unjust as some of the Mormons may have been in the Tuba City/Moenkopi area, their story differs from the traditional story provided about white-Indian relations in other parts on and off of the Navajo Reservation, especially among those living in the Southwest.

---

\(^3\) David M. Brugge, “The Moenkopi Boundary Problem-Final Report,” (photocopy), p. 23, David M. Brugge Collection, Center for Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, NM.

\(^4\) George S. Tanner and J. Morris Richards, *Colonization on the Little Colorado: The Joseph City Region* (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1977), 132; Harry C. James, *The Hopi Indians: Their History and Their Culture* (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, LTD., 1956), 80-81. James states that out of all the European groups to come among the Hopi Indians, the Mormons “did not resort to cruel coercion of one form or another,” but their efforts were as futile as any other European group.
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Appendix A

Brigham Young Letter to Jacob Hamblin

Salt Lake City, Feb. 16th, 1863
Brother Jacob Hamblin:

In the prosecution of the Moquis Mission it is always important that humility and the constant seeking of the Lord to guide, direct and sustain you, should be the first thought and constant desire of the soul; in selecting your missionaries, you should endeavor to get those who are willing to go for the cause of the truth, and discard the services of such, as desire to associate with you from the love of adventure, to search for gold or silver ores, or speculate with the Indians; impress upon the members of the Mission, the solemn responsibility which rest upon them to labor for the redemption of Israel; to build up the Kingdom should be the first, the only object desired by all the Elders. It will be necessary to make a wagon road to the Colorado, and to establish a safe and sufficient ferry, if the brethren could establish fortified houses at the principal watering places on the route, such as are safe; keep herds of cattle and a few Indians who could exercise a wholesome influence among the Indians who reside there, it would do much to render traveling safe. A fortified house at the crossing of the Colorado to protect the boat and ferrymen would also be important. In seeking a location on the other side of the river, a healthy spot possessing good soil, timber and water-power are desirable, and it is also desirable to locate as near the Colorado River, as those requisites can be found; it is hoped they may be obtained with in 50 miles, but should it be necessary to go 150, if the advantages obtained thereby are great, it might be wisdom to do so, the exploration of the country will determine these points; timber, water, soil and climate are seldom found together in this mountain country;
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rather than go too far for water — power, it might be best to obtain portable saw mills from California, and through that means locate nearer the Colorado, a location with 20 or 30 miles is much to be desired, as it would be away so much further from hunting grounds of the Apaches and other marauding tribes.

The brethren who accompany you should be well supplied with chopping axes, well cut saws, pit saws, augers, blacksmith and carpenters’ tools, with ploughs, and the requisite farming tools to enable them to employ to advantage, the Indians as well as themselves; also arms and ammunition.

As your location will be in or near a body of timber, it may be proper to enclose your fort with a stockade of timber by cutting trees about 16 feet long, splitting them, and lapping them half way, it may be best to put the top ends into the ground, as the American Agriculturist insists they will last as long again than if placed as they grow. The stockade can enclose on area of from 10 to 40 acres according to your ability. Should your force consist of near 100 persons, and timber convenient, you could enclose from 30 to 40 acres. Take with you a surveyor to lay out your fort in proper order, laying out the inside to form a nucleous for a city, without disturbing your principal streets in the Fort. A couple of block houses would be sufficient to defend the entrances; you could then invite the Moquis and such other friendly Indians as desire to do so under your protection, and with the aid of machinery which the brethren will possess or can construct, they can produce five times the amount of labor they can now do. Whenever your enclosure becomes crowded with residences you can construct another, to form another city, half a mile or a mile apart, according to locality, every man who is engaged in the mission should humbly and honestly design to act as a father and protector to the Lamanites; it will not be proper for any to take their families, except perhaps a few who may have small families, and even that
should not extend far until after the enclosures are made. It will be desirable as soon as possible to plant all kinds of fruits suitable to the climate, both by seeds and cuttings and roots, as they can be successfully carried from Saint George. It will be best for the herding of cattle to be conducted under the direction of discreet armed men, and to avoid seatering about promiscuously through the country; it will also be wisdom for a few brethren who are suitable to the task, to visit the different bands of Indians and acquire their language. A system of foot expresses could be established among those different hands that would communicate the approach of Apaches, Navajoes or other robbing hands.

Source: Andrew Jensen, ed., *Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,*” microfilm, letter dated 16 February 1863, box 19, reel 20, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
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Appendix B

Indian Agents over the Hopi Indians of Moenkopi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869-1870</td>
<td>Captain A. D. Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1873</td>
<td>W. D. Crothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-1874</td>
<td>William S. Defrees (Agency built, 1874)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-1876</td>
<td>W. B. Truax (Agency closed, 1876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1877</td>
<td>W.H. Danielson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1879</td>
<td>William R. Mateer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>E. S. Merritt (Acting, Nov. 2-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-1880</td>
<td>Navajo Agent Galen Eastman in charge of Moqui Agency (Nov. 21, 1879-July 1, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Milo A. Boynton, appointed January, 1880, never reached his Agency and resigned June 14, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Acting Navajo Agent Frank T. Bennett in charge of Moqui Agency, July 1-Oct. 1, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1881</td>
<td>John H. Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1883</td>
<td>Jesse H. Fleming (Moqui Agency closed 1883)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Navajo Indian Agents – in charge of Moqui Agency

1883-1884    D. M. Riordan
1884-1886    John H. Bowman
1886-1889    Samuel S. Patterson
1889-1890    Charles E. Vandever
1890-1893    David L. Shipley (Sub Agency)
1893-1894    Lieutenant E. H. Plummer (Acting Agent)
1894-1899    Captain Constant Williams (Acting Agent)
1900        George W. Hayzlett
1901-1903    Charles E. Burton (Acting Agent)

Agents/Superintendents of Tuba City Agency, 1901-1904

27 August 1901    Milton J. Needham
1 December 1904    Mathew W. Murphy

### Appendix C

**Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1865-1904**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Commenced</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 July 1865</td>
<td>Dennis N. Cooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November 1866</td>
<td>Lewis V. Bogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 1867</td>
<td>Nathaniel G. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 April 1869</td>
<td>Ely S. Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 1871</td>
<td>Francis A. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March 1873</td>
<td>Edward P. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 1875</td>
<td>John Q. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 September 1877</td>
<td>Ezra A. Hayt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 1880</td>
<td>R. E. Trowbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May 1881</td>
<td>Hiram Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 1885</td>
<td>John D. C. Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October 1888</td>
<td>John H. Oberly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 1889</td>
<td>Thomas J. Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April 1893</td>
<td>Daniel M. Browning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1897</td>
<td>William A. Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: “Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1865-1953,” John S. Boyden Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
Appendix D

Presidential Executive Order of 1882

Executive Mansion
December 16, 1882

It is hereby ordered that the tract of country in the Territory of Arizona, lying and being within the following described boundaries, viz: beginning on the one hundred and tenth degree of longitude west of Greenwich, at a point 36° 30’ north, thence due west to the one hundred and eleventh degree of longitude west, thence due south to a point of longitude 35° 30’ north; thence due east to the one hundred and tenth degree of longitude west, thence due north to the place of beginning, be and the same is hereby withdrawn from settlement and sale, and set apart for the use and occupancy of the Moqui, and such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon.

Chester A. Arthur

Appendix E

The 1892 Indian Allotments given by agent John S. Mayhugh in the Tuba City/Moenkopi Area

Those identified as Hopis

1. Tah-losh-hi-neni-mah
2. Nah-she-i-ing-ne-wah
3. Yah-she-wah
4. Lay-toke-she
5. Cotch-che-mon-nu
6. Nah-she-le-wee
7. Te-wah-me-men-i-mah
8. Ne-bah-yow-in-shee
9. Ah-cow-er-shee (was actually a Navajo married to a Hopi woman)

Those identified as Navajo

10. Is-citty (Atsidi)
11. Hos-teel
12. Is-cla-clol-pah-dan-ne

Source: John S. Mayhugh, Special Allotment Agent to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Daniel M. Browning, 19 February 1894, photocopy, John S. Boyd Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collection Library, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
Appendix F

Presidential Executive Order of 1900

Executive Mansion, January 8, 1900

It is hereby ordered that the tract of country lying west of the Navajo and Moqui reservations, in the Territory of Arizona, embraced within the following-described boundaries, viz, beginning at the southeast corner of the Moqui Reservation and running due west to the Little Colorado River; thence down that stream to the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve; thence north on the line of that reservation to the northeast corner thereof; thence west to the Colorado River thence up that stream to the Navajo Indian Reservation, be, and the same is hereby, withdrawn from sale and settlement until further ordered.

William McKinley

Appendix G

The Purchase Amounts of Mormon Holdings at Tuba City in 1902

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. David Brinkerhoff</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lydia A. Brinkerhoff</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emma E. Foutz</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Susan C. Foutz</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seth B. Tanner</td>
<td>$1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Annie M. Tanner</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. William J. Hunt</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Joseph H. Lee, Sr.</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stephen L. Heward</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lehi Heward</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Alfred D. Randall</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reuben E. Powell</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. John M. Tanner</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Joseph B. Tanner</td>
<td>$4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Frederick Tanner</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Henry W. Despain</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ashton Nebeker</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Nettie Ashton $1,700
19. Charles H. Algert $3,350
20. James Allen $850
21. Hyrum Lyond $1,500

Source: The Secretary of the Interior to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 31 December 1902, photocopy, United States Indian Affairs Office: Papers, Manuscript Collections, Research Center for the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, UT.
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