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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem.—Today in America, tension is at an all time high between the whites and negroes over civil rights legislation. It is clear in the philosophy of Negro leaders that nothing short of total assimilation will be accepted,¹ while the Southern white position holds more nearly to total segregation. Somewhere between the two positions must come a workable solution acceptable to both groups, or riot, bloodshed and chaos will result. To a minor degree and in isolated cases the latter has already been experienced.

During the past few years emphasis has been placed upon the equality of man as shown in the Little Rock (Arkansas) racial episode, and still later in Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi, as well as in New York, New Jersey, and Illinois. These areas appear to be trial runs in the Negro quest for realization of the full meaning of equality. Even though the Negro has been liberated from total slavery for over one hundred years, he has not fully realized total

¹Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., "What the American Negro Wants," U. S. News and World Report, XXXIII (September, 1952), 52-54. (To be considered more fully in Chapter IV of this thesis.)
freedom.

The major objectives of this research are: (1) To discover and record the position of slavery among the L. D. S. people from 1847 to 1865, especially as it pertained to the Negro, (2) to discover and record the attitude of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its members toward Indian slavery which existed among those tribes living within the boundary of the Territory of Utah, and (3) to determine how the "Mormon" people handled the problem of slavery when they were confronted by it during this period.

The westward movement of the Latter-day Saints brought them into close association with the Negro as well as with the Indian problem of slavery. The story of how these problems were met and resolved is an interesting saga in the history of Utah.

Justification of the problem.--James Reston, New York Times Service, wrote:

The tragedy of Negro emancipation 100 years ago was that the abolitionists thought of it as an end in itself and were not prepared for the social and economic problems that followed their political victory.

The same is true of the present race crisis. We may be much nearer to a political victory than many people suppose, but the problems of providing not only civil rights for the Negro but the education, the jobs, the housing and the social order to sustain equality of opportunity, will still exist. A Negro may have the right of access to all schools, restaurants, houses of lodgings, but if he doesn't have the education, he is not likely to have the money
to buy the things or patronize the new facilities that open up to him.4

The attitude of the Latter-day Saint Church toward slavery may be better understood by consideration of the following questions: (1) What was the position of the Church towards slavery during the years 1847 to 1865? (2) How extensive was slavery among the Latter-day Saint people in the Territory of Utah? (3) How did the L. D. S. people respond to the institution of slavery that existed among them?

Though much has been spoken and written by Latter-day Saint Church Leaders and Historians upon the subject of slavery, the information is available only in many scattered sources. This work is specifically intended to contribute to the early period of Utah history as well as to the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Delimitation of the study.--The purpose of the study was specifically to consider slavery as it touched the Latter-day Saint people in Utah, and how it influenced the Church to take a stand while establishing her colonies in the territory. However, a brief account of the history of slavery is given in Chapter II to provide a background of the universality of the problem.

This study deals with the period from 1847 to 1865.

4Salt Lake Tribune, June 23, 1963, p. 14A.
To understand the Latter-day Saint attitude toward slavery, it is necessary to go back to the days of the Missouri Period of the 1830's for the foundation of the problem.

When slavery is mentioned, reference is generally made to the Negro problem. However, this study points out that in the Utah Territory, other peoples were involved in the trafficking of slaves. Especially among many Indian Tribes, slavery was a popular enterprise. Though slavery among the Indians of Western America was at times an acknowledged business, this study was limited to those groups living within the boundaries of the Utah Territory.

Sources of data and methods of research.—Primary sources were used for research data. These were not always available, however. Little has been written concerning slavery in Utah or among the Latter-day Saint people. The Historian's Office of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is a valuable source for original histories. Most helpful in that office was the Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints which is a day by day account of the history of the Church as compiled by Andrew A. Jenson, Assistant Church Historian. This is a valuable compilation of newspaper articles and field notes taken by historian Jenson. Other sources of Church periodicals, newspapers of the time, and mission histories kept in the Church Historian's Office all have proven helpful to
this work.

Some helps were gained through the library facili-
ties at Brigham Young University, especially the Special
Collections Department which augmented the findings of other
sources.

Secondary sources proved helpful as background ma-
terial. The historians B. H. Roberts, Andrew Love Neff,
Hubert Howe Bancroft, Orson F. Whitney and others were
especially good references. Articles in the Utah Histor-
ical Quarterly were helpful to the study, especially case
histories of Indian experiences in Central and Southern
Utah.

Little was done with personal interviews. Written
facts recorded near the time of happening were considered
more authentic than the memory of an individual of a second
or third generation.

Definition of terms.—Church refers to the Church of
Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Saint or saints refers
to members of the Church, with no indication of standing
or worthiness. Mormon or Mormons is a nickname for a mem-
ber of the Church.

All quotations have been carefully checked, and
misspelled words or errors in grammar are written as they
were found in the original reference.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SLAVERY

To better understand the subject of slavery as it pertained to the Mormon people, a brief glance into history unfolds the subject in many areas of the earth, as well as to its many facets and shades of acceptance.

Slavery is one of the oldest of human institutions and has been practiced from the most primitive times. In the mid-twentieth century, slavery still exists in many parts of the world. The first slaves were probably prisoners of war—all the surviving members of a defeated tribe—who were divided among the families of the conquerors. Slavery existed among primitive African tribes at a very remote period.¹

Records of the Sumerian culture dating about 3000 B.C. indicate the existence of a well-developed institution of slavery in Mesopotamia. The code of Hummurabi, king of Babylon from about 1955 to 1913 B.C., includes many paragraphs dealing with the treatment of slaves. These show that they were treated with more severity in

the second millennium B.C. than they had been previously.\textsuperscript{1}

In Egypt the institution existed from the earliest dynasties, but conditions in the Nile Valley were unfavorable to its development. Perhaps its most successful period was that during the time of the Israelite bondage.

Slavery was never a flourishing enterprise in Greece.\textsuperscript{2} The slaves in Athens were perhaps the best treated of any on record, for they served in an official capacity, even as police, enjoying a special status among the people.

Roman slavery was a more deep-rooted and flourishing institution.

The ranks of slavery were kept filled by (1) births to slave parents—children of slave women were usually slaves; (2) prisoners of war—normally the population of captured cities were sold into slavery; (3) victims of piracy and brigandage—if unable to pay ransom; (4) infants exposed at birth, such waifs were often rescued and sold by their finders; (5) children sold by parents or guardians; (6) persons convicted of serious crimes (generally condemned to slave labor in mines and quarries).\textsuperscript{3}

Slavery, it seems, was never criticized as a moral evil, but rather considered a part of the natural order.

The settlement of America was followed by the introduction of European-type slavery into the Western Hemisphere. Spanish and Portuguese conquistadores and pioneers enslaved

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Ibid., 88b.
\end{itemize}
the natives and used them to mine gold and silver. The high mortality of these slaves led to the introduction of Negroes from Africa in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries.

History reveals the concepts of some of the recognized teachers and philosophers on slavery. Aristotle, with some degree of moral hesitancy, expressed the Greek thought:

If life only were the object, slaves and brute animals might form a state, but they cannot, for they have no share in happiness or in a life of free choice. Nor does a state exist for the sake of alliance and security from injustice, nor yet for the sake of exchange and mutual intercourse. A state exists for the sake of a good life, and not for the sake of life only.  

St. Augustine, often said to be the Father of Protestant Philosophy, declared:

Since God certainly could have given men good rulers instead of bad ones, there must be a divine reason for the criminals who have from time to time reigned as emperors. This reason is clear. Just as the body has become by God's decree, a punishment for our sins, so are wicked rulers a punishment. To revolt against them is, therefore, to revolt against God. What is true about bad rulers is also true about bad institutions. Though slavery, for instance, is undeniably an evil, we should not agitate for its abolition, for it has been instituted by God, since Adam's fall, as a part of the punishment man must suffer from his sins.  

St. Thomas, one of the fathers of Catholic Philosophy,

---


2Ibid., 375.
said:

Though a ruler who violates natural law is a king no longer and so may be deposed, rebellion is at best so hazardous an undertaking that subjects will be well advised to resort to prayer and repentance rather than to the use of force. Recourse must be had to God, the King of all, who is a helper in due time in tribulation. . . . But to deserve to secure this benefit from God, the people must desist from sin; because by divine permission wicked men receive power to rule as a punishment of sin. . . . Sin must therefore be done away with that the scourge of tyrants may cease.¹

Note the attitude of the founding fathers of the American Union regarding slavery:

Slavery was far from being approved in principle by the most eminent of the fathers of the American Union. Washington in his will provided for the emancipation of his own slaves; he said to Jefferson that it was "among his first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery in his country might be abolished by law." John Adams declared his abhorrence of the practice of slave holding, and said that "every measure of prudence ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States." Franklin, Madison, Hamilton and Patrick Henry all repudiated the principle of the system. Jefferson declared in regard to slavery, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."²

At the Convention of Philadelphia in 1787 the sentiments of the framers of the Constitution were against slavery, but South Carolina and Georgia insisted on its recognition as a condition of their joining the Union. The words "slave" and "slavery," however, were excluded from the Constitution because, as Madison said, "they did not

¹Ibid., 489.
²Encyclopaedia Britannica, 20(1963), 783.
choose to admit the right of property in man in direct terms."¹

Either before or soon after the formation of the Union the Northern States, beginning with Vermont in 1777 and ending with New Jersey in 1804, abolished slavery or adopted measures to effect its abolition. But the principal operation of the latter change was simply to transfer northern slaves to southern markets.²

While Negro slavery held a prominent place in the early American Colonies, Indian slavery was of some importance, particularly in Western America.³ Slavery was a prosperous enterprise of the Spaniards between 1560 and 1598. Their main interests were for silver and gold, but also were for "another type of wealth, perhaps, not as valuable as gold and silver but easier to find, for their [sic] were many Indians to be conquered."⁴ The practice of Indian slavery was common on the northern frontier.

The early Spanish conquerors were not satisfied with the gold and silver taken from the Indians of Central America, but also found a ready market in the trafficking

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
of slaves.

A basic antagonism against the Spaniards had already developed in the area from Sonora to New Mexico by 1539, and this hostility cannot be entirely explained by the activities of Esteban alone. In all probability the Indians of this area knew well enough the character of their would-be conquerors, because of reports from the south, for Spanish slavers had been raiding north from Culiacan for years.¹

Though there is much controversy among modern-day scientists concerning the origin of the American aborigines, the Book of Mormon gives an account of the histories of these peoples and their ancestors. As expressed on the Title Page, this book "is an account written by the hand of Mormon upon plates":

Wherefore, it is an abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi, and also the Lamanites—Written to the Lamanites, who are a remnant of the house of Israel; and also to Jew and Gentile—Written by way of commandment, and also by the spirit of prophecy and of revelation—written and sealed up, and hid up unto the Lord, that they might not be destroyed—To come forth by the gift and power of God unto the interpretation thereof—sealed by the hand of Moroni, and hid up unto the Lord, to come forth in due time by way of the Gentile—The interpretation thereof by the gift of God.

This record (Book of Mormon) is accepted by many to be of equal value with the Bible as divine scripture. Numerous references of "bondage," "slavery" and "captivity" are mentioned. To show that human bondage of the American Indian is not solely a latter-day problem, a few of these will be given:

¹Ibid., 7.
Yea, do ye suppose that they would have been led out of bondage, if the Lord had not commanded Moses that he should lead them out of bondage. (I Nephi 17:24)

For behold, we are in bondage to the Lamanites, and are taxed with a tax which is grievous to be borne. And now, behold, our brethren will deliver us out of our bondage, or out of the hands of the Lamanites, and we will be their slaves; for it is better that we be slaves to the Nephites than to pay tribute to the king of the Lamanites. (Mosiah 7:15)

And now it came to pass, before the Nephites could raise a sufficient army to drive them out of the land, they had destroyed the people who were in the city of Ammonihah, and also some around the borders of Noah, and taken others captive into the wilderness. (Alma 16:3)

Yea, and I also remember the captivity of my fathers; for I surely do know that the Lord did deliver them out of bondage, and by this did establish his church; yea, the Lord God, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, did deliver them out of bondage.

Yea, I have always remembered the captivity of my fathers, and that same God who delivered them out of the hands of the Egyptians did deliver them out of bondage. (Alma 30:11-12)

It is a well attested fact that slavery was an accepted principle or way of life in the United States by at least a segment of the population. The Latter-day Saint people, mainly from the Northern States, were either neutral or indifferent to slavery. Some Church members from the South accepted slavery. When this mixed group migrated to the Utah Territory, there were no laws for or against slavery in the territory. This left them entirely on their own to cope with the situation as they chose.
CHAPTER III

SLAVERY AMONG THE INDIANS OF THE UTAH TERRITORY

As the Saints moved westward under the direction of Brigham Young, they faced immediate and gigantic tasks. One of these was protection against the Indians. President Young's attitude toward the Indians was plainly stated when he said: "... But even aside from Christian duty, I am satisfied it will be cheaper to feed them, that to fight them."¹ This concept was generally carried out by the Saints wherever possible. An early experience in the Salt Lake Valley reveals:

In their first encounter with the Indians the Pioneers observed that there were many more native men than women and children. They soon learned that Mexicans and bands of Utes had repeatedly made raids upon various groups of Indians for the purpose of taking their children to California or Mexico to be sold into slavery. Sometimes the native men even sold their wives and children for fire-arms and horses.²

The oldest known record of Indian slavery or mention of it in the Utah Territory was found in the Spanish Library of New Mexico:

¹John R. Young, Memoirs (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1920), 55.
²Milton R. Hunter, Utah in Her Western Setting (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1959), 288.
Further evidence of Spanish contact with Yuta Indians is contained in a recently discovered document in the Spanish Library in New Mexico. It tells of a trading expedition conducted by Mauricio Arze and Legos Garcia in 1813. They and five companions went to Timponogos Lake, (Utah Lake) remained three days among the Yutas, and then returned to New Mexico.

While they were at Timponogos Lake, the Indians were anxious to sell them native women and children for slaves. The Spaniards refused to make the purchase; therefore, the natives became hostile and began killing the Spaniard's horses. However, the chief succeeded in getting his braves to cease their warlike actions.

Continuously after the Arze-Garcia expedition into Utah, Spaniards and Mexicans carried on trade with the Indians. In 1821 Utah passed from Spanish to Mexican ownership, and after that date trade increased. Principal articles of exchange were the Indian women and children who were carried into California and Old and New Mexico for slaves.  

A particular point of interest to the student of Utah History is the mention of slaves. From this and other information to be presented, almost continuously from the time of the expedition of Escalante until after the coming of the Mormon Pioneers, Spaniards entered the Utah valleys, not only for furs but to traffic in Indian slaves.

Uncle Dick Wootton, an old wilderness man who apparently was trapping in Utah in 1837-1838, made the following comment:

It was no uncommon thing in those days (back in the 30's) to see a party of Mexicans in that country (the Great Basin) buying Indians, and while we were trapping there I sent a lot of peltries to Taos by a party of those same slave traders.  

1Ibid., 34-35. (This report is contained in a recently discovered document in the archives of New Mexico. A photostat copy is now in the Bancroft Library. The original document is listed without number under Twitchell, Spanish Archives of New Mexico.)

That this slave traffic was no uncommon thing is expressed by various other authorities. The noted western traveler, Thomas J. Farnham, said:

There is a stream called the Severe [sic] River which rises in the high plateau to the southeast of the lake . . . and terminates in its own lakes . . . . Here live the "Piutes" and the "Land Pitches" (San-pitch) the most degraded and least intellectual Indians known to the trappers . . . . These poor creatures are hunted in the spring of the year, when weak and helpless, by a certain class of men, and when taken, are fattened, carried to Santa Fe and sold as slaves during their minority. A likely girl in her teens brings oftentimes six pounds or eight pounds. The males are valued less.¹

The following from T. J. Farnham, as reported by Kate B. Carter, gives additional light on the subject. Mr. Farnham was an eye witness to this trafficking.

I have seen other Indians engaged in this species of foraging, and even some of the women of New Mexico, but with much less zest and enjoyment of the appetite. Abolition, a custom universal among other tribes, these never practice . . . without knowledge, without shelter, without raiment, food, water fit for man, they are born and live and die among those terrible deserts, the most miserable of men, yet contented with their lot. But every man's hand is against them. The New Mexicans capture them for slaves; the neighboring Indians do the same, and even the bold and usually highminded old beaver hunter sometimes descends from his legitimate labor among the mountain streams, to this mean traffic. The price of these slaves in the market of New Mexico varies with the age and other qualities of the person. Those from ten to fifteen years sell from $50 to $100, which is by no means an extravagant price, when we take into consideration the herculean task of cleansing them fit for the market. Notwithstanding their horrible deficiency in all

¹Thomas J. Farnham, "Travels in the Great Western Prairies," Thwaites Early Western Travels, XXVIII (May to October, 1839), 249ff.
the comforts and decencies of life, these Indians are ardently attached to their country, that when carried into the land of their captors and surrounded with abundance, they pine away for their native deserts. ¹

Similar incidents were related by Daniel W. Jones, noted Indian Scout and Western Traveler. Writing of New Mexico he said:

Thus we find that the people of New Mexico, at the time I am writing of them, in 1851, were making annual trips, commencing with a few goods, trading on their way with either Navajos or Utes (generally with the Navajos) for horses, which they sold very cheap, always retaining their best ones. These used-up horses were brought through and traded to the poorer Indians for children. The horses were often used for food. This trading on the down trip would be traded to the Mexican-California for other horses, goods or cash. Many times a small outfit on the start would return with large herds of California stock.

All children bought on the return trip would be taken back to New Mexico and then sold, boys fetching on an average $100, girls from $150 to $200. The girls were in demand to bring up for house servants, having the reputation of making better servants than any others. This slave trade gave rise to the cruel wars between the native tribes of this country, from Salt Lake down to the tribes in Southern Utah. Walker and his band raided on the weak tribes, taking their children prisoners and selling them to the Mexicans. Many of the lower classes, inhabiting the southern deserts, would sell their own children for a horse and kill and eat the horse. The Mexicans were as fully established and systematic in this trade as ever were the slavers on the seas and to them it was a very lucrative business. ²

Slave traffic on the part of the Spaniards of New Mexico became somewhat of a custom among the different

¹Kate B. Carter, Heart Throbs of the West (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939), I, 145.

²Daniel W. Jones, Forty Years Among the Indians (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor, 1890), 49.
Indian tribes. According to Captain Simpson, the Indians in the southern part of the territory bartered their children to one another. The Utes in particular bought slaves and sold them to other southern tribes or to the Mexicans.¹

Previous to this, James G. Bleak, historian of Southern Dixie, recorded the following regarding a group of missionaries sent to labor among the Indians of that area:

The first day they camped on the present site of Toquerville, and had an interview with the Indian chief Toquer [sic] Indian word for black, they found the band very friendly. The following day the missionaries continued their journey south and camped on the Rio Virgin, opposite the present site of Washington. Here they found another camp of Indians. These were very timid. The women and children secreted themselves in the brush while the men approached the newcomers in a very cautious hesitating manner, trembling as they shook hands with the whites. . . . The cause of their fear it was found arose from the fact that bands of Utes and Mexicans had repeatedly made raids upon them and had taken their children to California and Mexico and sold them for slaves.²

Slavery was known, not only in the Great Basin area, but by many Indian tribes throughout North America. Slavery among the Indians was rather general between warring tribes; however, in the Spanish-speaking areas the whites did much to exploit this business. The numerous examples given for the Great Basin area and the following from the


²James G. Bleak, Journal History of Dixie (Typed copy in library, Brigham Young University), 20f.
Mid-west and South-west show the practice to be somewhat universal.

Male slaves, themselves captured in war as children, were encouraged to go to war when they had grown up. If they did this, they might take new names and assume the status of free men. Female war captives were taken as wives, and the children of such unions were regarded as free fox.¹

Many Indian tribes of the Northwest also traded in commodities and slaves mostly captured from other tribes by the predatory plains Indians.²

The evidence of Indian slavery in the Utah Territory was both widespread and deep-seated. The Latter-day Saints were brought face to face with this problem soon after entering the valley. The Historian, Bancroft, recorded:

During the winter of 1847-8, some Indian children were brought to the fort (the old Salt Lake Fort) to be sold. At first two were offered, but the settlers peremptorily refused to buy them. The Indian in charge said that the children were captured in war, and would be killed at sunset if the white men did not buy them. Thereupon they purchased one of them, and the one not sold was shot. Later, several Indians came in with two more children, using the same threat; they were bought and brought up at the expense of the settlers. Charles Decker bought one of the prisoners, a girl, who was afterward brought up in Pres. Young's family. She married an Indian chief named Kanosh.³

¹Ralph Linton, Acculturation In Seven American Indian Tribes (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940), 278. (The Fox Indians were from the Illinois-Iowa area.)

²Ralph W. Andrews, Indian Primitive (Seattle: Superior Publishing Company, 1960), 37. (These Indians lived in the Washington-British Columbia area.)

³H. H. Bancroft, History of Utah (San Francisco: The History Company Publishers, 1889), XXVI, 278.
John R. Young gave an eye-witness account of the above experience. He wrote:

Soon after we moved on to our city lot in the fall of 1847, a band of Indians camped near us. Early one morning we were excited at hearing their shrill, blood curdling war whoop, mingled with occasionally sharp cries of pain. Father sent me to the fort for help. Charley Decker and Barney Ward (the interpreter) and others hurried to the camp.

It was Wanship's band. Some of his braves had just returned from the war path. In a fight with "Little Wolf's" band, they lost two men, but had succeeded in taking two girls prisoners. One of these they had killed and were torturing the other. To save her life Charley Decker bought her and took her to our house to be washed and clothed.

She was the saddest looking piece of humanity I have ever seen. They had shingled her head with butcher knives and fire brands. All the fleshy parts of her body, legs and arms had been hacked with knives, then fire brands had been stuck into the wounds. She was gaunt with hunger and smeared from head to foot with blood and ashes.

After being scrubbed and clothed, she was given to Pres. Brigham Young and became as one of his family. They named her Sally, and her memory has been perpetuated by the "Courtship of Kanosh, a Pioneer Indian Love Story," written by my gifted cousin, Susa Young Gates.¹

The Latter-day Saints sought the friendship of the Indians and tried by various peaceable means to placate their hereditary vengeance and promote their good will. Because the Mormons were often tender-hearted and considerate toward their fellowmen, the crafty Indian usually took advantage. Many are the examples of Indian slave children being foisted upon the pioneer families. The

¹Peter Gottfredson, History of Indian Depredations in Utah (Salt Lake City: Shelton Publishing Company, 1919), 16-17.
following stories were taken from the writings of William R. Palmer who personally interviewed many Indian slaves living as free people with Mormon families:

Christmas night, 1850, the pioneer Iron County colony was raided by Indians and some of their cattle driven away and killed. They too were camped on the Sevier River near where the Uba Dam (Sevier Bridge Dam) now stands. Horsemen trailed the marauders and captured an old Indian and a boy. In settlement for damages done, the Indian gave the boy to the whites. The boy was glad enough to go with his white owners and it was afterward learned that he had been a slave taken from his tribe in Southern Utah. Months later freedom was offered him, but fearing that he would be re-taken if he returned to his tribe, he begged to be allowed to remain among the whites.

Another boy—Omer Badegee Heywood—died in Harmony in 1862. He also had been bought out of slavery from Walker's band by the Mormons. The records say that he was a "Piede Indian" captured by the Utes in 1853 and soon after purchased from captivity by Z. N. Baxter of Nephi City, Utah, by whom he was presented to J. L. Heywood in the spring of 1854. The "Piedes" were the Cedar Indians. Omer was a splendid character, much loved, an Elder in the Mormon faith, and his death was mourned by the entire community. He died at about the age of twenty years and was the fourth person buried in the Harmony cemetery.

There lives at Santa Clara, Utah, an old squaw named Mary Shem who was captured by a band of Walker's men. She was a girl of perhaps twelve years of age when the raiders carried her away from her tribe—the Shivwits. One night on the way north they were camped near the spot where Milford now stands. Mary was placed in charge of a woman who was the wife of one of the warriors. This Indian had announced his intention of making the girl his second wife. At night while the Indians gambled and smoked, the jealous wife released the girl and told her to go back to her tribe. Mary says she crept stealthily out into the darkness then ran all night as fast as she could. She wore out her moccasins and threw them away, then trailed on barefooted. She traveled back in the hills where she would not be seen through the day and took to the valleys at night. After several days and nights of travel through a hundred miles of rough unsettled country, she finally stumbled exhausted into the camp of her own people.
She had not stopped to sleep and the only food she had was the weeds she snatched up and chewed as she ran.

There died not long ago on the Indian Peak Reservation an old squaw known to the whites as Jinnie, wife of Curley Jim. As a little girl she was stolen by the Navajoes after a fight near the site of Hatchtown (Hatch, Utah), in which her father, Blue Blanket, was killed. She was carried away across the Colorado and grew to womanhood in Navajo servitude. She herded sheep, cared for children and wove blankets. Finally being a good looking young squaw the man that claimed her took her to wife and she lived with him for several years. One day she learned that her husband was the man that killed her father and she decided then and there to escape. Watching her opportunity she stole a horse and fled to the Colorado River. It was just after John D. Lee had settled at the (Lee's Ferry) crossing and he put her over the stream in a boat. She made her way to Cedar City where her sisters Susie and Rena were living. The Navajoes pursued her to this place. Learning of their approach Jinnie fled in terror to the hills. After the Navajoes had left, the family went in search of the frightened woman. They found her after several days of searching at the home of Thomas Gower in Cedar City. The Gowers were feeding and hiding her in an old potato cellar.* Jinnie, Susie and Rena were the daughters of Blue Blanket. There was also a little boy about two years old. Their mother died, Blue Blanket was killed, Jinnie had been carried away, and the other children were being cared for by their aunt. The aunt married and the children were objectionable to her husband. He wanted to get rid of them. The girls, Susie and Rena, were big

---

*Of the Navajo slaves the females fared better than the males. They worked not much harder perhaps, than the women of the tribe and most of them were chosen in marriage before they were twenty years of age. There was no tribal prejudice against such unions, and the social status of a slave woman so wedded became the same as that of any other married woman in the tribe.

For the male slaves, however, there was no such process of amalgamation. They were always slaves and had to suffer every indignity that their masters cared to inflict. Many were emasculated that they might be left in safety among the women of the tribe while the warriors were away on their fighting or hunting expeditions. Some had their tongues cut out to prevent them from talking if they escaped. Others had their ears cut off to mark their servile status.
enough to shift for themselves with the aid of other relatives, but the baby boy was helpless. The brutal man proposed either to kill him or to trade him to the Navajoes. To save the baby's life the aunt gave him to John Harris of Glendale, by whom he was reared. The story goes that John Harris bought him, but the child's sister Rena says this is not true. The boy grew into an active man and as Frank Harris was known all over Southern Utah. He died an old man at Moccasin, Arizona, in December, 1928. In his day he had been famous as one of the best riders and ropers on all the southern range.

At times when Walker had made his selection of children the mothers fought frantically to save them. One of the tragedies of the Virgin River is centered in such an occasion. The mother had seized her child that had already been traded to the Navajoes and had fled into the hills. She was chased around for several days by Walker's warriors and the purchasers and was finally trapped on Thompson's point near Virgin City, a high promontory that jutted out into the river. As the Indians rushed upon her she threw her child off the cliff down into the swollen river and killed it.¹

Fear of a worse fate for their children influenced many Indian women to sell their babies to the whites where they could at least be seen and sometimes cared for by the mothers. Many children in the early days were thus purchased by the Latter-day Saints. They were adopted into the families and grew up as members of the family, often-times having the same legal status as any other adopted child.

Intertribal slavery was bad even at its best, but the nefarious slave business of the Spaniards caused the Mormon people and especially Brigham Young, the Indian

Agent of the Utah Territory, to take steps for correction.

In an editorial of the Deseret News, then the only paper published in Utah, dated November, 1851, attention was called to the fact that Pedro Leon and a party of about twenty Spanish Mexicans were then in the Sanpete Valley trading horses for Indian children. They held a license signed by James S Calhoun, Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for New Mexico, authorizing them to trade with the Utah Indians. The license was dated August 14, 1851. Another blank license in the possession of the party, dated July 30, 1851, authorized its holder, whose name was not given, to proceed to the Salt Lake country in the Territory of Utah for the purpose of trading with the Utah Indians. Following is the editorial:

We have not seen or heard His Excellency, Governor Young, upon the subject, he being confined to his house by sickness, but we shall speak our own sentiments on this matter; and first, the license given to Pedro Leon to trade with Utah Indians in New Mexico, and that said Pedro has exceeded his license in coming within the limits of Utah Territory; and if we are not mistaken in these premises, the next most reasonable conclusion is, that some other person than James S. Calhoun, as Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico, has issued such license, and if this be a wrong conclusion and said Calhoun is Governor and Superintendent in said Territory, that he ought to try and watch his boys a little closer and keep them out of other dominions.

And again, if the said J. S. Calhoun is Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs of New Mexico, and has issued a blank license to any honest man, or scoundrel, who may please to put his name to it and by the authority of that license, go to "Salt Lake County, in the Territory of Utah, and trade in said county, and no other place, and with no other than with Utah
Indians," he has transcended the limits and authority of his office, he has violated his oath, trampled upon the Constitution and laws of the United States, and set at defiance every righteous principle that binds together the states and territories of our Union. But if said blank be a forgery, and there be any such man as J. S. Calhoun, it belongs to him or his friends to ferret out and expose the forger.

Again, the purchase and removal of Indian children from Utah Territory to any other state or territory, or the removal of Indian children without purchase to any other territory by any such means or process, as appears to have been contemplated by said men, is kid-napping in the eyes of the U. S. laws, and ought to be treated so in any United States Court.

It is well understood that the Navajo Indians are at war with the United States, and it is strongly presumed that those traders are endeavoring to purchase arms and ammunition for the purpose of supplying the Navajo Indians in exchange for horses, mules, blankets, etc. Now if we are correct in our supposition, for any one to furnish arms and ammunition to said Indians is to fight against the United States, would be treason, according to the letter of the Constitution; and for any one to sell arms or ammunition to said traders, having reasonable proof of their designs, would be giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the nation, and equally entitle them to a traitor's halter.

We have no objections to the Spaniards, Mexicans, or any other nation coming to our midst, buying tea, sugar, coffee, or molasses, buying selling or swapping horses, mules or any other animals or property, which will tend to the public good; but from what we have heard of the affair before us, we feel to raise our warning voice to all men within our limits and especially to the citizens of Utah Territory, to beware how they furnish arms or ammunition to any tribe of Indians whatsoever, and especially to any man or set of men of whom it can be reasonably supposed they have any disposition to furnish munitions of war to hostile tribes. And we further counsel that no person whatsoever be guilty of trafficking in human blood, or of selling Indians or Indian children to be transported out of the Territory or from one part of the Territory to another.¹

The Deseret News article by editor Richards, quoted

¹Whitney, 509-10.
above, had little effect upon the haughty Mexican slave traders who continued their traffic in Indian children and firearms. One member of the group was purported to assert that he would do just as he thought proper in the matter, and to back up his boast, declared he had a band of four-hundred Mexicans on the Sevier River awaiting his command. When told of his unlawful course and warned of the consequences, he flippantly remarked, "Catching is before hanging."¹

Brigham Young's views upon the question of slavery cannot fail to interest the student of early Utah history, and to make him realize the seriousness of this business. As Governor, in his message to the Council and House of Representative of the Legislature of Utah in 1852, he said:

The practice of purchasing Indian children for slaves is a trade carried on by the Mexican population of New Mexico and California. These traders of late years have extended their traffic into the limits of this Territory. This trade I have endeavored to prevent, and this fall, happening to encounter a few of them in my travels as Superintendent of Indian Affairs, strictly prohibited their further traffic. The majority of them appeared satisfied, and after making an exchange of property in the settlements, returned to their own country; unfortunately, however, a few of them still determined to carry on their nefarious traffic; they have been arrested and are now on their trial in this city.²

Judge Zerubbabel Snow of the First District Court,

¹*Journal of Discourses* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1852), I, 104.
²Whitney, 496.
who presided over the trial of Pedro Leon and associates at Manti, Utah, during the winter of 1851-52, gave the following summary of the case:

In September last, twenty-eight Spaniards left New Mexico on a trading expedition with the Utah Indians, in their various localities in New Mexico and Utah. Twenty-one of the twenty-eight were severally interested in the expedition. The residue were servants. Among this company were the Spaniards against whom these suits were brought. Before they left, Pedro Leon obtained a license from the Governor of New Mexico to trade on his own account with the Utah Indians, in all their various localities. Another member of the company also had a license given to blank persons by the Governor of New Mexico. The residue were without license. They proceeded on their route until they arrived near the Rio Grande, where they exchanged with the Indians some goods for horses and mules. With these horses and mules, being something more than one hundred, they proceeded to Green River, in this Territory, where they sent some five or six of their leading men to see Governor Young, and exhibit to him their license; and as the Spanish witness said, if that was not good here, then to get from him another license. Governor Young not being at home, but gone south, they proceeded after and found him November 3rd at San Pete Valley. Here they wished to sell their horses and mules to the Utah Indians, and buy Indian children to be taken to New Mexico. Governor Young then informed them that their license did not authorize them to trade with the Indians in Utah. They then sought one from him, but he refused it, for the reason that they wanted to buy Indian children for slaves. The Spaniards then promised him they would not trade with the Indians but go immediately home. Twenty of the number, with about three-fourths of the horses and mules, left pursuant to this promise and have not been heard from since. The eight who were left behind, are the men who were parties to these proceedings.¹

The decision of Judge Snow was rendered against the eight defendants. The Indian slaves then in their possession, a squaw and eight children, were liberated, and the

¹Ibid.
Mexicans were released to return home.

By this time a possible trend which would take advantage of the problem of slavery was developing toward the Indian by the leaders of the Mormon Church.

Governor Young expressed a future policy by saying:

It is unnecessary for me to indicate the true policy for Utah in regard to slavery. Restrictions of law and government make all servants; but human flesh to be dealt in as property is not consistent or compatible with the true principles of government. My own feelings are that no property can or should be recognized as existing in slaves, either Indian or African... Under the present law and degraded situation of the Indian race, so long as the practice of gambling away, selling and otherwise disposing of their children, as also sacrificing prisoners, obtains among them, it seems indeed that any transfer would be to them a relief and a benefit.  

Governor Young extended a policy in which slaves may be purchased into freedom:

If in return for favors and expenses which may have been incurred on their account, service should be considered due, it would become necessary that some law should provide the suitable regulations under which all such indebtedness should be defrayed.  

Again Brigham Young advised the members of the Church to buy Indian children. He said:

I spoke upon the importance of the Iron County Mission and the advantages of the brethren filling it. Advised them to buy up the Lamanite children as fast as they could, and educate them and teach them the gospel, so that many generations would not pass ere they

---

1Ibid.
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should become a white and delightsome people, and said that the Lord could not have devised a better plan than to have put us where we were in order to accomplish that thing. I knew the Indians would dwindle away but let a remnant of the seed of Joseph be saved.¹

As early as May 15, 1848, a law had been passed by the High Council regulating trade with Indians and prohibiting the sale of guns and ammunition.

The Great Salt Lake City High Council granted a mill site to John Neff on Mill Creek. Also, decided to employ four horsemen to guard their fields; and passed prohibitory regulations against trading guns and ammunition to Indians.²

The author was unable to find the specific law passed by the High Council at that time; however, on March 28, 1850, the final ordinance of the day revived the above law alluded to.

There was a tightening of the law toward the Indian, for when the Assembly met in joint session at the call of the Governor, August 31, 1850, D. B. Huntington petitioned for a license to trade with the Indians in Sanpete Valley. There is no mention as to the disposition of his request. However, in 1849 the High Council voted that:

Alexander Williams and Diminick B. Huntington should have the priviledge of trading with the Indians for the community, and that all other persons should be prohibited, under fine.³

¹History of Brigham Young, May 13, 1851, p. 846 (MS in Church Historian's office, Salt Lake City, Utah).
²Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, May 15, 1848 (in Church Historian's office, Salt Lake City, Utah).
³Journal History, May 27, 1849.
This plan was generally followed, although there were violations. However, the plan induced a sense of personal responsibility that was beneficial. As a result the problem of traffic in firearms and whiskey was measurably controlled.

In March, 1850, "An Ordinance Prohibiting the Sale of Arms, Ammunition, or Spirituous Liquors to the Indian" was approved. It read:

Sec. 1.---Be it ordained by the General assembly of the State of Deseret: That if any person shall hereafter trade or give any guns, rifles, pistols, or any other deadly weapons, ammunitions or spirituous liquors to any Indian, without having a license, he shall, on conviction thereof before any Justice of the Peace, be fined in a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars for each offense, and also forfeit all the property received from the Indian, which shall be sold and the proceeds thereof paid into the public treasury.

Approved March 28th, 1850.¹

Almost two years later, "An Act in Relation to the Assembling of Indians," was passed. The Act read:

Sec. 1.---Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah: That if any individual trader or traders shall, by any notice or previous arrangement, assemble or cause to be assembled any number of Indians within the neighborhood or immediate vicinity of any white settlement in this territory, he shall be considered as breaking the peace, and may be proceeded against by any citizen of the territory in a suit at law, and may be fined in any sum not less than twenty-five dollars nor exceeding one thousand dollars, at the discretion of the court having jurisdiction.

¹Laws of Utah. Acts, Resolutions, and Memorials of the Territory of Utah (Salt Lake City: Henry McEwan Public Printer, 1866), 63.
Governor Young was determined to put a stop to Indian slavery and do all in his power to end the Mexican traffic of it. With this possibly in mind, the Utah Legislature passed a law which permitted Mormon families to adopt children that Indian parents were determined to sell to the Mexicans. From the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah known as "A Preamble and an Act for the Further Relief of Indian Slaves and Prisoners," is given:

... Whereas, from time immemorial, the practice of purchasing Indian women and children of the Utah tribe of Indians by Mexican traders has been indulged in and carried on by those respective peoples, until the Indians consider it an allowable traffic, and frequently offer their prisoners or children for sale, and

Whereas, It is common practice among these Indians to gamble away their own children and women; and it is a well established fact that women and children thus obtained, or obtained by war, or theft, or in any other manner, are by them frequently carried from place to place packed upon horses or mules; larietted out to subsist upon grass, roots, or starve; and are frequently bound with thongs made of rawhide, until their hands and feet become swollen, mutilated, inflamed with pain and wounded, and, when with suffering, cold, hunger and abuse they fall sick so as to become troublesome, are frequently slain by their masters to get rid of them; and

Whereas, One family frequently steals the children and women of another family, and such robberies and murders are continually committed, in times of their greatest peace and amity, thus dragging free Indian women and children into Mexican servitude and slavery, or death, to the almost entire extirpation of the whole Indian race, and

Whereas, these inhuman practices are being daily enacted before our eyes in the midst of the white

---

1Ibid., 88.
settlements and within the organized counties of the Territory; and when the inhabitants do not purchase or trade for those so offered for sale, they are generally doomed to the most miserable existence, suffering the tortures of every species of cruelty, until death kindly relieves them and closes the revolting scenery.

Whereas, when all these facts are taken into consideration, it becomes the duty of all humane and christian people to extend unto this degraded and downtrodden race such relief as can be awarded to them, according to their situation and circumstances; it therefore becomes necessary to consider;

First, The circumstances of our location among these savage tribes under the authority of Congress, while yet the Indian title to the soil is left unextinguished not even a treaty having been held by which a partition of territory or country has been made, thereby bringing them into our dooryards, our houses and in contact with our every avocation;

Second, Their situation and our duty towards them, upon the common principles of humanity;

Third, The remedy, or what will be the most condu-cive to ameliorate their condition, preserve their lives and their liberties, and redeem them from a worse than African bondage. It suggests itself to your committee that to memorialize Congress to provide by some act of national legislation for the new and unparal-leled situation of the inhabitants of this territory, in relation to their intercourse with these Indians, would be one resource prolific in its results for our mutual benefit; and further, that we ask their concurrence in the following enactment, passed by the Legislation of the Territory of Utah, January 31, A.D. 1852, entitled

AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF INDIAN SLAVES AND PRISONERS.

Sec. 1.—Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the territory of Utah; That whenever any white person within any organized county of this territory shall have any Indian prisoner, child, or woman in his possession, whether by purchase or otherwise, such person shall immediately go, together with such Indian prisoner, child or woman, before the Selectman or Probate Judge of the county. If in the opinion of the Selectman or Probate Judge the person having such Indian prisoner, child or woman, is a suitable person and properly qualified to raise, or retain and educate said Indian prisoner child or woman, it shall be his or their duty to bind out the same by indenture for the term of not exceeding twenty
years, at the discretion of the Judge or Selectman.

Sec. 2.--The Probate Judge or Selectman shall cause to be written in the indenture the name and age, place where born, name of parents, if known, tribe to which said Indian person belonged, name of the person having him in possession, name of Indian from whom said person was obtained and date of the indenture, a copy of which shall be filed in the Probate clerk's office.

Sec. 3.--The Selectmen in their respective counties are hereby authorized to obtain such Indian prisoners, children, or women, and bind them to some useful avocation.

Sec. 4.--The master to whom the indenture is made is hereby required to send said apprentice to school, if there be a school in the district or vicinity, for the term of three months in each year, at a time when said Indian child shall be between the ages of seven and sixteen. The master shall clothe his apprentice in a comfortable and becoming manner, according to his, said master's condition in life.

Approved March 7, 1852.¹

An indenture was made out February 1, 1859, by John Beal of Sanpete County when he adopted an Indian boy, Samuel, who was then nine or ten years old. This interesting application shows that Mr. Beal was to have the boy for ten years. In return he promised:

"... to teach and instruct the said Samuel as an apprentice or otherwise cause him to be well and sufficiently instructed and taught the trade of farming after the best way and manner that he can; and instruct said apprentice [sic] by sending him to school three months in the year of each year while said apprentice is between the age of seven and sixteen; and also to train him to the habits of obedience, industry and morality and allow him meat, drink, washing, lodging and apparel for winter and summer and all other necessaries proper for such an apprentice during the term aforesaid, and at the expiration of said term will give unto the said apprentice a new Bible, Book of Mormon and two new suits of clothing, suitable to

¹Ibid., 87-88.
his condition.¹

With passage of the law prohibiting Indian slavery by Mexican slave parties, it was made clear to the Mormon people that they were to get all the Indian children they could adequately support.² As missionaries were called to the various Indian missions, they were also told to get all the children they could to teach and educate. Although little could be done for the older ones, with patience the children would be more susceptible to accepting changes.

Harmony, Utah, some sixty miles south of Parowan, became the first established mission to the Indians in the Utah Territory, and known as the Southern Indian Mission. In the history of the Harmony Ward of the Latter-day Saint Church under date of 1854, the following is given:

A number of missionaries were called by the authorities of the Church to labor among the Indians in Southern Utah, 12 of these missionaries including Thomas D. Brown, arrived at Harmony May 2, 1854.³

There are a number of entries concerning missionaries and their activities with the Indians in the Harmony Ward history.

In the record of the Southern Indian Mission, the

¹Utah Historical Records Survey, Inventory of the County Archives of Sanpete County, p. 14. (Original owned by Frank Anderson, Manti, Utah.)

²Young, 846.

³Harmony Ward Historical Record, 1854 (in LDS Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah).
entry of April 10, 1854, states:

Sixteen of these brethren were set apart to this mission this evening in the Council House under the hands of Orson Hyde, P. P. Pratt, W. Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, E. T. Benson, and Erastus Snow of the Twelye. T. D. Brown was appointed clerk and recorder.¹

Within two weeks after the arrival of the first missionaries to the field of labor, Brigham Young and his party paid them a visit. His instructions given, as recorded by the clerk, show clearly the objectives of the mission:

You are sent not to farm, build nice houses and fence fields, not to help white men, but to save red ones, learn their language, and this you can do more effectively by living among them as well as writing out a list of words, go with them where they go, live with them . . . feed them, clothe them, and teach them as you can, and being thus with them all the time, you will soon be able to teach them in their own language.²

All the visiting brethren spoke in a similar vein. One of the most instructive and interesting speeches was that of Parley P. Pratt:

The poor Indians, the descendants of the ancient prophets! Can we behold them unmoved? . . . feed, clothe, instruct them; win, save the remnants of the house of Israel. You will all have a measure of the Priesthood, if you cannot yet talk with them, there is one language that all can understand and feel—kindness, sympathy . . . Say not "Be ye fed and clothed" . . . feed, clothe, and instruct them, and in one year they will more than repay you your

²Ibid., 46.
outlay. . . . You can teach them habits of cleanliness and industry. . . . I would always have clean garments ready and clothe every one I should baptize . . . . Be patient with them . . . .1

A recorded experience as related by one of the missionaries in following the counsel of the Church Leaders is typical and somewhat humorous:

We went over to their wichiuups after supper and found their women grinding seeds by the light of the moon, and making a large potful of pottage—in a conical dish made from sand, thin and hard. This mess seemed of a darkish gray color with like chunks of bacon in it. We tasted the flour which the women were making from the seeds by rubbing them between two rocks. It tasted much like buckwheat flour or bean meal. What we fancied to be pieces of bacon I have since been told was masses of matted ants. One of the brethren tasted this feed and said, "those clusters tasted very oily," but knew not the cause; this porridge the female stirred with a large spoon or laddle . . . made from the horn of a mountain sheep; with this the mess was divided on wicker baskets, flat, in the shape of flat, wood turned dishes, about one quart to each—the elders served first—this was soon cleaned out by bending the forefinger of the right hand inwards around the point of the thumb for a spoon—the same dish handed back and passed around. They supped this up greedily, and with the head of a roasted porcupine, brains and bones, added to an entire roasted sand lark, seemed added to what we gave them, to about satisfy. Then like dogs with little or no covering they huddled together in the sand. Oh! how Ephraim has fallen!2

This and similar experiences must have taxed the imagination of the most devout missionaries to think of the Indians becoming "white and delightsome," for perhaps, everywhere one would see only squaler, filth, and poverty.

1Ibid., 56-57.

2Ibid., 76-77.
Many journals kept by individuals of the 1850's indicate the problems involved and patience required to help the lowly Indian to better his condition. It perhaps took a great deal of love and consideration on the part of the Mormon people to accept the policy of the Church Leaders toward the Indians.

The author can remember as a boy in Logan as late as the 1920's, the scare of entering the kitchen one morning for breakfast and finding a squaw and papoose in the room without invitation, desiring food and clothing.

One of the unfortunate incidents relative to early Utah history is that of the Walker War of 1853-1854. Though it was not a destructive war of lives and property, the anxiety, uprooting of settlements, and general inconvenience caused by this incident placed a great strain upon the relationship between the Mormons and the Indian tribes of central Utah. President Young's constant counsel, even in the face of loss of property and life, was that of forbearance and patience. An example is that found in the Weeks case. A few reckless Indians attacked and brutally murdered William and Warren Weeks, sons of Bishop Allen Weeks, 35 miles southwest of Salt Lake City. President Young wrote to the boys' father sympathizing with him and "counselling the brethren to be friendly with the Indians, to seek out the guilty ones, and deliver them up to justice,
but not to have feelings against those who were not guilty."  

Andrew Love Neff, in his History of Utah, had this to say concerning the underlying causes of the Walker War:

The Deseret News of July 30, 1853, records that for a year or more Chief Walker had been surly in his feelings and conduct, seeking a quarrel out of small pretexts which earlier would have been disregarded. Col. Young states that "Early in April, Walker, the Ute Chief, began to evince hostile feelings, by ordering settlers back who went in pursuit of horse thieves, and in many other ways."

Simultaneously word came northward that Mexicans were trading guns and ammunition to southern Indians and inciting them to militancy. Thereupon Governor Young issued a proclamation forbidding the alleged practices in violation of national law . . . .

More fundamental to the cause of the war was the unavoidable friction occasioned by the incident to the joint occupation of the Indian country by two distinct and conflicting civilizations. So numerous and close were the interrelations that the clashing of interests were inevitable. . . .

The long-smoldering ill-will between certain of the tribesmen and unregenerate whites burst into flame the summer of 1853. The immediate cause was a trivial and easily avoidable altercation at James Ivie's cabin, north of Springville, July 17, 1853, over the exchange ratio of fish and flour, resulting in the death of a brave. . . .

Immediately the hostiles fled to the mountains and over into Sanpete County where, by surprise attacks, they hoped to spread death and destruction before the alarm became general. The widespread operations of the raiders is indicated by the simultaneous attacks on the settlements at Pleasant Creek, Manti, and Nephi on the 19th, and even Springville, the origin of the disturbance. A Nephi guard barely escaped death on the 20th, and timely steps saved the horse-herd at the Allred Settlement in Sanpete County.

These initial raids proved disappointing to those on the warpath as only a few horses and cattle were secured, and one warrior had bit the dust to pay for

1History of Brigham Young, August, 1854, 73-74.
the life of a Mormon guardsman at Fort Payson. The
menaced frontiersmen were drawing rich dividends from
their investment of time and labor in the building of
roads and in the quick availability for active service
of the local militiamen.  

B. H. Roberts, a recognized L. D. S. historian, had
this to say about the causes of the Walker War:

One remarkable thing about this Indian disturbance
of 1853 is the extent of territory over which it ex-
tended—from Iron country in the south to Summit county,
east of Salt Lake City, in the north, a distance north
and south of over two hundred and fifty miles, and a-
long the whole line of white settlements. It seems to
be altogether too general to arise from a circumstance
so local as that in which it apparently had its origin.
The fact is that the incident at Springville of the
white man interfering with an Indian beating a squaw,
and unfortunately producing his death, was not the real
cause of the war, but merely a pretext for beginning
hosilities which were inevitable under the operation
of influences then at work, and the temper of the red
men. . . .

In his message to the legislature which convened in
December, 1853, following the outbreak of that year,
Governor Young again alludes to this slave traffic in
Indian children, and assigns the pernicious influence
of the slave traders upon the minds of the Indians as
the cause of the Indian troubles. Repeating his ac-
count of stopping the Leon parties in their traffic
in Indian children the governor charges that the slave
traders had poisoned the minds of the Indians against
the white settlers of Utah, by representing that they
had not accorded the Indians a sufficient compensation
for their lands; that the settlers' stock should be as
free to them as the game upon the mountains; that the
settlers would not allow them to trade off their chil-
dren as was their custom previous to the whites set-
tling among them.  

---

1Andrew Love Neff, History of Utah (Salt Lake City:
The Deseret News Press, 1940), 370-72.
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Chief Walker of the Ute Indian Nation was a member of the L. D. S. Church.

Walker was baptized a member of the church on the 13th of March, 1850. His brother Arapeen was also baptized, and later these two chiefs together with Sowiette, and Unhoquitch were ordained elders in the church, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards and Elijah Ward—the last named acting as interpreter—being present. The presidency would, of course, ordain the chiefs. Brother Morley (Isaac) had baptized Walker, the Utah chief, on the 13th (March, 1850).\(^1\)

The following instructions by Latter-day Saint Church Authorities given in 1853, were direct and commanding:

To all we wish to say, that it is evident that the Indians intend to prey and subsist upon our stock and will shoot and kill whenever and wherever they can. It is therefore expected that these orders will be rigidly enforced and complied with, and the small settlements in Peteetneet Canyon, and all such exposed places must be evacuated and the inhabitants of all weak settlements and stronger ones upon their borders should not be permitted to wander out any distance from the forts alone; or after dark, but keep themselves secure, and not permit any sense of security to lull them into a spirit of carelessness or indifference to their safety.

Let every enterprise be guarded; and look out that you are not surprised in harvesting and haying in the fields, or in hauling between the fields and stackyards; and as soon as may be thresh the wheat and safely store it and be careful that you have hay sufficient for the winter if you should have to keep up stock or in case any emergency should arise. We do not expect that any person will complain or think it hard to comply with these instructions, for it is for their good and salvation for them to do so. The safety of the settlements depends upon it, and we expect them to be complied with, whether it suits every individual circumstance or not, and the Commandants and various Military Districts and authorities of the

\(^1\)Ibid., III, 464.
various settlements are required to carry them out.¹

The same day, Governor Young forwarded the following letter to Walker by an interpreter:

G. S. L. City, July 25, 1853.

Capt. Walker:

I send you some tobacco for you to smoke in the mountains when you get lonesome. You are a fool for fighting your best friends, for we are the best friends, and the only friends that you have in the world. Everybody else would kill you if they could get a chance. If you get hungry send some friendly Indian down to the settlements and we will give you some beef-cattle and flour. If you are afraid of the tobacco which I send you, you can let some of your prisoners try it first and then you will know that it is good. When you get good natured again I would like to see you. Don’t you think you should be ashamed. You know that I have always been your best friend.

Brigham Young²

There were only twelve white casualties of the Walker War, according to the Deseret News published at the time, and none killed in military action.³ This may indicate the complete observance on the part of the people to the instructions of the First Presidency of the Church, at least of those living within the boundaries of the action. The fruitlessness on the part of the Indians to continue the fight was recognized. Two men were killed, however, while on guard duty. The remaining ten lives

¹Neff, 373-74.
²Ibid., 374.
³The Deseret News, July 30 and October 1, 1853.
were lost due to their own carelessness in the later stages of the conflict, and far removed from the actual fighting area.

The Walker War which began at Springville, July 17, 1853, was officially closed at Chicken Creek, Juab County, May, 1854, when Governor Brigham Young and Indian Chief Joseph Walker completed negotiations. The conference began with the silent and solemn peace-pipe ceremonial. Following this Indian formality, when all present had participated in this symbol of peace, then, and only then, were the long-pent-up emotions allowed to break forth with feeling and passion to scathingly denounce their grievances against the white man. One unnamed gray-headed chieftain, whose fleshless arm punctuated his earnestness, expressed himself so:

I am for war, I never will lay down my rifle, and tomahawk, Americats have no truth—Americats kill Indian plenty—Americats see Indian woman, he shoot her like deer—Americats no meet Indian to fight; he have no mercy—one year gone, Mormon say, they no more kill Indian—Mormon no tell truth, plenty Utahs gone to Great Spirit, Mormon kill them—no friend to Americats more.¹

It has been said that Chief Wakara had no peer among his own people and could possibly out-general and out-maneuver any West Point graduate of his time. The chief-of-chieftains was not ready to give his decision that day,

¹Neff, 380.
but chose to commune with the Great Spirit before divulging the secrets of his heart. The next day Governor Young, ex-officio Superintendent of Indian affairs for Utah, spoke to the reassembled council. Through his interpreter, Lott Huntington, he said he loved the Lamanites like a father, hated the bad blood that had arisen, and had brought sixteen oxen, quantities of clothing and ammunition to wipe out the feelings of bitterness.

The great Chief Wakara arose to render his decision:

Wakara has heard all the talk of the good Mormon chief. Wakara no like to go to war with him. Sometimes Wakara take his young men, and go far away, to sell horses. When he is absent, then Americats come and kill his wife and children. Why not come and fight when Wakara is at home? . . . Wakara no want to fight more. Wakara talk with Great Spirit; Great Spirit say—"Make peace." Wakara love Mormon chief; he is good man. When Mormon first come to live on Wakara's land, Wakara give him welcome. He give Wakara plenty bread, and clothes to cover his wife and children. Wakara no want to fight Mormon; Mormon chief very good man; he bring plenty oxen to Wakara. Wakara talk last night to Payede, to Kanutah, San Pete, Parvain—all Indian say "No fight Mormon or Americats more." If Indian kill white man again Wakara make Indian howl.1

In a sermon of April 6, 1854, possibly one month before the peace pact, President Young exonerated Chief Walker of all responsibility for the war that went on under his name. It is possible that Walker was forced to fight through uncontrolled circumstances and militant subordinates.2

1Ibid., 381. 2Ibid.
Brigham Young, in a letter to Col. Kane, dated June 29, 1854, expressed satisfaction on the peace secured without further bloodshed.

It is truly gratifying to be able thus to prevent the shedding of blood, although even if we had been obliged to chastise them we should (have) been abundantly able to do it. Still some of the brethren would have lost their lives in putting them down by force, and then if we do not have compassion upon the poor Indian, who will?1

Brigham Young's advice to buy Indian children did not seem inconsistent with the opposition which he always maintained toward Indian slavery. He drew a fine distinction between actual slavery to the Mexicans and purchase by the Mormons, insisting that in the latter case the Indians were in reality free, merely giving their services for the favor and expense of being kept by the Saints. He said:

No person can purchase them without their becoming as free, so far as natural rights are concerned, as persons of any other color; under the present low and degraded situation of the Indian race, so long as the practice of gambling away, selling, and otherwise disposing of their children; as also sacrificing prisoners obtains among them, it seems indeed that any transfer would be to them a relief and a benefit. . . . This may be said to present a new feature in the traffic of human beings; it is essentially purchasing them into freedom instead of slavery; but it is not the low, servile drudgery of Mexican slavery, to which I would doom them, not to be raised among beings scarcely superior to themselves, but where they could find that consideration pertaining not only to civilized, but humane and benevolent society.2

1Ibid.
2The Deseret News, January 10, 1852.
This indicates that Indian children were not pur-
chased into slavery but into opportunity with greater free-
dom than they heretofore realized. The Indians sensed this
difference also, for many often sold or gave their children
to Mormon families. An interesting experience was related
by Ann Chatterly McFarlane which points out the confidence
and trust many Indians had for some Mormon families:

In her life, Ann Chatterly McFarlane used often to
tell of the time when an Indian mother ran into her
house in Cedar City and thrusting a two-year-old son
toward her said, "Hide him, quick!" and disappeared
out the back door. Ann had not time to find a hiding
place, so she lifted her long, full skirts and put
the baby under, telling him to stand on her feet and
hold to her legs.

Almost before she had him placed, the warriors came,
searching for the child. Mrs. McFarlane pretended not
to understand, and in answer to their questions shook
her head and pointed off in the opposite direction from
which the mother had gone. The men went through the
house, searching in every corner, under the bed, in
the cellar and closets. In the meantime she went about
her work, the child beneath her skirts as quiet as a
quail. A few days later his mother returned and took
him away.¹

There has been few white men so consistently friendly
toward the Indians as Brigham Young. Soon after their ar-
rival in the Salt Lake Valley he said to his people:

When you go among the Lamanites, deal with them hon-
estly and righteously in all things. Any man who
cheats a Lamanite should be dealt with more severely
than for cheating a white man. . . . I am sorry that
some of our brethren have been killed by the Indians,
but I am far more sorry that some of the Indians have

¹Juanita Brooks, Indian Relations on the Mormon
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XII, 15.
been slain by the brethren. I have often said, and I say again, if any person is to be killed for stealing let that one be a white man and not an Indian, for white men know better, while Indians do not, and you must lay aside your angry feelings toward them, and cease wishing to kill them.¹

Some eleven years later, during which time there had been many provocations on the part of the Indians, Brigham Young still insisted on kindly methods, admitting that the natives had cause for their feelings of resentment, and that in spite of everything, the Saints should treat them kindly. Speaking in 1864, he said:

We could circumscribe their camps and kill every man, woman and child of them. This is what others have done, and if we were to do it, what better are we than the wicked and ungodly? It is our duty to do better than they in our administration of justice and our general conduct toward the Lamanites.² It is not our duty to kill them, but it is our duty to save them and the lives of their children. This is the land they and their fathers have walked over and called their own, and they have just as good right to call it theirs today as any people have to call any land their own. They have buried their fathers and mothers and children here; this is their home and we have taken possession of it and occupy the land where they used to hunt. But now their game is gone and they are left to starve. It is our duty to feed them. The Lord has given us ability to cultivate the ground and read bountiful harvests; we have an abundance of food for ourselves and for the stranger. It is our duty to feed these poor ignorant Indians. We are living on their possessions and at their homes.²

Perhaps in no intercourse of Mormon-Indian affairs is the relationship more closely woven than that of the missionary efforts of the Mormon Church. From the very

¹Journal History . . ., October 9, 1853.
beginning of the Latter-day Saint Church, and immediately following the publication of the *Book of Mormon*, Church policy has been concerned with the Indian. (See Chapter II for additional information.)

A closer scrutiny of the missionary-Indian relationship may throw additional light upon the treatment accorded the Indian by the Mormons. Very early some of the Mormon leaders recommended that the missionaries marry Indian women as a means of cementing the friendship between the races. There is no evidence that white women were urged to marry Indian men. One of the most entertaining incidents, and perhaps as human a story as has been told about this phase of the Mormon-Indian relations, is recorded in the diary of Hosea Stout who was a member of the Green River Mission of 1854. On May 8--after recording that Green River County had that day been organized and that Isaac Bullock, James Brown, Elijah Ward, and James Davis had been appointed to go as missionaries among the Shoshoni Indians--he wrote in good humor:

Elder Hyde held a meeting in the evening. In the discourse he recommended the marrying of squaws in the most positive and strong terms and particularly the immediately taking Mary an old haggard mummy looking one [sic] who had been here all winter. He was very eloquent on the occasion all of which was generally understood to be squinting at M. M. Sanders who already seemed to have some inklings that way and was well pleased with fair opportunity thus to safely commit himself so he readily bit at the bait and the courtship commenced immediately after meeting by interpreters for he could not talk with her. She wanted some time to consider he being a stranger and she don't like him much any how. The affair created an
unusual amount of fun and jokes among the disinterested.

(May 10, 1854). About noon today the proxied courtship between Sanders and Mary the Shoshone (the flower of the desert as Elder Hyde called her) was brought to close and they both were launched into a State of matrimony by Elder Hyde who acted the Parson. The Ceremony [sic] being performed over by the interpreter James Bullock our joy was now full and the fun loving corps enjoyed the time to the best possible advantage.

... (May 12). Some six wagons started to Green Ferry. 
... Sanders came with us to Bridger to purchase some goods for "Flower of the Deseret," which however we afterwards learned she would not accept and even refused to have anything to do with him. The matrimonial alliance thus entered into has proved a signal failure.1

The Elders who were sent to the Salmon River Mission were given similar instructions by Brigham Young and his party who visited them in May, 1857. At least three different missionaries tell of them, all under date of Sunday, May 10, 1857. Milton G. Hammond said simply, "The president and members of the Twelve all spoke. Pres. Young spoke of Elders marrying natives."2 William H. Dame of Parowan, who was one of President Young's party, recorded in his journal: "Meeting was held at 10 a.m. All the presidency spoke on the subject of this and other missions among the Indians. Young men might take squaws


to wife . . . .”¹ David Moore, the Mission Clerk, gave a
more detailed account:

Sunday, May 10, (1857). Brethren all called in
Center of fort for meeting. Pres. H. C. Kimball and
Wells addressed Missionaries as well as the brethren.
On the importance of the Missionaries being faithful
in the discharge of their duties and for them to marry
the Native women. That the marriage tie was the strong-
est tie of friendship that existed.²

W. H. Daines also recorded:

Pres. B. Young said, he did not wish the Brethren
to feel in a hurry about anything but to live their
Religion and when the Lord opened the way before them
so that they could Marry Girls they would be very
likely to be enabled to keep them.³

It is evident that Brigham Young was cautious to-
ward the brethren taking Indian wives, especially the older
ones, for another entry in the Journal of the Salmon River
Mission stated:

But if the Brethren were to marry those old vani-
gaddoes they would be off with the first Mountaineer
that came along. Much more good instruction was given
and the day was spent in a very agreeable manner to
all present.⁴

As a result of these teachings, at least three of
the brethren married Indian women. The following entry
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points out the degree of success which attended the marriages:

Tuesday 22nd (Dec. 1857). Thos. Day of Salt Lake City married a Bannack woman, a widow, Chas Dolton officiating in the Ceremony [sic].

Wednesday 23. Br. Day's wife ran off taking her child with her some time during the night. This morning a little Bannack a relation of the woman went after her, found her hid in the Brush and Brot her back again.

Thursday 24. Br. Day's wife still keeps very sullen and obstinate during the evening she ran off again.


Tuesday 12, (Jan. 1858). E. J. Barnard arrived from the herd and stated that Pete Mattigans Brother & Wadzusi, Pete's cousin had induced his wife to leave & that she had taken several articles with her from his camp.

Friday 22, (Jan. 1858). Richard B. Margitts and a Bannack woman was married this evening. Demsey (a mountain man) formerly had her for a wife.¹

The record tells of the losses the brethren sustained at the hands of the Indians, of the death of three of the missionaries and the closing of the mission. As to the Indian women whom the missionaries had taken as wives, the Journal History record states:

Two squaws who had married the brethren refused to come, fearing the soldiers would kill all the Mormons. One squaw came with her husband. Many of the Indians cried when the brethren left.²

No further reference was made concerning the Missionary who brought out his Indian wife, but it appears that there were no permanent unions between the Indians and the

¹Brooks, 30.
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whites in that mission.

In the Southern Utah (Indian) Mission where the most extensive and successful Indian relations were maintained, there was little said directly of the matter of intermarriage. The following letter from Brigham Young to Jacob Hamblin makes reference to it, commending the brethren who had taken Indian wives, but neither ordering nor recommending it as a general practice:

President's Office
G. S. L. City, 1st April 1857.

Elder Jacob Hamblin
Santa Clara

Your letter of the 2nd March was duly received. It is your privilege to increase.

I am pleased with the course you have taken in that part of the mission assigned to you, and the result of the late difficulty; I desire to make honorable mention of Thales Haskell and Ira Hatch; let them continue to befriend the remnants of Israel, and they will see the day when they will rejoice because of their present association and the results thereof.

If you ascertain that the parents of the Indian girl given to Ira Hatch are still of the same mind, and the girl is old enough, and matured sufficiently to bear children without injury . . . This will be his authority to go ahead, and do as he has done, proving himself the Indians' friend; I am rather inclined to think the girl is too young at present, from what I am informed.

I remain your friend and Bro.

Brigham Young.¹

¹Letter of Brigham Young, Book No. 3, p. 516 (in Archives of L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah).
There had been no definite or general instructions regarding the marriage of Indian wives in the South as shown by this extract from a letter written to Brigham Young:

As this is Sunday, we had quite an interesting day in meeting. The Great and all absorbing question of amalgamation with the natives was spoken upon at length by Brother Frem, one of our Seventies. He holds forth that it is our duty, as Latter-day Saints, to take the Lamanite women to wife and by that means make them our fast friends. He was opposed by Father Groves, who said that the Indians in these mountains are the descendants of the Gadianton Robbers* and that the curse of God is upon them, and we had better let them alone. The Bishop put a stop to further teaching of the doctrine of amalgamation, saying that he had received no orders to instruct the brethren to take Indian wives.

As two influential men, of long standing in the Church, have divided on this question, and the Bishop has failed to give his decision in the matter, I am anxious to know for myself, as it is my duty to inquire of my Bishop for information, but when he fails to satisfy my mind, I claim the right to inquire of those that can do it, and should you find time to give me a few ideas or hints upon this subject, it would be gladly received, I assure you.

Your humble brother in the cause of truth,

Marion J. Shelton ¹

It appears that Jacob Hamblin considered the matter of intermarriage rather important, since its major purpose was to strengthen the relations between the whites and Indians so that more Indian children would come under the influence of the Mormons, both through natural increase as

*Gadianton is referred to in the Book of Mormon, Helaman 2:4.

¹Journal History . . ., December 18, 1858.
well as adoption. During the winter of 1857-58, Jacob Hamblin was employed as a guide to take companies through to California. This entry appears in his journal following the account of his first trip:

On my arrival at the Mudday [sic] as I returned, I found the mission there in a rather precarious situation. The brethren that were there had taken rather an unwise course with the Indians in regard to taking Indian women. When I went down I told them it was a delilicate [sic] matter for them to handle and not to say anything about it at present. But as they felt very impatient to take squaws, the young bucks had become very jealous of them and waylaid to shoot them.¹

Some years later Jacob Hamblin received a letter from Brigham Young which presented definite information regarding the marriage of Moqui (Indian) girls:

I have written to Brother E. Snow in relation to marrying Moqui girls, informing him that the brethren were at liberty to do so; but that in case a person at the time had a wife, the parties would have to come here to have the ceremony performed, otherwise they can be married there.²

The social results of the Mormon-Indian associations, particularly those resulting from intermarriage, and the adjustment of the Indian children who were raised in white homes, gives an opportunity for studies in acculturation. This thesis, however, points out only a few

¹Jacob Hamblin, Journal, p. 49 (MS in L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah).
²Letter from Brigham Young to Jacob Hamblin, March 4, 1863 (original owned by Mrs. Mary Beeler, Mesa, Arizona).
examples for the purpose of showing in a limited degree some resulting evidence of the vision of Brigham Young and his policy toward the Indian.

The following are brief case histories of Indian children adopted by Mormon families:

Among the Indian girls who died at maturity without marrying are Mickey, who was adopted by Artemisia Snow, the wife of Erastus Snow, and Jane, who was raised by Samuel Knight of Santa Clara. Mickey died in her "teens," but Jane worked in different homes in St. George for several years before she became ill. She returned home in Santa Clara to die.

Sister McClellan, the mother of Samuel Knight, also adopted an Indian girl. Sister McClellan owned the only organ in Santa Clara at the time, and the girl learned to play well, so that the home became the gathering place of the young people of the village on Sunday afternoons. The girl had a chance to marry a white man as his fourth wife, but the parents thought she could do better, and so opposed the match. They moved back north, taking the girl with them, but the climate did not agree with her. She contracted pneumonia and died, unmarried.

Still another Indian girl was Ann, who was raised at Hamilton's Fort by John Hamilton. She is still living and has never married. She became an expert housekeeper and worked for many years in some of the best homes in Salt Lake City. To meet her now is to meet a woman who is well groomed and who dresses in excellent taste. She speaks with a cultured accent and is a delightful person to know. She spends a great deal of her time in the Mormon temple and has done some work there for her own people.¹

The following are accounts of Indians who inter-married with the whites.

Janet was a Shivwits child who was bought by Prime Coleman of Pinto and later given to Eliza McConnell of

¹Brooks, 35.
Cedar City, from whose home she married James Clark. She had at least seven children: Prime Coleman Clark, who died when about twenty years of age; Alfred, who died in young manhood, and three daughters and two sons who lived and married. Two of the girls married Dave and Henry Edwards, brothers, and the third married Rone Thompson—all white men. One boy, Jim, married a girl named Smith and had a number of children by her, and after her death married her sister and had a younger family by her. The other brother, Will, also married a white girl and lives in Cedar City, where they are well respected. The descendants are now quite numerous, and move on an equality with their neighbors.

Rhoda was also a Shivwit child who was purchased by William Carpenter and his wife. Her mother, Annie, was one of the Indian women who worked for the whites, often doing the washing for the same family for years, and at her death left this one child. Since the Carpenter family had no daughter, they purchased the child and called her Rhoda. She grew up in the home, loved and happy. Her one fear was of Indians, for she always ran and hid when any of her own race came around. She learned to play the organ, and served as organist at the various church meetings. She married Thomas Sharp, a Spanish war veteran, and they had six children, but the marriage was not congenial and she left. After being away almost twenty years, in the spring of 1943 she returned for a short time to St. George, to dispose of her property, bringing two of her daughters with her. She is a stylish, well-groomed woman; her daughters are slender and good-looking also tastefully dressed. When the writer (Brooks) met them they were disturbed over some slight, real or imagined, and were insistent that they were as good as anyone in the town, a fact which it had never occurred to anyone to question, so that all attempts to be cordial were wasted. It is understood that one of her children died in childhood and one as a young man; the one remaining son is serving with the armed forces in North Africa (1942), and all three daughters are married.\footnote{Ibid., 36.}

Soon after the arrival of the settlers in St. George, Jacob Hamblin brought a five-year old Indian girl to the home of Melancthon Burgess and asked him to buy her. Since
the wife wanted her, he paid Jacob the value of fifty dollars for her. She was named Minnie. Mrs. Wallace Miles, a daughter of the Burgesses, told what a favorite Minnie was in the family and what pride the mother took in her, especially in keeping her long black hair clean and shining.

When she grew to womanhood, Minnie married Albert Hartman of Leeds. She had four children, and died when the oldest was about thirteen years of age. The father secured the services of Cora Keate, another Indian girl, as housekeeper, and later married her.

Cora had been raised in St. George by Susannah Rogers Keate, who had no children of her own. Mrs. Keate had been a pioneer school teacher, and gave the little dark girl excellent training, until in young womanhood she was known as an expert seamstress, and went to work at the mining camp at Silver Reef. Here she met and married a man named Williams, but he soon deserted her. Later she married Albert Hartman of Leeds and took over the care of his children. She had none of her own, but was very kind to those of her husband: One died young; another, Albert, died in young manhood of miner's consumption; a third, Willie, married a white girl and had five children before he, too, died. The only daughter, Daisy, married Bill Nicoles of Leeds, Utah, where she still lives, the mother of six children, a respected citizen.

In 1851 Priddy Meeks purchased an Indian girl about three years of age, and gave her to his wife, Sarah. The child, Lucy, was given every advantage of education and training that the white children had. There are many family legends concerning her—how on one occasion at a funeral, every member of the choir broke down and she carried the song through alone to the end as a solo; how popular she was at the dances; how no one else could make biscuits or iron ruffles with such skill. When she reached maturity she had an illegitimate child, a daughter. Just before the birth of the child, the man who presumably was responsible, and whom all the neighbors had supposed was going to marry Lucy, shot himself. Some thought that he did this through some idea of blood atonement; others thought that he preferred death to life with an Indian woman;
still others maintained that since he had been such a shy, bashful fellow, spending his time in the hills with the sheep and never going to meetings or dances or public gatherings, he could not face the Mormon penalty for his act. This would include a confession and apology before the congregation in church and a rebaptism before he could be reinstated in fellowship. Whatever the motive behind his suicide, Lucy was forced to bear the disgrace of the child and the blame for its father's death. Gossip ran riot, until at last the authorities from St. George were forced to come up and investigate matters. (Many persons near the man involved persistently believed his protestations of innocence to the last.—Ed.)

As for Lucy, she went into seclusion until her parents sent her north, thinking that a change in environment would be good for her. Her foster mother kept the baby, Sylvia. After a short time away, Lucy became ill and had to come home. Quick consumption, they called it. She lay listless, saying little and showing no interest in anything, not even the baby. She made no complaint of pain, but lay in weakness and languor, often with her face to the wall.

Other people tell how, during her last days, neighbors took turns sitting up at night with her to relieve the family: The watchers on the night of her death tell how, after she had lain quietly for some time, she opened her eyes wide to the ceiling and began to sing in a high, clear voice the Mormon hymn, "O My Father." It seemed to them that the lines, "Father, Mother, may I meet you in your royal courts on High," had special meaning, as did the last line, "Let me come and dwell with you."

After a short rest she told them she was going to join her own people in their happy hunting grounds and that it had been a mistake for her ever to suppose that she could be a white girl. Indian children, she said, should be left with their own people where they could be happy; when they were raised in white homes they did not belong anywhere. Then, so the story goes, a strange thing happened. The flame leaped up in the coal-oil lamp as though it were fanned by a sudden breeze, in spite of the fact that the room was closed and there was no air stirring. The same instant Lucy's spirit took leave, passing without struggle.

The child, Sylvia, grew to be a beautiful girl. According to the account, she married a traveling salesman from Salt Lake City. Since he was a man of some means, she had a luxurious apartment, was well
dressed, and moved in a good circle. She had two sons, but both died as children. Grief over their loss impaired her health, and she, too, died while still a young woman.

Another unusual case in the writer's (Brooks) own family was that of Janet. She was purchased as an infant by Silas Smith of Parowan. Later Smith died and his wife married a Mr. McGregor, but Janet stayed in the home and acted as an older sister to the young family, though she still went by the name of Smith. She was given the best training in all the household arts, and took part in the social activities of the town. In her young womanhood she received an offer of marriage as a plural wife from a white man in Parowan, but to the surprise of the family, she refused. They criticized her, saying that she should be glad to get so good an offer since she could not expect to pick and choose. At last she told them that there was only one man that she had seen that she felt she would like to marry, and he was Dudley Leavitt. He was related to her foster mother and always stopped at the home on his annual trips to Salt Lake City. At this time he was in the north with a load of fruit.

The mother reported what the girl had said to Apostle George A. Smith, who was visiting in Parowan at the time, and when Dudley came back he was called in and asked if he would consider marrying her. The theory was that a woman ought to have some say in the choice of her husband, and that when a girl had her heart set on a man, he had some responsibility in the matter of providing her a home. Dudley, just twenty-nine himself, already had three wives, the last a girl of sixteen to whom he had been married only six months. He hesitated to give his consent to a fourth until the Apostle said, "Brother Leavitt, I promise you in the name of the Lord, that if you will take this girl, give her a home and a family, and do your duty by her, you will be blessed. You will count her descendants as among the choice ones of your offspring." To Dudley such a statement had all the weight of a command direct of God. He had no more to say. 

The ceremony was performed then and there, the girl's belongings loaded into the wagon, and the young couple started for Santa Clara. Interesting reverberations still come to the family of the welcome the pair received when

\[\text{Ibid.}, \ 37-39.\]
they arrived, though eventually the other wives did accept the Indian girl with fairly good grace. There is no question but that she suffered under the arrangement in spite of all that her husband could do to maintain equality.

Janet was the mother of eleven children, eight of whom grew to maturity and six of whom married and had families. The grandchildren numbered 147; the great-grandchildren are now more than 170 with others being added regularly, while there are already quite a few in the fifth generation. From the first, her descendants maintained that they were not Indians, but whites, the sons and daughters of Dudley Leavitt. The writer (Brooks) remembers when an agent came to town to persuade some of the grandchildren to attend the Indian college at Carlisle, holding out to them the offer of a free education. How insulted they were! They were white, and no inducement would have any weight with them. They preferred to pay their own way to white institutions rather than to go free to an Indian school.1

If the children suffered disadvantages--and no doubt they did--the grandchildren suffered less, while some of the fourth and fifth generations seem to have forgotten that there was even an Indian ancestor. A number of them held important church and civic positions, and there is an indication that the promise which was made to Dudley Leavitt will be fulfilled in these later generations.

Of all the boys who were adopted into white homes in Southern Utah, the only one known to have married a white girl is David Lemmon. David was of the Ute tribe, and was first purchased by Hyrum Stevens, who later traded him to James A. Lemmon of Rockville, Utah, for a large black horse. The child disliked school so much that his foster parents did not force him to go, 1Ibid., 39.
but sent him out to herd the cows in the hills. Thus it was that he did not learn to read.

As a young man he was large and well formed, weighing nearly two hundred pounds. He was also very athletic, his greatest delight being to challenge the white boys to wrestle or race, either on foot or on horseback. He also learned to play the violin, and was for years the only musician in the region, going on horseback as far as Silver Reef and Toquerville to play for dances. He received five dollars a night for this service, which was at that time a handsome wage.

He married Caroline Josephine Neilsen, a Swedish girl. His son, David W. Lemmon, relates that after he himself was old enough to start school he tried to teach his father to read from a primer. In vain would he point out the difference between the letters "b," "d," "p," and the others; his father would only laugh good-naturedly and say, "They all look alike to me, son."

When they had five children, the couple decided that they would like to go through the Mormon temple. At first there was a hesitancy on the part of the bishopric to grant the application since David had never been active in the Church, but knowing his character and disposition, they finally granted the privilege. After the ceremony, as they were leaving St. George on their way back to Rockville, they stopped and purchased a Bible, a Book of Mormon, and Doctrine and Covenants. David learned to read with almost miraculous ease and became in his later life an ardent student of the Scriptures. He taught a Sunday School class and was active in other ward work. (A "ward" is an ecclesiastical unit of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon), corresponding to a parish.)

After his religious awakening, he was reputed to enjoy the power of healing. When there was sickness and he was called in to administer, the patient always seemed to recover. At last his white neighbors came to have such faith in him that he was always sent for in time of trouble; in fact, he often went a whole day's journey to bless the sick.

"You may be ashamed of your father now," he told his son, David, one day, "but the time will come when you will be proud to own him and to claim your ancestors."1

David Lemmon died at the age of seventy-five. Of

1Ibid., 40.
his six children who grew to maturity, four married and had
families. His descendants now number twenty-eight, at
least two of whom are successful school teachers.

An unusual life was that of Susie who was first pur-
chased by Dudley Leavitt. His daughter, Hannah Leavitt
Terry, told of the transaction:

Once when the Indians were hungry, they sold Susie
to father. The Indian put down a blanket and father
poured wheat on it as long as any would stay without
rolling off. I can still see father holding the bucket
and pouring it on. He also let them have some sheep
that were killed before they went away. Susie was a
little Indian girl about five years old. Aunt Janet
took care of her. I can still see her crying when the
Indians went away. Father kept her five years and let
Brother William Pulsipher have her for a span of oxen.

Susie took the name of Pulsipher, by which both she
and her children have been known: As soon as she was
old enough, she went out to do house work in different
homes, and later she was a cook at camps. Though she
never married, she had three children, Harvey, Renie,
and Nina. Soon after the birth of her second child,
Susie was called before the local Church authorities
to answer for her sins.

"I have a right to children," she told them cour-
ageously. "No white man will marry me. I cannot live
with the Indians. But I can have children, and I will
support the children that I have. I will ask no one
else to support them. I have them because I want them.
God meant that a woman should have children."

After that, people came to accept Susie and her
children. A young girl once said, "If I were going to
be an old maid, I'd be a respectable old maid, like
Susie, and have children," a sentiment which was often
repeated when Susie was referred to. Susie was as good
as her word. She was proud, in her way. Mrs. Lottie
Carter tells how, while Susie was working for her, she
stood at the window one day looking down the street.

"What are you watching so closely?" Mrs. Carter
asked her.

\footnote{Ibid., 44. (See also Hannah Leavitt Terry Journal
in possession of Mrs. Selena H. Leavitt, Homedale, Idaho.)}
"Look," said Susie, "It is my people. My mother and my folks. Sister Carter, do you know what I would like? I wish I could invite them in and cook them a meal.

"You certainly may, Susie," Mrs. Carter said.

So the Indians were asked in and Susie was given the best linen and dishes for the table and allowed to cook a fine meal and serve them. Mrs. Carter said that she always thought Indians were stolid and undemonstrative until she saw their delight as they examined the nice things on the table and their pleasure in eating the food.

Of Susie's three children, Renie, the oldest girl, died in young womanhood. Harvey, the boy has never married, and now lives in Nevada. Nina, the youngest girl followed the example of her mother and was a "respectable old maid" who had children. She had three, all of whom she wheeled proudly around the streets of St. George in a beautiful baby carriage with a fine silk quilt, ignoring the whisperings and nudgings of her white neighbors. She claimed that the children were all fathered by fine men; it is said by some that she named the girl after the father's mother, and the boys after their father's. All three were adopted into a white home. One died young; the other two have both married whites, and are fitting into white society unquestioned. The girl is particularly attractive, and accomplished pianist, and a skilled housewife.¹

Many questions have arisen concerning Mormon-Indian relationships through the research of this study, and possibly answers may never be fully known. How did the Indian child feel with his foster parents? Was he given love and acceptance by the white community? Some Indian children were afraid of their own people, whereas many possibly felt resentment and sarcasm for their white playmates. The scope of this study is not to analyze the many facets of this relationship, but to point out some possible problem areas.

¹Ibid., 45.
A number of mixed marriages were noted. What was the attitude of the white wives toward the dark one in a polygynous household? How did the neighbors feel toward the man who took an Indian wife? How did the children of these mixed marriages fare? Were they considered white and accepted with no color discrimination, or were they Indian and segregation made against them? Again, it is not the purpose of this work to produce a suitable conclusion to the many questions that arise regarding the Indian-White relationships, but to point out that this relationship did exist. Perhaps many valuable and beneficial experiences did accrue to both races.

Many persons have expressed their Indian ancestry with pride. Perhaps some became proud of the "blood of Israel" in their veins while others must have felt a certain stigma or were at a disadvantage in their association with the whites. Will Rogers stated that his ancestors didn't come on the Mayflower—they were here to meet it.¹ Perhaps many felt the same way and were proud of their heritage.

It is interesting to note that a recent selection of a girl to be the queen of the Covered Wagon days (A celebration of the coming of the Mormon Pioneers, held each year in Salt Lake City, from July 22 to 24.)—a girl supposed to represent the epitome of beauty and culture and accomplishment—had a great grandmother who was an Indian. In recent months, the writer

made it a point to check on the fourth and fifth generations of the descendants of her grandfather's Indian wife. In one family of eight great-grandchildren, the first five were all valedictorians of their high school graduating class; the others are younger and not yet graduated. In Las Vegas, Nevada, three other girls were met, all of whom held excellent positions; in fact, in general they take their places without question in society and as leaders.¹

The promise that the Indian shall yet become a "white and delightful" people is still repeated by the Mormons, but perhaps it is with a difference. The first missionaries went out to help bring about its fulfillment with a genuine interest in the welfare of the Indians, but now that zeal is largely spent. The Mormon record on the whole is perhaps good; their experiment in intermarriage, however, leaves much to be desired on both sides. Certainly it resulted in heartbreaks and maladjustments for many. The children of such marriages, and in many cases perhaps the grandchildren, were also at a disadvantage socially. Yet seen from a distance after four or five generations, it seems possible that the results cannot entirely be condemned.

There is no way of knowing the number of Indian children adopted or raised by Mormon families, or the number of

¹Ibid., 48. (For greater clarity of the following quotation, and for further information regarding Mrs. Juanita Brooks, it should be said that she is a granddaughter of Dudley Leavitt, a prominent and noted person not only among the "Mormon" people of his time, but was also greatly involved with the Indian peoples as well.)
deaths while still in babyhood, youth, or of those reaching maturity.

Records were irregularly kept. Trades and transfer from one family to another likely occurred, especially in the more rural or primitive areas, with the results that there is no way to ascertain the number of Indians involved with the white people during the period of 1847 to 1865.

What influence the Mormon people have had on the Indians, and whether they have appreciably been benefitted through this association will probably never be fully known. But from evidence gained through this research, it appears that in many cases both the Indians and Mormons have benefitted.
CHAPTER IV

NEGO RO SLAVERY IN UTAH

The first record of Negroes in the Utah Territory is of those who arrived with the original company of Mormon colonizers in 1847. At the end of the list of original pioneers on the bronze tablet on the north side of the monument erected to honor Brigham Young and his pioneers are the names of Green Flake, Hark Lay, and Oscar Crosby, "colored servants."

In 1850, Utah was the only western territory in which Negroes were held as slaves, and one of the few places in America where Indian and Negro slavery occurred simultaneously.1

The problem of slavery which confronted the Saints in Utah was not a new situation. To better understand the attitude of the Mormon people toward slavery, reference is made to the Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois period of the history of the Latter-day Saint Church. It is here, particularly in Missouri, that the Latter-day Saints first met the problem of slavery. The problem was so acute that the Saints were driven from the state primarily because they were from the north, and Missouri was a slave state.

1James B. Christensen, "Negro Slavery in the Utah Territory," The Phylon Quarterly, XVIII (1957), 298.
Brigham Young said of this experience: "In our first settlement in Missouri, it was said of our enemies that we intended to tamper with the slaves, not that we had any idea of the kind, for such a thing never entered our minds."\(^1\)

When the Latter-day Saint Church was founded in 1830, slavery was a legal but somewhat explosive issue in the United States. Initially, Negroes apparently were admitted to full membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Andrew Jenson, Assistant Church Historian, stated:

The only colored man who is known to have been ordained to the Priesthood, was born July 25, 1810, in Maryland. Becoming a convert to "Mormonism" he was baptized in September, 1832, by Ezekiel Roberts and, as appears from certificates, he was ordained an Elder March 3, 1836, and a Seventy April 4, 1841, an exception having been made in his case with regard to the general rule of the Church in relation to colored people. At Nauvoo, Illinois, where he resided, he followed the avocation of an undertaker. After his arrival in Salt Lake City he became a resident of the Tenth Ward, and, together with his wife, he managed the Farnham Hotel in Salt Lake City. In Nauvoo he was intimately acquainted with the Prophet Joseph Smith and later in life was the especial friend of the late Levi W. Hancock. In 1883, as a member of the Third Quorum of Seventy, he left Salt Lake City on a mission to Canada, during which he also performed missionary labors in the United States. Two weeks after his return he died, Dec. 25, 1884, of debility, consequent upon exposure while laboring in the ministry in Ohio. He died in full faith of the gospel.\(^2\)

In the early years of the Latter-day Saint Church the

\(^1\)Journal of Discourses, II, 172.

\(^2\)Jenson, 577.
problem of the Negro member was not one of great concern. George A. Smith, Church Historian in the 1850's and 1860's, gave two interesting discourses which discussed the days when "prophets were at a discount," and when some of the new branches lived in error. Speaking of the early days in Ohio, Smith stated:

They had a meeting at the farm, and among them was a negro known generally as Black Pete, who became a revelator . . . . Finally on one occasion, Black Pete got sight of one of those revelations carried by a black angel; he started after it, and ran off a steep wash bank twenty-five feet high, passed through a tree top into the Chagrin river beneath.¹

The Prophet Joseph Smith was well aware of the Negro member, and possibly at first there were few restrictions placed upon him. The priesthood and the Negro must have been one of the topics of the day as shown by this interesting situation from the diary of L. John Nuttal:

Saturday May 31st 1879 at the house of Prest A. O. Smoot. Provo City. Utah County Utah - 5 P.M.-President John Taylor Elders Brigham Young, A. O. Smoot. Zebedee Coltrin and L. John Nuttal met, and the subject of ordaining Negro's to the Priesthood was presented Prest Taylor said. Some parties have said to me that Zebedee Coltrin had talked to the Prophet Joseph Smith on this subject, and they said that he (Coltrin) thought it was not right for them to have the Priesthood. . . . Bro C. - The spring that we went up in Zion's camp in 1834 Bro Joseph sent Bro J. P. Green and me out south to gather up means to assist in gathering out the Saints from Jackson County Mo. - On our return home we got in conversation about the Negro having a right to the Priesthood - and I took the side he had no right - Bro Green argued that he had. the subject got so warm between us that he said he would report me to Bro

Joseph when we got home to Kirtland we both went in to Bro Joseph's office together to make our returns and Bro Green was as good as his word and reported to Bro Joseph that I had said that the Negro could not hold the Priesthood - Bro Joseph kind of dropt his head and rested it on his hand for a minute, and then said Bro Zebedee is right, for the Spirit of the Lord said the Negro has no right nor cannot hold the Priesthood. He made no reference to scripture at all - but such was his decision - I dont recollect ever having any conversation with him afterwards, but I have heard him say in public, that no person having the least particle of Negro blood can hold the Priesthood.¹

Probably the number of Negroes in the Latter-day Saint Church in the first decade was fewer than a dozen. Parley Pratt, in his account of the Missouri persecutions, sets that number as too high for as late as 1839, and said: "In fact one-half dozen negroes or mulattoes never have belonged to our society in any part of the world, from its first organization to this day, (1839)."²

The agitation against the Latter-day Saints in Jackson County, Missouri was increasing rapidly. Slavery was not the only issue between the Saints and the older inhabitants, but it played a very prominent role in the controversies and accusations that were being circulated. A crisis was precipitated over a seemingly harmless pronouncement of state laws regarding "free people of color" which appeared in the Mormon paper, The Evening and Morning

¹Diary of L. John Nuttal, May, 1879, p. 290 (in Brigham Young University Library, Provo, Utah).

Star, July 1, 1833. The article began as follows:

To prevent any misunderstanding among the churches abroad, respecting free people of color, who may think of coming to the western boundaries of Missouri, as members of the Church, we quote the following clauses from the laws of Missouri.¹

Then followed Section 4 of the State laws which explicitly denies entrance into the state and residence therein of any free negro or mulatto. Section 5 is also quoted wherein any person who brings a free negro or mulatto into the state for residence is subject to punishment. The article closed with:

Slaves are real estate in this and other states, and wisdom would dictate great care among the branches of the Church of Christ on this subject. So long as we have no special rule in the Church, as to people of color, let prudence guide, and while they, as well as we, are in the hands of a merciful God, we say: Shun every appearance of evil.²

A few days later some leading citizens of Jackson County drew up and circulated a "secret constitution" which condemned the Mormons and issued an ultimatum. This manifesto stated that a crisis was at hand that the Mormons must be made to go, "peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must." After accusing the Mormons of performing wonder-working miracles and claiming them to be "idle, lazy, and vicious," the constitution suggested what appeared to be the real contention: Mormon attitude toward slavery. A

¹Evening and Morning Star, July 1, 1833, p. 218.
²Ibid., 219.
portion of the secret constitution follows:

More than a year since, it was ascertained that they had been tampering with our slaves, and endeavoring to sow dissensions and raise seditions amongst them. Of this their "Mormon" leaders were informed, and they said they would deal with any of their members who should again in like case offend. But how spacious are appearances. In a late number of the Star [July 1, 1833], published in Independence by the leaders of the sect, there is an article inviting free negroes and mulattoes from other states to become "Mormons" and remove and settle among us. This exhibits them in still more odious colors. It manifests a desire on the part of their society, to inflict on our society an injury that they know would be to us entirely insupportable, and one of the surest means of driving us from the country; for it would require none of the supernatural gifts that they pretend to, to see that the introduction of such a caste amongst us would corrupt our blacks, and instigate them to bloodshed.1

The Evening and Morning Star immediately published an "extra" clarifying any views on the previous article:

Our intention was not only to stop free people of color from emigrating to this state, but to prevent them from being admitted as members of the church.2 Great care should be taken on this point. The saints must shun every appearance of evil. As to slaves we have nothing to say. In connection with the wonderful events of this age, much is doing towards abolishing slavery, and colonizing the blacks in Africa.

We often lament the situation of our sister states in the south, and we fear, lest, as has been the case, the blacks should rise and spill innocent blood; for they are ignorant, and a little may lead them to disturb the peace of society. To be short, we are opposed to have free people of color admitted into the state; and we say, that none will be admitted into the church, for we are determined to obey the laws of the constitution of our country, that we may have that protection

1 Joseph Fielding Smith, History of the Church (Salt Lake City: The Deseret Book Company, 1953), I, 375.
2 Roberts, I, 328, footnote 14.
which the sons of liberty inherit from the legacy of Washington, through the favorable auspices of a Jefferson, and Jackson.\textsuperscript{1}

No church stand in regard to slavery had been taken up to this time. Not until the expulsion of the Jackson County Saints into the north counties of Missouri did Joseph Smith express official pronouncements of the Latter-day Saint Church on the slave issues. These were published in the April, 1836 issue of the \textit{Messenger and Advocate}, a church monthly newspaper of Kirtland, Ohio. Another reason, although somewhat foreign to the issues in Missouri, possibly brought the question to a head. An abolitionist visited Kirtland, Ohio in 1836. Not to be misunderstood by Mormons and non-Mormons alike, Joseph Smith expressed his views on slavery and abolition in a letter to Oliver Cowdery. Because of the issues involved upon the subject of slavery, the letter is quoted almost in its entirety:

April 9, 1836

Brother Oliver Cowdery,

Dear Sir:—This place (Kirtland) having recently been visited by a gentlemen who advocated the principles or doctrines of those who are called abolitionists,\textsuperscript{2} and his presence having created an interest in that subject, if you deem the following reflections of any service, or think they will have a tendency to

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 328.

correct the opinions of the Southern public, relative to the views and sentiments I entertain, as an individual, and which I am able to say from personal knowledge are the sentiments of others, you are at liberty to give them publicity in the columns of the Advocate. In one respect I am prompted to this course in consequence of many Elders having gone into the Southern States, besides there being now many in that country who have already embraced the fulness of the Gospel, as revealed through the Book of Mormon. . . . I fear that the sound might go out, that "an Abolitionist" had held forth several times to this community, and that the public feeling was not aroused to create mobs or disturbance, leaving the impression that all he said was concurred in, and received as Gospel, and the word of salvation. I am happy to say that no violence, or breach of the public peace, was attempted; so far from this, all, except a very few, attended to their own vocations, and left the gentleman to hold forth his own arguments to nearly naked walls. I am aware that many, who profess to preach the Gospel, complain against their brethren of the same faith, who reside in the South, and are ready to withdraw the hand of fellowship, because they will not renounce the principle of slavery, and raise their voice against every thing of the kind.

Joseph Smith seems to have dipped into the future history of the United States and seen not only the Civil War period, but our time of the 1960's, as he continued:

This must be a tender point, and one which should call forth the candid reflections of all men, and more especially before they advance in an opposition calculated to lay waste the fair states of the South, and let loose upon the world a community of people, who might, peradventure, overrun our country, and violate the most sacred principles of human society, chastity and virtue.

No one will pretend to say that the people of the free states are as capable of knowing the evils of slavery, as those who hold slaves. If slavery be an evil, who . . . would first learn it? Would the people of the free states, or the people of the slave states? All must readily admit, that the latter would first learn this fact. If the fact were learned first by those immediately concerned, who would be more capable than they of prescribing a remedy? And besides,
are not those who hold slaves, persons of ability, discernment and candor? Do they not expect to give an account at the bar of God for their conduct in this life? . . . I do not believe that the people of the North have any more right to say that the South shall not have slaves, than the South have to say the North shall.

And further, what benefit will it ever be to the slaves for persons to run over the free states, and excite indignation against their masters in the minds of thousands and tens of thousands, who understand nothing relative to their circumstances, or conditions? I mean particularly those who have never traveled in the South, and who in all their lives have scarcely ever seen a Negro. . . .

After having expressed myself so freely upon this subject, I do not doubt, but those who have been forward in raising their voices against the South, will cry out against me as being uncharitable, unfeeling, unkind, and wholly unacquainted with the Gospel of Christ. It is my privilege then to name certain passages from the Bible, pronounced by a man who was perfect in his generation, and walked with God. And so far from that prediction being averse to the mind of God, it remains as a lasting monument of the decree of Jehovah, to the shame and confusion of all who have cried out against the South, in consequence of their holding the sons of Ham in servitude. "And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." (Gen. 9:25-26)

Trace the history of the world from this notable event down to this day, and you will find the fulfillment of this singular prophecy. What could have been the design of the Almighty in this singular occurrence is not for me to say; but I can say, the curse is not yet taken off from the sons of Canaan, neither will be until it is affected by as great a power as caused it to come; and the people who interfere the least with the purposes of God in this matter, will come under the least condemnation before Him; and those who are determined to pursue a course, which shows an opposition, and a feverish restlessness against the decrees of the Lord, will learn, when perhaps it is too late for their own good, that God can do His own work, without the aid of those who are not dictated by His counsel.

The Prophet turned to the Bible, as did the Southern apologists for slavery, to show that servitude was well
established, not only from the black race, but from others as well. The letter continues:

I must not pass over a notice of the history of Abraham, of whom so much is spoken in the Scripture. If we can credit the account, God conversed with him from time to time, and directed him in the way he should walk, saying, "I am the Almighty; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Paul says the Gospel was preached to this man. And it is further said, that he had sheep and oxen, men-servants and maid-servants, etc. From this I conclude, that if the principle had been an evil one, in the midst of the communications made to this holy man, he would have been instructed to that effect, and if he was instructed against holding men-servants and maid-servants, he never ceased to do it; consequently must have incurred the displeasure of the Lord, and thereby lost His blessings; which was not the fact.

Some may urge that the names man-servant and maid-servant, only mean hired persons, who were at liberty to leave their masters or employers at any time. But we can easily settle this point, by turning to the history of Abraham's descendants, when governed by a law from the mouth of Jehovah himself. I know that when an Israelite had been brought into servitude, in consequence of debt, or otherwise, at the seventh year he went from the task of his former master, or employer, but to no other people or nation was this granted in the law of Israel. And if after a man had served six years, he did not wish to be free, then the master was to bring him unto the judges—bore his ear with an awl, and that man was "to serve him forever." The conclusion I draw from this, is, that this people were led and governed by revelation, and if such a law was wrong, God only is to be blamed, and abolitionists are not responsible. . . .

. . . All men are to be taught to repent; but we have no right to interfere with slaves, contrary to the mind and will of their masters. In fact it would be much better, and more prudent, not to preach at all to slaves, until after their masters are converted, and then teach the masters to use them with kindness; remembering that they are accountable to God, and the servants are bound to serve their masters with singleness of heart, without murmuring.

I do most sincerely hope that no one who is authorized from this Church to preach the Gospel, will so far depart from the Scriptures, as to be found stirring up strife and sedition against our brethren of the South.
Having spoken frankly and freely, I leave all in the hands of God, who will direct all things for His glory, and the accomplishment of His work. Praying that God may spare you to do much good in this life, I subscribe myself your brother in the Lord.

JOSEPH SMITH, Jun.¹

As early as 1832 Joseph Smith predicted the coming Civil War between the North and South.² The impending conflict would be fought over the slavery issue. In 1844 he announced his own candidacy for the presidency of the United States. In support of his claims to office he prepared and circulated a pamphlet called "Views of the Powers and Policy and Government of the United States." From this article the following is quoted:

Petition, also, ye goodly inhabitants of the slave States, your legislators to abolish slavery by the year 1850, or now, and save the abolitionist from reproach and ruin, infamy and shame.
Pray Congress to pay every man a reasonable price for his slaves out of the surplus revenue arising from the sale of public lands and from the deduction of pay from the members of Congress.
Break off the shackles from the poor black man and hire him to labor like other human beings; for "an hour of virtuous liberty on earth is worth a whole eternity of bondage."³

This proposal recognized the desirability of freedom but also the property rights of the slave-holders. He proposed that the federal government should buy the slaves

¹Smith, II, 436-40.
²Doctrine & Covenants, Sect 87, Verses 1-8.
³Smith, VI, 205.
from their owners and set them free.

In a meeting held March 7, 1844, Joseph Smith made the following statement regarding the Negro question with a possible solution thereof:

The South holds the balance of power. By annexing Texas, I can do away with this evil. As soon as Texas was annexed, I would liberate the slaves in two or three States, indemnifying their owners, and send the negroes to Texas, and from Texas to Mexico, where all colors are alike. And if that was not sufficient, I would call upon Canada, and annex it.¹

It was the purpose of the writer to explore the possible avenues of the concepts of slavery as propounded by the Latter-day Saint Church. To understand the attitude of the Mormons of Utah regarding the problem of slavery, it was necessary to get the concept from the teachings of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet. With this background at least partly explored, it should be easier for the reader to better understand the Church position of slavery in its Utah setting.

The initial exodus of the Mormons in 1847 to the Rocky Mountains, which was then Mexican territory, was to find a place to live where they could be free of the mob violence they had been subjected to continually in Missouri and Illinois. In the group were converts from the South who were accompanied by a few slaves.

In the Journal of John Brown, a native of Tennessee who was sent on a mission to the Southern States for the

¹Ibid., 244.
Mormon Church in 1843, a brief but interesting history of the initial pioneer company on its trek to Utah was recorded. He reported that in April, 1846, he assisted in fitting out a company of fourteen families in Mississippi and started for the Rocky Mountains where they expected to meet the Saints from Nauvoo. The winter was spent in Pueblo. Upon learning that Brigham Young had not yet left Winter Quarters, Brown and seven others returned to Monroe County, Mississippi for their families. His own diary as arranged by his son, John Zimmerman Brown, M. D., states:

After a few days rest we began making preparations to move our families early in the spring, to Council Bluffs, and thus be ready to go westward with the Church. About this time Elders Bryant Nowlin and Charles Crismon came to our settlement directly from Council Bluffs. They carried an epistle from the council of the twelve apostles, instructing us to remain another year with our families, but to fit out and send all the men we could spare to go west with the pioneers.

We called a council to consider the matter, at which we concluded to send some four colored servants as pioneers, one of us going along to take charge of them. William Crosby, John H. Bankhead, William Day, and I each to furnish a servant, and John Powell arranged for his brother David to go along. It fell to my lot to go and take charge of the company. In order for us to reach Council Bluffs in time, it was necessary to make this journey of a thousand miles during the winter months. . . . All arrangements being made, we left Mississippi on January 10, 1847. . . . Daniel M. Thomas joined with his family, and Brother Charles Crismon also accompanied us. . . . We were well filled out with two good wagons and supplies, but as we traveled northward the weather became extremely cold. . . .

At St. Louis, where we were joined by Joseph Stratton and his family, we purchased more teams and wagons. A few days later Bryant Nowlin and Matthew Ivory overtook us, and we now had six wagons. But the mud was so heavy that we had to lay over several days. Finally
it turned cold, giving us the severest kind of weather, which was extremely hard on the negroes. My servant, whose name was Henry, caught cold and took the winter fever, which caused his death. I buried him in Andrew County, Missouri, at the lower end of the Round Prairie, just eight miles north of Savannah.

In this neighborhood we purchased some more cattle, and resuming our journey, we reached the Bluffs a few days before President Brigham Young and the pioneers started for the west. While we were waiting here, John Bankhead's colored man also died with the winter fever. This journey from the Mississippi was the hardest and severest trip I had every undertaken.

I left one wagon and its load here with Brother Crismon, to bring along with the families that were to follow, and took the other two wagons and the two colored men, Oscar Crosby and Hark Lay, who had survived the journey, and joined the Pioneer Camp. Brothers David Powell and Matthew Ivory also enlisted as pioneers and on April 11, when the pioneer company was organized, and I was chosen captain of the Thirteenth Ten, these four men were assigned to my ten.

Oscar Crosby and Hark Lay (colored) came west with the original Pioneer Company. James M. Flake of Anson County, North Carolina, also brought Green Flake, his colored servant, with the original pioneer company.

According to records in the Historian's Office of the Latter-day Saint Church:

Green Flake was born January, 1825, as a slave in Anson County, North Carolina, on the plantation of James M. Flake's father, and spent all of his early life in that family; he went with the Flake family to Nauvoo, Illinois, and thence west during the "Mormon" exodus of 1846. Green Flake's permanent home was Union, Salt Lake County, Utah; but he lived temporarily in Salt Lake City after the fall of 1893; later he moved to Idaho and died at Idaho Falls, October 20, 1903.

1John Zimmerman Brown, Diary of John Brown (Salt Lake City: by the author, 1941), 71-73.
Hark Lay, or Hark Wales was born about 1825 in Mississippi; he died about 1890 in Union, Salt Lake County, Utah.

Oscar Crosby was born about 1815 in Virginia; he died in 1870 in Los Angeles, California.¹

Green Flake was baptized by John Brown, April 7, 1844.²

Some of the Utah slave-holders and their negro slaves, according to Amasa M. Lyman, Jr., of Teasdale, Utah, son of Amasa M. Lyman, original pioneer of 1847, were:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLAVE OWNERS</th>
<th>NEGRO SLAVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel M. Thomas</td>
<td>Toby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Matthews</td>
<td>Uncle Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lay</td>
<td>Hark, Henderson, and Knelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crosby</td>
<td>Oscar and Grief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Flake</td>
<td>Green and his wife &quot;Liz.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>later known as Mrs. Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Aunt &quot;_____&quot;, Hanna, &amp; Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Bankhead</td>
<td>Mrs. Sina Bankhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>Betsy Crosby Brown Flewellen⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper N. Perkins</td>
<td>Mary Perkins⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueben Perkins</td>
<td>Frank, wife Esther, Ben and other children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Perkins</td>
<td>Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber C. Kimball</td>
<td>Martha, later married Green Flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sprouse (Texas)</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles C. Rich</td>
<td>Owned 3 pair of negro slaves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


²Brown, 46.

³Journal History . . . , June 16, 1856.

⁴Brown, 146.

⁵Frank Esshom, Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah (Salt Lake City: Publisher and date unknown), 958.
Chad Flake, in charge of the Special Collections Library of the Brigham Young University and greatgrandson of James M. Flake, produced an account of the life history of William J. Flake, his grandfather, from which the following was taken:

James M. Flake was baptized by Elder Clapp in the winter of 1843-44, in the State of Mississippi. After a trip to Nauvoo, Illinois in the Spring of 1844, the family decided to cast lots with the Saints, and with three other families, the Flake's with three negro slaves made the move.

With the final preparation of the original Pioneer Company, James M. Flake sent his slave, Green, with mules and a mountain carriage to help the company to its destination. He told Green to send the outfit back by some of the brethren who would be returning, and for him to stay and build them a house.²

James M. Flake and family came west with the Amasa Lyman and Willard Richards Company of 1848. James was appointed captain of 100 wagons. A large part of this company was made up of southern families. The company consisted of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>502 white people</td>
<td>63 pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 negroes</td>
<td>5 cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 wagons</td>
<td>44 dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 horses</td>
<td>170 chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mules</td>
<td>4 turkeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Ibid., 9.
There was no mention as to the distribution of the negroes, whether slave or free.

When they reached the Salt Lake Valley, there was a log house awaiting them, that Green had built on the "Amasa Survey," on Cottonwood. The negro was then given his freedom and was known as Green Flake. "Liz," a negress was brought to Utah by James Flake in 1848, who had been given to his wife, Agnus, when they were married, became the wife of Green Flake.1

The following statement by Amasa M. Lyman, Jr. in 1936, concerning the Negro Pioneers sheds further light upon the issue of the original slaves:

I knew all three of those negro servants who were members of President Brigham Young's Pioneer Company of 1847. Hark Lay belonged to William Lay. Hark was always hard to manage. He died in California. William Crosby also went to California and took his servant Oscar Crosby along with him, where the latter died. . . After the slaves were freed, Green Flake lived at Union Fort, Salt Lake County.2

A few of the slave-owners went with Amasa M. Lyman to San Bernardino, California, in 1851, to establish an L. D. S. colony. Among these were Charles C. Rich, William Matthews, Daniel M. Thomas, William Crosby and William Smith. Their slaves were liberated in California, then a free state. Mr. Lyman, Jr., related that when William Smith realized

---

1Ibid., 10-11.
2Ibid., 13.
3Brown, 73.
that his slaves would become free in California he tried to take them to Texas, but his slaves desiring freedom refused to go with him.¹

When the Buchanan War (Utah War) broke out in 1857, the rancho of San Bernardino was sold and the Saints returned to Utah. There is no record of any negroes returning to Utah with the Saints.

Some of the Mississippi Saints moved on to San Bernardino with their slaves. Of the southern members who remained in Utah with their slaves, John H. Bankhead resided first at Draper in Salt Lake County, and later moved to Wellsville, Cache County. His Negroes also were taken to Wellsville, Utah and following the Emancipation remained with him as free persons of color until his death in 1884. Shortly thereafter they left the Valley.

According to Mrs. Sina Bankhead (colored) of the Mill Creek Ward, Salt Lake County, her father-in-law was one of the Negroes that John H. Bankhead brought with him to Draper. His name was Nathan Bankhead and he was married twice. The name of his first wife was Mary, and that of the second, Susan.²

There is no record of a Nathan Bankhead in the list given by Amasa M. Lyman, Jr. This may point out the

¹Beller, 129.
²Ibid., 124.
inaccuracy of these early records of the Negro slaves. A second reason for some confusion is that the Negro slaves assumed the surname of their masters. If the notation was not designated as white or colored, it would be difficult to know the difference.

The following information was obtained from Jasper N. Perkins of Salt Lake City, grandson of Reuben Perkins and nephew of Monroe Perkins; Mrs. Ester Jane Leggroan (colored) of Mill Creek, Salt Lake County, daughter of Mary Perkins, one of the Perkins slaves; Sylvester James, son of Sherman James and Jane E. Manning of Salt Lake City, pioneers in September, 1847, Captain Eldredge Company, born March 1, 1835, came to Utah with his parents. Married Mary Perkins, January 31, 1865, Salt Lake City, a daughter of Franklin and Ester Perkins, pioneers 1848, A. Perkins Company. Ester J. born February 14, 1869, married Henry Leggroan.

Reuben Perkins came to Utah, October 18, 1848, with the Andrew H. Perkins Company from North Carolina, and settled at Bountiful, Davis, County. He brought several negro slaves with him—Frank, his wife Ester, and most of their eleven children. Their oldest son, Ben, went snow blind while working on a ranch. Frank Perkins, born 1803 in North Carolina, married Ester ____, 1835, in Grundy County, Missouri, who was born, 1803; their children: Sarah, M. Peter Livingston; (Ben); Mary, M., Sylvester James; Downey, M. Sylas Sprouse; Ephraim D. Aged 21; Wesley, d. aged 8; Albert d. aged 3; Manissa and Thomas B., died infants; Sylvester, m. Martha A. J. Stevens; Charlotte, M, Charles Camble. Farmer. Died 1878, at Salt Lake City.

Monroe Perkins owned another negro slave named Ben whom he sold in Utah to Sprouse, a southerner. While Sprouse was returning to his home in the South, Ben escaped into the mountains near Denver and returned to Utah. Many

---

1Esshom, 958. (See article on James Sylvester.)
2Ibid., 1097.
descendants of the negroes once belonging to the Bankhead
and Perkins families are residing in Salt Lake County,
Utah.  

Attorney Benjamin L. Rich of Salt Lake City stated
that his grandfather, Charles C. Rich in whose honor Rich
County, Utah, was named, owned three pairs of slaves that
were later liberated in California when Rich went there in
1851. Charles C. Rich was a native of Kentucky and arrived
in the Great Salt Lake Valley October 3, 1847.  

It was customary for slaves to assume the surname of
their masters. Where a surname was not given, it was under-
stood that it was the same as that of the master.

An interesting entry in the John Brown Diary, Sat-
urday May 27, 1848 follows:  

I made a report on the Mississippi Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Persons</th>
<th>Colored Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Smith</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Bankhead</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis McKown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Crosby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (Betsy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crosby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | 37            | 34              |

1 Beller, 125.

2 Ibid.

3 Brown, 96.

4 John Brown's mother-in-law. His wife was also
named Elizabeth.
The list of Saints in the Mississippi Company of 1848 was much longer, but for purposes of this research only those pertaining to the Negro issue are listed.

According to the 1850 U. S. census there were twenty-four free persons of color in Utah, and twenty-six slaves, the latter being listed as enroute to California. ¹ This conveys the impression that none of the negroes residing in Utah were admittedly being held as slaves.

The author was unable to verify the number of colored persons in Utah as listed above, with the 1850 census. There was no way of knowing the numbers traveling through the territory to California or the deaths reported. Records in many cases were inadequate and incomplete.

In 1848 the Utah and New Mexico territories were annexed to the United States. The problem of whether this newly-acquired area should be free or slave resulted in the Compromise of 1850 whereby California was acknowledged free, and New Mexico and Utah were left open to slavery. Thus, there was no law to prohibit holding slaves in Utah at this time. The compromise did leave Utah and New Mexico territories vulnerable as a fighting ground for slave

¹United States Bureau of Census, Seventh Census of the United States (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1850), 993. (There possibly is an error in the census of 1850 if the reports of the pioneer companies are correct.)
power.¹

It is evident from the United States census of 1860 that all of the slaves did not go to California. Thirty free colored and twenty-nine slaves remained in Utah. Of the slaves, Davis County had 10 and Salt Lake County 19. Of these 29 Negro slaves, 18 were males and 11 were females.² At the time of the 1860 census, Utah was the only western state or territory having slaves.

Little or nothing is recorded as to the treatment of this small group of Negroes in Utah communities in which they lived, or the role they played in the settling of this part of the west. The type of agriculture carried on by the Mormons was not conducive to slavery, and at this time there was little interest in exploiting the mineral deposits in the area.

From 1847 until the Civil War the position taken by the Latter-day Saints relative to slavery was neutral, in a sense. They did not advocate slavery, but at the same time they did permit the holding of slaves by members of their group. Their position on slavery was set forth in the Millennial Star, official church organ of the Latter-day Saints, a few years after their arrival in Utah. It

¹Encyclopedia Americana, XXVII, 396.

stated:

We feel it to be our duty to define our position in relation to the subject of Slavery. There are several men in the valley of the Salt Lake from the Southern states, who have their slaves with them. There is no law in Utah to authorize slavery, neither any to prohibit it. If the slave is disposed to leave his master, no power exists there, either legal or moral, that will prevent him, but if the slave choose to remain with his master, none are allowed to interfere between the master and slave. All the slaves that are there appear to be perfectly contented and satisfied.1

In an article "Slavery Among the Saints" published in the **Frontier Guardian** by Orson Hyde, Editor, he wrote:

It is frequently asked, what are the views of the Latter-day Saints upon the subject of Slavery? As this subject is so frequently introduced, and clad with both civil and religious livery, it is thought the following explicit answer will at once serve the many. "When a man in the Southern States embraces our faith, and is the owner of slaves, the church says to him, if your slaves wish to remain with you, and to go with you, put them not away; but if they choose to leave you, or are not satisfied to remain with you, it is for you to sell them, or to let them go free, as your own conscience may direct you. The Church, on this point, assumes not the responsibility to direct. The laws of the land recognize slavery, we do not wish to oppose the laws of the country. If there is sin in selling a slave, let the individual who sells him bear that sin, and not the church. Wisdom and prudence dictate to us this position, and we trust that our position will hence-forth be understood. Our counsel to all our ministers in the North and in the South is, to avoid contention upon this subject, and to oppose no institution which the laws of the country authorize; but labor to bring men into the Church and kingdom of God, and then teach them to do right, and to honor their God and his creatures."

1Millennial Star, February 15, 1851, p. 63.

*Has reference to dress, garb, or outward appearance.
The attitude of the church leaders toward slavery, as above stated, remained constant during the next 15 years. The celebrated interview between the abolitionist Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, and President Brigham Young at Salt Lake City, July 13, 1859, bears this out. Mr. Greeley was taking an overland journey from New York to San Francisco in the Summer of 1859. Stopping off in Salt Lake for a short visit with the Mormons, he recorded the following:

My friend Dr. Bernhisel, late delegate in Congress, took me this afternoon, by appointment, to meet Brigham Young, President of the Mormon Church, who had expressed a willingness to receive me at two p.m. . . . President Young avowing his willingness to respond to all pertinent inquiries, the conversation proceeded substantially as follows:

H. G. What is the position of your church with respect to slavery?
B. Y. We consider it of divine institution, and not to be abolished until the curse pronounced on Ham shall have been removed from his descendants.
H. G. Are any slaves now held in this territory?
B. Y. There are.
H. G. Do your territorial laws uphold slavery?
B. Y. Those laws are printed—you can read for yourself. If slaves are brought here by those who owned them in the states, we do not favor their escape from the service of those owners.
H. G. Am I to infer that Utah, if admitted as a member of the Federal Union, will be a slave state?
B. Y. No! she will be a free state. Slavery here would prove useless and unprofitable. I regard it generally as a curse to the masters. I myself hire many laborers, and pay them fair wages; I could not afford to own them. I can do better than subject myself to an obligation to feed and clothe their families, to provide and care for them in sickness and health. Utah is not adapted to slave-labor. . . .

1Neff, 618.
From all indications, the Church leaders remained constant in their attitude toward the Negro. In a message to the territorial legislature dated January 6, 1852, Brigham Young reviewed at length the item of slavery being obnoxious to humanity, yet the Negro should serve the seed of Abraham and not be a ruler nor be able to vote for men to rule over him. "My own feelings," he said, "are that no property can or should be recognized as existing in slaves, either Indian or African."¹

In a discourse delivered in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, February 18, 1855, Brigham Young said:

Formerly the rumor was that "we were going to tamper with the slaves," when we had never thought of such a thing. The seed of Ham which is the seed of Cain descending through Ham, will, according to the curse put upon him, serve his brethren, and be a "servant of servants" to his fellow-creatures, until God removes the curse; and no power can hinder it. These are my views upon slavery. I will here say a little more upon this point. The conduct of the whites toward the slaves will in many cases, send both slave and master to hell. This statement comprises much in a few words. The blacks should be used like servants, and not like brutes, but they must serve. It is their privilege to live so as to enjoy many of the blessings which attend obedience to the first principles of the Gospel though they are not entitled to the Priesthood.²

Again in a talk given October 6, 1863, in the Bowery, Brigham Young stated:

Ham will continue to be the servant of servants,

¹Journal History . . ., January 24, 1930.
²Journal of Discourses, II, 185.
as the Lord has decreed, until the curse is removed.
Will the present struggle free the slave? No! but
they are now wasting away the black race by thousands.
Many of the blacks are treated worse than we treat our
dumb brutes; and men will be called to judgment for
the way they have treated the negro, and they will re-
ceive the condemnation of a guilty conscience, by the
just Judge whose attributes are justice and truth.
Treat the slaves kindly and let them live, for Ham
must be the servant of servants until the curse is re-
moved. Can you destroy the decrees of the Almighty?
You cannot. Yet our Christian brethren think that
they are going to overthrow the sentence of the Al-
mighty upon the seed of Ham. ¹

Brigham Young recognized that the abolitionists of
the North and the slave-holders of the South each had a
set of primary interests which he felt only indirectly con-
cerned the Mormons of the Utah territory. In the sermon
in which he stated his position the following passage is
found:

The rank, rabid abolitionists, whom I call Black-
hearted Republicans, have set the whole national fabric
on fire. Do you know this, Democrats? They have
kindled the fire that is raging now from the North to
the South and from the South to the North. I am not
an abolitionist, neither am I a pro-slavery man; I
hate some of their principles and especially some of
their conduct as I do the gates of hell. The South-
erners make [sic] the Negroes, and the Northerners
worship them; this is all the difference between
slaveholders and abolitionists. I would like the
President of the United States and all the world to
hear this.²

There is some evidence to show that the leaders of
the Utah Territory were humane in their consideration for

¹Journal of Discourses, X, 250.
²Christensen, 300.
the lot of the Negro people. In An Act in Relation to
Service, passed by the First Annual and Special Sessions
of the Legislative Assembly on the 22nd day of September,
1851, it states:

Sec. 4. That if any master or mistress shall have sexual
or carnal intercourse with his or her servant or ser-
vants of the African race, he or she shall forfeit all
claim to said servant or servants to the commonwealth;
and if any white person shall be guilty of sexual inter-
course with any of the African race, they shall be sub-
ject, on conviction thereof to a fine of not exceeding
one thousand dollars, nor less than five hundred, to
the use of the Territory, and imprisonment, not exceed-
ing three years.

Sec. 5. It shall be the duty of masters or mistresses,
to provide for his, her, or their servants comfortable
habitations, clothing, bedding, sufficient food, and
recreation. And it shall be the duty of the servant
in return therefore, to labor faithfully all reason-
able hours, and do such service with fidelity as may
be required by his, or her master or mistress.

Sec. 6. It shall be the duty of the master to correct
and punish his servant in a reasonable manner when it
may be necessary, being guided by prudence and human-
ity; and if he shall be guilty of cruelty or abuse, or
neglect to feed, clothe, or shelter his servants in a
proper manner, the Probate Court may declare the con-
tract between master and servant or servants void,
according to the provisions of the fourth section of
this act.¹

John Taylor and N. H. Felt, while on their way to
New York to establish a paper for the purpose of explain-
ing the doctrines of the Latter-day Saint Church and de-
fending the Saints in Utah, expressed themselves on con-
ditions of slavery in the Utah territory. The following

¹Utah Territory Legislature, An Act in Relation to
Service, First Assembly, September 22, 1851.
was published by a Chicago paper:

As respects slavery in the territory, we were assured there was but little of it there, yet it is there. Some slaves had been liberated by their owners since they were taken to Utah; others still remain slaves. But the most of those who take slaves there pass over with them in a little while to San Bernardino, a Mormon settlement in California, some seven hundred or eight hundred miles from Salt Lake City. How many slaves are now held there they could not say, but the number relatively was by no means small. A single person had taken between forty or fifty, and many had gone in with smaller numbers.¹

There could have been a misrepresentation of the facts, for there is little indication that large numbers of slaves were taken to Utah.

There is some indication that during the period from 1850 until the Emancipation Proclamation, trading in Negro slaves was carried on to some extent in the Utah Territory. The following quotation, a news item from the Salt Lake Tribune, documents this fact:

Although the slave trade never was legal in Utah, the fact that dealing in human bondage took place in the past has been discovered in time-worn documents in the county recorder's office. An employee of a Salt Lake Abstract firm, while searching the records for real estate information, came across the copy of a bill of sale for a Negro boy named Dan in a book containing transactions for the year 1859. The slave was sold by Thomas S. Williams of Great Salt Lake City to William H. Hooper, same address, for $800.

The writer of the above article was obviously misinformed as to the legality of the slave trade. In addition

¹Millennial Star, January 25, 1855, p. 63.
²Salt Lake Tribune, May 31, 1939, p. 22.
to showing the existence of trading in slaves, this item is significant inasmuch as it indicates the general lack of knowledge by the present citizens of the area that slavery ever existed in the Utah Territory.

The following slave bill was found among the relics of an old Negro who is believed to be one of those sold on the block at this public sale, September 29, 1846, in Pike County, Missouri:

To Whom it may concern:

The undersigned will sell at public outcry on the premises where old Coon creek crosses Mission Ridge, the following chattels.
To wit:
Six yoke of oxen and chains; three bedsteads with beds; three nigger wenches; four nigger bucks; three nigger boys; four nigger girls; two prairrie plows; one barrel of pickled cabbage, one lot of nigger noses; one hogshead of tobacco; one spinning wheel; one loom; 23 fox hounds, all well trained; a lot of coon, mink and skunk hides; a lot of other articles.
Terms of sale will be made on day of sale. Am going to California.

(signed) John Montgomery

Jim Lone, Crier.
Free head cheese, apples and hard cider for all.
Come and have a good time. 1

There is evidence to indicate that the Latter-day Saint concept of Negro slavery was hardly the same as that accepted by many people in the United States. It is rightly so, according to this view, that the Negro is by virtue of his birth a "servant of servants" and therefore it was

---

1E. Cecil McGavin, Nauvoo the Beautiful (Salt Lake City: Stevens and Wallis, 1946), 66.
expected of him to fulfill this decree. Still he was not to be mistreated or fully controlled as in total slavery.

Joseph Smith recognized servitude for the Negro, but not abject or total slavery. Perhaps that is why he could say, "An hour of virtuous liberty on earth is worth a whole eternity of bondage," and have reference to the Negro. Though the Negro is to live in the capacity of servitude to others, he need not be in slavery. Therefore, to use the Negro in the capacities of serving others, but with the freedom to choose when and where he works and for whom, is, it seems, what Joseph Smith proclaimed and desired. He was not by this view classed as the brute animal, to be bartered, traded or sold, but a person with human feelings, taking pride in a job well-done, with hope and faith in his future.

With the conclusion of the Civil War came the Emancipation of the Negro. Likewise, the Negros in Utah were given their freedom too. Many left the families to whom they had been in bondage, while others remained living out their lives as hired hands. Some went to California and became free prior to the Emancipation while others went there after 1865 following their freedom from their Utah masters. Thus ended Negro slavery in Utah while Indian adoption continued on for a number of years.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To many of the early Latter-day Saints, enslavement of Negroes was a familiar and accepted thing. On the other hand, slave trade among the Indians was entirely foreign. There are several reasons for accepting slavery of the Negroes while abhorring the slave traffic among the Indians and legislating against it. The majority of the Latter-day Saint people in the Utah Territory were not involved with the Negro, but almost every family lived in close proximity and fear of the Indians. Their attitude toward Indian slavery was their concern with the treatment accorded the Indian by his captors. Also, there is the theological aspect of the question. The Latter-day Saints, as a deeply religious people, accepted the Biblical explanation of the Negro being the "servant of servants." At the same time they looked upon the Indians as being of the same racial strain as themselves.

This Latter-day-Saint-accepted relationship between the Indians and themselves is based on the belief that the American Indians, who are known as "Lamanites," are descendants of Israel (Jacob) as are the Mormons. Stated briefly,
according to the Book of Mormon a group known as "Nephites" migrated to the New World about 600 B.C. These were God's chosen children, described as a "white and delightsome" people, who developed a complex culture in Mexico and Central America. Because of jealousy, idleness and sin, they separated into two groups—namely, Nephites and Lamanites. A final destructive war between these groups exterminated the Nephites. Because of their evil ways and the fact that they had forgotten God, the Lamanites were cursed with a darkened skin. Thus, the Latter-day Saints hold that the American Indian and themselves are from the same racial strain. There has been considerable interest on the part of Church members for the welfare of the Indians, both for his physical and spiritual wellbeing. Likewise, there has been extensive missionary work done among many Indian tribes, especially in the United States.

In contrast to the proselyting among the Indians, the Latter-day Saints have never, as a part of missionary activity, solicited members from any group they regard as having Negroid ancestry. One of the first pronouncements on the position of the Negro was by the founder of "Mormon-ism," Joseph Smith, shortly after the organization of the Church. He referred to the curse of Ham to indicate the role of the Negro. There is some indication that this concept was held by many in the United States some thirty years
before the Civil War. This explanation has had wide acceptance among the members of the Latter-day Saint Church. This was one of the reasons given by Brigham Young to Horace Greeley. Joseph Smith took a pro-slavery stand in 1836 when he said, "We have no right to interfere with slaves, contrary to the mind and will of their masters."¹

About this time another theological explanation was expressed which may also be taken as an elaboration of the curse of Ham. According to some of the prophets and leaders of the Latter-day Saint Church, the Negro was the recipient of a punishment or curse from God which extends back to Cain. Why the descendents of Cain were chosen to bear a black skin is not completely explained in Church doctrine. Some leaders have suggested that in the pre-existent spirit world where all men lived as spirits or souls before coming to the earth to take upon themselves a fleshly body, there were some spirits that were not wholly valiant in the cause of God. During the war in Heaven (Rev. 12:4, 7) there was a division of the sons and daughters of God, with one-third cast out as followers of Lucifer. The majority remaining were valiant toward the accepted plan, while part of the hosts were not valiant in defense of the plan. Because of their limited participation in the war in Heaven, they were given bodies on earth bearing the curse of a dark or black

¹_Messenger and Advocate_, April, 1836, p. 290.
The doctrine of the Church, both past and present, maintains that while a Negro may be a member and partake of the sacrament (or communion), he may not hold the priesthood in mortal life. (The priesthood in the Latter-day Saint Church is a position of power and authority conferred upon adult males of good standing. Females are excluded, but attain the blessings of the priesthood through ecclesiastical marriage.)

Whatever the reason, the Negro with his black skin and subjugation by the other races of the world had entered this life burdened with problems. He is to be the object of pity, rather than censure; however, he is subject to salvation and the blessings of God. Joseph Smith expressed it this way:

They came into the world slaves, mentally and physically. Change their situation with the whites, and they could be like them. They have souls and are subjects of salvation. Go into Cincinnati or any city, and find an educated Negro, who rides in his carriage, and you will see a man who has risen by the power of his own mind to his exalted state of respectability. The slaves in Washington are more refined than many in high places, and the black boys will take the shine off many of those they brush and wait on.²

America has been a blessing to the Negroes. The following excerpts bear this out:

Some years ago a scheme was set on foot to colonize

---
¹Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, Inc., 1958), 476-77.
²McGavin, 64.
the colored people of this country in Africa. The idea was that they should be returned to the land of their origin; that Africa was the proper place for the African race. This was thought to be the solution of the Negro problem. The enfranchisement of the colored men, so soon after their freedom from slavery, was seen to be a failure in a social and political sense, whatever it may have been as a party movement. And the colonization of the emancipated blacks in Africa was thought to be the best means of removing the troubles arising from the political blunder.

That, however, was not the first movement in this direction. As long ago as 1817 an American Colonization Society was organized in Washington, for the purpose of relieving as many negroes as possible from the sorrows of slavery. A ship load of colored people was sent away in 1820, and an African colony founded called Liberia. About a thousand negroes were gathered there in seven years.

After the war, as we have shown a renewed effort was made to remove the colored folks to Africa and a few were induced to emigrate. But the colony has not prospered. After seventy years the present American negro population of Liberia is said to be only about twenty thousand. America seems good enough for the darkies and they do not rush for the land of their ancestors.¹

And:

Horace Greeley Griffin, a young colored gentleman of Texas, holds that the slavery traffic of olden days in this country was, after all, a blessing in disguise. He has been in West Africa, to teach the natives to grow cotton for the German settlers. He did not succeed very well. He found that the natives would not work. Money did not tempt them. Their needs were few, and supplied with but little trouble from the forests, fields, and streams. In contrasting their condition with that of the American negro, Mr. Griffin thinks himself justified in pronouncing slavery a blessing in disguise.²

In conclusion, the first Negro slaves came to the

¹Journal History . . ., December 15, 1891.
Utah Territory in 1847 while it was still Mexican domain and not subject to the laws of the United States. Most of the written material indicates that the pioneer Negroes were contented servants. The slaves who were held in Utah were given their freedom after the Civil War, but many remained and settled in and around Salt Lake City. Many were members of the Latter-day Saint Church, and a number of their descendants are still living in that area. There were approximately forty Negro Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City in 1948, about one-third active members of the Church.  

Though the Negro by virtue of his birth was a "servant of servants" and must fulfill the curse placed upon him, the Latter-day Saint leaders passed laws to protect his chastity as well as his physical being. This was to protect him from white domination of control of his own body. Generally speaking, he was treated fairly by the white Latter-day Saint people, for they believe that all human beings born into this world are spirit sons and daughters of God. Each must answer for his actions in life and be tested by his own experiences. Finally, because of the peculiar position of the Latter-day Saint Church with no professional or paid ministry but with priesthood

---

authority, the Negro is not permitted to officiate in this "lay" organization. However, he is entitled to similar activities in the Latter-day Saint Church that are afforded him as a lay member of any Christian denomination. He is denied nothing as an active member of the Latter-day Saint Church that membership in other churches would allow him.

Much of the work of this thesis has been concerned with Indian slavery, and the concern of the Latter-day Saints for the Indian has been pointed out repeatedly. Brigham Young was the foremost exponent of the Indian policy due to his position as President of the Latter-day Saint Church, Governor of the Territory, and Superintendent of Indian Affairs. He expressed the Indian policy in his message to the Utah Legislature on December 11, 1854, when he said:

I have uniformly pursued a friendly course toward them (Indians), feeling convinced that independent of the question of exercising humanity toward so degraded and ignorant a race of people, it was manifestly more economical and less expensive, to feed and clothe than to fight them. . . . In many of the Southern settlements, already the Indians have become useful in labor and business.\(^1\)

The policy was in effect while the Pioneers were crossing the plains, partly because other groups would follow the same routes and this would make for their safety, and partly because of the feeling of the moral responsibility

\(^1\)The Deseret News, December 14, 1854.
which they had toward the Indian by virtue of the Book of Mormon. Apart from the precepts of the Book of Mormon, they were practical enough to know that they were isolated and far from any assistance. It was sound policy to maintain a friendly or neutral association with the Indians. When the natives gathered around to watch the newcomers "throw the dirt," as they called plowing, and shape the hewn logs into houses, they were treated with kindness and tolerance.  

The most important reason for the Indian policy of the Church members is found in the precepts of the Book of Mormon. On the title page is an abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi and of the Lamanites—Written to the Lamanites, who are a remnant of the house of Israel; and also to Jew and Gentile... to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel what great things the Lord hath done for their father; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord, that they are not cast off forever...  

Melvin J. Ballard, in discussing this topic, pointed out that the original purpose for writing the Book of Mormon has not yet come to pass:

The Book of Mormon has not yet fulfilled the great purpose for which it was originally written. Incidentally, of course, it has brought a knowledge of the dealings of God with that ancient branch of the House of Israel on this American continent to the Church and

---

1Brooks, 3.
to the world but the Church is merely a custodian of this sacred book to carry it to its real mission . . .

In the third section of the book of Doctrine and Covenants the Lord said to the Prophet Joseph Smith that the chief purpose for which the Book of Mormon was written was that the testimony shall go to the knowledge of the Lamanites and other branches of the House of Israel concerning their forefathers and for this very purpose are these plates preserved which contain these records, that the promises of the Lord might be fulfilled which He made to His people, and that the Lamanites might come to the knowledge of their fathers and that they might know the promises of the Lord and that they may believe the Gospel and rely upon the merits of Jesus Christ and be glorified through faith in His name.1

The Book of Mormon states that the Lamanites were cursed because of rebellion and disbelief in Christ and His teachings.2 Mormon described the condition of the Lamanites who would remain following the destruction of the Nephite people: "For this people shall be scattered, and shall become a dark, a filthy, and a loathsome people, beyond the description of that which ever hath been amongst us, yea, even that which hath been among the Lamanites, and this because of their unbelief and idolatry."3

The promise was given that the Lamanites would not be utterly destroyed. (II Nephi 3:3.)

The Lord will be merciful unto them and prolong their existence in the land. (Alma 9:16.)

---

2Book of Mormon, II Nephi Chapter 5: Verses 20, 21.
3Book of Mormon, Mormon Chapter 5: Verses 15, 16.
The histories of the Indians relate the scattering and mistreatment of the aborigines upon this continent. The Indians were considered by many to be no more than savages. They were shot and killed much like animals would be destroyed.

When the Book of Mormon was published it was the prevailing opinion that the Indians were a perishing race that would become extinct. Book of Mormon prophecy is to the contrary. History has thus far proven this position to be right. The Indian population is increasing and the condition under which the Indian lives is improving. It seems evident that the Indian is to remain in the Americas.

**INDIAN POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>846,000 (estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>294,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>248,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>237,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>265,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>244,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>332,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>333,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>343,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>523,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nephi foresaw that the Lamanites would come to know that they are of the House of Israel and to a knowledge of the Gospel:

---

And at that day shall the remnant of our seed know that they are of the house of Israel, and that they are the covenant people of the Lord; and then shall they know and come to the knowledge of their forefathers, and also to the knowledge of the gospel of their Redeemer. . . and the very points of his doctrine, that they may know how to come unto him and be saved.¹

Latter-day Saint Church leaders have had an active interest in the Indians from the beginning. How could it be otherwise? The Book of Mormon is said to be their history. A recognition of the responsibility of the Church to take the gospel to the Lamanites was inevitable.

Much was said by Brigham Young and others about the Indians becoming white and delightsome. The term was borrowed from Nephi, an ancient Book of Mormon prophet:

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 delightsome people.²

The Indians who are becoming enlightened through the gospel and are taking advantage of the opportunities for advancement offered them are described as becoming "white and delightsome." Varying shades of darkness in skin coloration are observable between many of the Indian parents and their children. Spencer W. Kimball says:

The work is unfolding, and blinded eyes begin to see, and scattered people begin to gather. I saw a

¹Book of Mormon, I Nephi, Chapter 15, Verse 14.
²II Nephi 30:6.
striking contrast in the progress of the Indian people today as against that of only fifteen years ago. Truly the scales of darkness are falling from their eyes, and they are fast becoming a white and delightsome people...

The day of the Lamanites is nigh. For years they have been growing delightful, and they are now becoming white and delightsome, as they were promised. The children in the home placement program in Utah are often lighter than their brothers and sisters in the hogans on the reservation.

At one meeting a father and mother and their sixteen year-old daughter were present, the little member girl--sixteen--sitting between the dark father and mother, and it was evident she was several shades lighter than her parents--on the same reservation, in the same hogan, subject to the same sun and wind and weather. There was the doctor in a Utah city who for two years had had an Indian boy in his home who stated that he was some shades lighter than the younger brother just coming into the program from the reservation. These young members of the Church are changing to whiteness and to delightsomeness.1

The Indian race is becoming "lightened" through intermarriage with the white race. There are a number of examples of prominent citizens of the United States who have close ancestral relationship to the Indians. The widow of the late President Woodrow Wilson, descended in line from Pocahontas, and a recent vice-president of the United States, Charles Curtis, whose grandmother was a full-blooded Indian of the Kaw tribe, are well known examples.2 Two of our U. S. senators boast of Indian blood in their veins. The Hon. Charles Curtis of Kansas... is of the

---

1Conference Reports (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1960), 32, 34.

Sioux tribe and was born in a "tepee." Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma is a Cherokee.¹

Thus, we conclude that Negro slavery was accepted by the Latter-day Saint people, while Indian slavery as practiced by Mexican slavers was forbidden.

¹*Improvement Era*, XXVII, 420-21.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Latter-day Saint Scriptures


The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1941.

Books


Conference Reports. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, October, 1960.


Esshom, Frank. *Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah.* Salt Lake City: Publisher and date not known.


Flake, O. D. *Life of William J. Flake.* Publisher and date not known. In Special Collections Library, Brigham Young University.


Jones, Daniel W. *Forty Years Among the Indians.* Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor, 1890.


Journal of Discourses. 26 Vols. Salt Lake City: The Deseret News Press, 1852. (Collection of talks given by Brigham Young, the Apostles, and others.)


Whitney, Orson F. History of Utah. 4 Vols. Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, Publisher, 1893.


Public Documents


Articles and Periodicals


Improvement Era. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Messenger and Advocate. April, 1836.


The Deseret News. Salt Lake City, 1852-1854.


Unpublished Materials

Beeler, Mary. Brigham Young's Letter to Jacob Hamblin. Mesa, Arizona.

Bleak, James G. Journal History of Dixie. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. (Typed Copy)


Daines, W. H. Journal of the Salmon River Mission. L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah. (Handwritten)

Diary of L. John Nuttal. Brigham Young University Library, Provo, Utah.

Harmony Ward Historical Record. In L. D. S. Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah. (Under date 1854)

History of Brigham Young. In the L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah. (Handwritten)

Inventory of the County Archives of Sanpete County (In possession of Frank Anderson, Manti, Utah).

Journal of Jacob Hamblin. MS in L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Journal of Milton D. Hammond. MS in L. D. S. Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830 to Present. In Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Journal of Hosea Stout. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. (Typed Copy)


Young, Brigham. Letter Book No. 3. L. D. S. Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to recognize the position of slavery as it pertained especially to the Negro in the Territory of Utah from 1847 to 1865, and the position of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints toward Indian slavery found in those tribes living within the boundary of the Utah Territory. Negro slavery was accepted and tolerated by the Latter-day Saints even though there were but few Negroes in the Territory. These were brought in by a few southern Saints.

As the Mormons moved into the Salt Lake Valley, they immediately became involved with Indian slavery—a far-reaching and sinister affair practiced not only by local Indian tribes, but also by the Mexican slave traders of the Territory of New Mexico. It became necessary for the Saints to orient their concepts of slavery toward the Negro as well as the Indian.

To the Latter-day Saints who had run into difficulty in Missouri mainly through mis-interpretation of their position concerning slavery, acceptance of slavery of the Negro was the status quo which they did not care to disturb, while slavery among the Indians was entirely unknown.

It may be difficult to understand how a people could accept the status quo of slavery for the Negro race and
condemn it for the Indian.

Indian slavery was far more deep-seated and widespread in the Utah Territory than that of the Negro. By 1847, Indian slave trade was a lucrative and flourishing business. Pedro Leon and others had permission from the Indian Agent of the Territory of New Mexico to come into the Utah Territory for the purpose of acquiring Indian women and children from the weak tribes of the territory to sell in California. Chief Walker of the Ute Tribe was notorious in preying upon the weaker Indian tribes and supplying women and children to the New Mexico slavers.

Brigham Young saw to it that laws were passed prohibiting Indian slave traffic but permitting Mormon families to adopt Indian children. Apparently this stemmed from the Latter-day Saint belief in the Book of Mormon, which considers the Indian people descendants of Israel (Jacob) who through sin and disobedience had a curse of a dark skin pronounced upon them. Nevertheless, the promise was made that the "Lamanites" after many years of living in ignorance, being scattered and partly destroyed, would eventually become a "white and delightsome" people. Thus, the Latter-day Saints were desirous to help, befriend, and teach this benighted race.

Also, as early as September of 1851, the Utah Legislature passed laws protecting the Negro slave from abuse
and mis-treatment by his master, and providing that if mis-treatment occurred the slave was entitled to his freedom.

In conclusion, it was found that to many of the early Mormons, it was expedient to accept Negro slavery as it existed in practice while on the other hand slave trade among the Indians was new and abhorrent. The Utah Territory was one of the few places in the United States where both Negro and Indian slavery were practiced simultaneously.