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INTRODUCTION

Many people like newspapers, but few preserve them; yet the most interesting reading imaginable is a pile of old newspapers. It brings up the very age, with all its bustle and everyday affairs, and marks its genius and its spirit more than the most labored description of the historian.

Valley Tan, October 5, 1859

It is not uncommon, when reading any history of Utah or the Mormons, to see a statement such as, "It [the Valley Tan] was a bitterly anti-Mormon publication which did not circulate far from Camp Floyd." In fact, it is even more common for such histories to be silent on the subject. The Valley Tan's rival, the Mountaineer, has received even less prominence in most of these accounts and most histories never mention its existence. Because of the historian's lack of attention, there exists a mistaken conception of at least two

of the earliest newspapers known in Utah, the Valley Tan and the Mountaineer, neither of which ran more than two years. However, their very existence and relative success during an important, yet misunderstood, time in Utah history warrant this research. Such a work has not been adequately performed. This may be because the Deseret News, the survivor of early Utah newspapers, but certainly not the best indicator of the times, has gained most of the historian's attention. By an in-depth study of these two newspapers, the aftermath of the Utah War and the struggle of the Mormons in the face of bitter enemies becomes easier to understand and enjoy.

The secondary literature on the Valley Tan consists only of a thesis written by James Greenwell for the University of Utah in 1963. While one-third of his short thesis discussed the Valley Tan, his focus was more on the later Union Vedette newspaper. There is no secondary material of any substance on the Mountaineer, which like the Valley Tan is mentioned only briefly in texts and

2Reading exclusively through the Deseret News of this time period, the reader does not get the same sense of the problems and struggles of the people of Utah that they would reading the independent writings of the Valley Tan and Mountaineer.

related monographs. However, Cecil Alter has given both newspapers some consideration in his book on early Utah newspapers, as has Chad Flake in a paper delivered at the Utah Newspaper Conference.

The major primary sources to be used are the newspapers themselves. They both ran over a relatively short period of time and are filled with interesting insight and discussion into the issues facing the Territory of Utah as a result of the occupation of federal troops and the appointment of federal officers. The thesis will basically cover the time period between the Summer of 1858 when Kirk Anderson arrived in Utah to the Summer of 1861 when the Mountaineer finally disappeared. Comparing coverage of specific issues and responses to controversial issues by each newspaper will be the primary focus.

Many questions were asked of these papers: What were the reasons behind the formation of these organs? Why did the Valley Tan take up so strongly against the Mormons? Was there any truth to their terrible accusations? How did the Mountaineer respond to the accusations of murder, treason, and immorality? Did the newspapers see the same events differently? Did each paper cover the same events, or were some ignored? Did the Valley

---


5Robert P. Holley, Utah Newspapers--"Traces of Her Past," Papers Presented at the Utah Newspaper Conference, University of Utah (Salt Lake City: Marriott Library, 1984).
Tan change any as a result of the Mountaineer’s existence? And finally, was the Mountaineer successful in its objective to combat the “lies” of their competition? Each of these questions were asked of the sources.

Besides the newspapers themselves, journals, diaries, letters, speeches, and other sources were consulted to know what others are saying and how they are reacting to the newspapers. Particular emphasis was given to the reaction of the Mormon Church leaders, notably Brigham Young and other reactions as covered in the Journal History of the Church. All of these sources are listed in the bibliography provided.

This thesis fits in historiographically as the first history of the Valley Tan and Mountaineer newspapers and of the battle between them. Besides merely providing a much needed history of the conflict between these organs, this paper contributes insight to a much misunderstood time in Utah history: the time between the Utah War and the Civil War. This time is mostly neglected by historians because of its “mutual misunderstanding and misinformation,” between the Mormons and the rest of the nation and many do not wish to report on such difficult times. This was a time of reshaping values and identity in the Mormon culture and for Utah. Even though their time was short, the presence of the troops and of their newspaper must have had some effect on the outcome of those changing values and new identity.

In a larger context, this paper explores issues of Mormon/Anti-Mormon conflict, thus will be of value to those wishing a further study of this issue that permeates all of Mormon history and cannot be ignored. The Valley Tan's coming as an "opposition" paper to the Mormons' Deseret News was important to the Gentiles, as it gave them a voice in the Territory. However, sometimes this voice got out of hand. The Mountaineer attempted to serve as a check to the hypercritical attacks of its rival, while also challenging the writings of other newspapers throughout the country. The Mountaineer was successful in its quest to challenge the many accusations of the Valley Tan and others, and in defending the truth.
CHAPTER TWO

KIRK ANDERSON'S VALLEY TAN

In 1847, when Brigham Young entered the Valley of the Great Salt Lake, he had prophetic visions of his people finally finding a home, away from direct persecution, where they could begin to set up their "Zion." The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was only seventeen years old and its members had already been driven from their homes countless times, lost property and possessions, and had their beloved prophet and President, Joseph Smith, murdered by an angry mob. Brigham Young, as successor to Joseph Smith, had told the saints that if they had ten years to build in Utah that no one would be able to drive them out.

The Saint's dream of isolation and peace, which had been slowly deteriorating since the gold rush of 1849, came to a screeching halt. Ironically, during a celebration marking the ten year anniversary of their arrival in the

7According to Mormon doctrine, Zion was a place appointed by God and set apart as a gathering place for his people. There, God's chosen people were to set up the perfect society where all would be of "one heart and one mind," and where they would be safe from their enemies to prepare for the second coming of Christ.[Daniel H. Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1992), s. v. "Zion," Vol 4, 1625.]
valley, Brigham Young learned that President James Buchanan had sent an
army to accompany Alfred Cumming, the newly appointed governor of Utah
Territory, to replace Brigham Young, who was suspected of treason and
rebellion against the United States Government. Although Young was
disappointed by these actions, he allowed Cumming to peaceably take his
appointed position as Governor of Utah Territory. Along with Governor
Cumming, many other Gentiles, as the non-Mormons were called by the Latter-
day Saints, entered the territory as federally appointed officers or as
merchants and contractors to provide their services to the profit-giving army.
It seemed as though after a short ten years that the termination of Brigham
Young's vision was inevitable.

Even more disconcerting was the decision of John Floyd, the Secretary of
War, that the accompanying army should remain in Utah to protect the citizens
from the Indians in their settlements and on the overland routes, and to ensure
a peaceful transfer of power within the territory. It was determined that the
over 3,000 man army, commanded by General Albert Sidney Johnston, would

8The President was acting partially upon the false accusations of Judge
William W. Drummond and other federally appointed officials who were bitter
toward the Mormons.

9This decision came only after widespread defensive actions by Young
and through extensive negotiations led by Senator Thomas L. Kane, a long time
friend to the Mormons. [Norman F. Furniss, The Mormon Conflict (New Haven,
CT: Yale University Press, 1960).]
Figure 1. Alfred Cumming, Governor of Utah Territory.

[Frank Esshom, Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah (Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1966) 681].
march through Salt Lake City and settle in Cedar Valley, near present-day Fairfield, at a place they called Camp Floyd (appropriately named in honor of the Secretary of War, an avowed Mormon-hater).\textsuperscript{10} This location put the army at an equal distance of thirty miles from each of the major settlements in the area, Salt Lake City and Provo. The Utah War, as this was called, was rather uneventful in terms of physical combat. The real battle began with the struggle for power and influence within the territory. Eventually, the Gentiles would leave the territory, but there were really no winners in this battle. Young's dream of isolation and peace for the Mormons was over.

Part of the Mormons' quest for autonomy and control in their settlements had historically been to establish an organ from which the Church leaders could present news, messages, and information to its members. In Utah that organ became the \textit{Deseret News}. Established by the Mormon Church in 1850 and first edited by Willard Richards of the Church's First Presidency, the \textit{Deseret News} was the only newspaper in the Territory until late in 1858 and because of its religious purpose and strong Mormon influence, it would have been very biased and one-sided to the Gentiles coming from the East. \textit{Deseret News} historian, Monte McLaws, explained that the editors of the Mormon newspaper were more interested in religion than journalism and were either in the Church hierarchy or very close to it; thus, the paper was never immune

\footnote{\textsuperscript{10}Thomas G. Alexander, \textit{Utah, the Right Place}, (Salt Lake City:), 128.}
Figure 2. Utah Territory, 1858. [Map drawn by author]
from suppression and editing by Church leaders and in order to protect and perpetuate the Church, the whole truth was not always printed.\textsuperscript{11}

The motto of the \textit{Deseret News} was "Truth and Liberty," and its stated purpose was "to record . . . every thing that may fall under our observation, which may tend to promote the best interest, welfare, pleasure, and amusement of our fellow citizens."\textsuperscript{12} While the Mormons had been accustomed to opposition literature and journalism from their Ohio, Missouri and Illinois periods, prior to 1858 they had been journalistically unopposed in Utah. But, because of the events of the Utah War and the settlement of troops, the bitterness between the Mormons and the government-appointed army and federal officers continued to swell. Each held the other responsible for the growing crime and violence in the territory. The Gentiles sought for a means of publicly destroying the \textit{Deseret News} that they called the "scourge of the territory"\textsuperscript{13} and of rallying support for their cause. This means finally came in the form of an opposition newspaper, the \textit{Valley Tan}.

On September 7, 1858, in the midst of the growing turmoil between the Mormons and the soldiers, the \textit{Valley Tan}'s future editor, Kirk Anderson, arrived


\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Deseret News}, Salt Lake City, June 15, 1850.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Valley Tan}, August 27, 1858.
in Salt Lake City from Missouri. He was a successful attorney who had previously written for the Missouri Republican published in St. Louis. It had been speculated by Brigham Young and other Church leaders that he was sent by President James Buchanan to stir up controversy in Utah and to harass the Mormons. Through the words of one soldier, it can also be inferred that Anderson was sent by the Missouri press as a “permanent” correspondent to cover the Utah War and its aftermath.

The Missouri Republican had a correspondent in Utah as early as 1855, called Voyaguer. He reported mostly on the growing problem of crickets in Utah. In a later issue, Voyaguer took a pro-Mormon position by reporting

14 Very little is known of Anderson’s early background and training. He was nominated for city attorney of St. Louis by the Whig Party and elected by a large majority in 1850. In 1854, Anderson was listed by the St. Louis City Directory as the local editor of the Missouri Republican. While in St. Louis, he took part in many railroad and river conventions to urge better transportation. In August, 1858, he left St. Louis to start a newspaper in Utah Territory. [Eugene T. Wells, "Kirk Anderson's Trip to Utah," Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 18 (October 1961): 3-19.]

15 Andrew Jensen, et al, eds., Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: April 6, 1830-December 31, 1972 (Salt Lake City: Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, textfiche), September 7, 1858.

16 Harold D. Langley, ed., To Utah with the Dragoons and Glimpses of Life in Arizona and California (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1974), 106-133.

17 Missouri Republican, August 25, 1855.
that he could not understand why federal troops were going to be sent to Utah because the settlers could defend themselves against the Indians and would be willing to support a newly appointed governor without force.\textsuperscript{18} This correspondent relationship with Utah would explain Anderson’s swiftness in the setting up of a newspaper.

According to the \textit{Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints},\textsuperscript{19} Anderson also became involved in the Utah Territorial government. He had been recommended by John Hartnett to be a sub-agent for the Department of Interior to replace Columbus L. Craig, but that did not seem to work out. Instead, he was appointed as a Federal auditor for Utah, where he was once signed a requisition making Thomas B. Irvin a Notary Public and was also involved at least once in testifying in defense of the Mormons that they had not been tampering with and destroying territorial court and government records.\textsuperscript{20} He also practiced law in Salt Lake City and was listed as the defense attorney for at least one important criminal case.\textsuperscript{21} Little else

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., April 27, 1856.

\textsuperscript{19}The \textit{Journal History}, as it will be called from here on, is a daily compilation by the Church’s historian of events and happenings related to the History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Journal History}, October 27, 1858.

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., November 26, 1858.
is known of Anderson, but because of his newspaper ventures, he apparently became known as the "homeliest man in the Territory."22

Owing to the swiftness with which the first edition of the Valley Tan was published Anderson must have quickly begun to organize all the resources he could find to set up his shop. Kirk Anderson found his office space at Theodore Johnson's building, just South of the Historian's office on First South Street, between Main and State Streets in the heart of Salt Lake City. Many of the printing supplies, paper, and skilled printers he acquired came from the office of the Mormon Deseret News.23 The first edition of Kirk Anderson's Valley Tan was published and distributed on November 6, 1858, mainly among the troops at Camp Floyd. It was circulated at the relatively high price of eight dollars per annum, or twenty-five cents per single copy, because, as Anderson explained, his costs were higher out on the frontier. The paper contained four pages per issue with five columns per page, making the Valley Tan a little larger than its rival, the Deseret News. One thousand copies were printed and circulated in the original edition.24

22Scipio Africanus Kenner, Utah As It Is (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1904), 157.

23Journal History, November 6, 1859.

24Kirk Anderson's Valley Tan, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 6, 1858.
Figure 3. Kirk Anderson’s Valley Tan newspaper, November 6, 1858.  
[Photo courtesy of Harold B. Lee Library, Special Collections, Brigham Young University].
The soldiers at Camp Floyd surely took note of its appearance and welcomed its beginning. On November 8, 1858, John Phelps, an officer at Camp Floyd, proudly recorded in his journal, “The first copy of the Gentile newspaper has made its appearance. It is called ‘Valley Tan.’” In appearance, the Valley Tan was much like many of the other weekly frontier newspapers of the period. It contained local as well as national and world news. Local artists were featured with their poems and stories. There was a “humorous” section and an editorial column, including letters to the editor. Business and personal advertisements often took up over one-fourth of the print. However, as was quickly noticed, the purposes and practices of the Valley Tan were very different from those of other papers of that day.

In its very first number, Anderson took up the issue of the alleged "rowdyism" of the soldiers as reported by the Deseret News. He argued, "such is the good order and discipline of this camp . . . Drunkenness and rowdyism . . . certainly have not been exhibited . . . The presence of the army has been a

25 The term "Valley Tan" was originally used in the territory to refer to the first technological process brought to Utah, which was the tanning of hides. The Utah system was of such quality that it picked up its own name. However, the term came to mean any type of a home manufactured good in the Valley, including a strong whiskey loved by the soldiers and now a newspaper. [Richard M. Burton, The City of the Saints (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1863), 188. Quotation from John Wolcott Phelps, Diary (Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University), November 6, 1859.]
blessing to ‘this people.’” Anderson then contended that the camp brought protection, economic help, and civil order to the Territory. After offering this consolation as to the effect of the troops, Anderson wasted no time in lashing out against the Mormons and their beliefs. The first issue also featured a vitriolic attack on the legality of polygamy.

The admitted purpose of the paper, as stated by Anderson, was to bring to light the “truth” of the events of the Territory and the world to the people of Utah. He accused the Mormons of disguising and even hiding the truth from the people in their Deseret News. Subsequent issues attacked the Mormons for their supposed treason and rebellion against the United States government, their protection of accused Mormons in the court systems, and for the alleged acts of “blood atonement” committed by the Danites. So strident was Anderson that historian Donald Moorman has called him “that

26 Kirk Anderson's Valley Tan, November 6, 1858.

27 Ibid.

28 During the Mormon Reformation of 1856-57, Church leaders taught, among other things, that there were some sins for which Christ's sacrifice did not atone; therefore, the sinner's blood must be shed for the atonement. Shedding one's own, or another's, blood under this doctrine came to be known as blood atonement. Many of the murders in the Territory were suspected of being perpetrated by a group of blood atonement assassins who were known as the Danites.
indefatigable military boaster and herald of everything Gentile."29 He had to be, for he was supported financially by these non-Mormons.30

The Valley Tan was actually owned by John Hartnett, a non-Mormon and the federally appointed Secretary of the Territory, but a friend to many prominent Church leaders. Hartnett was known as one of the more lenient of the federal officials to the Mormons, but because of his newspaper he was often threatened with violence on the streets.31 When Daniel H. Wells, of the Church's Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, approached Hartnett regarding the harshness of Anderson's attacks, Hartnett replied that he did not totally agree with the direction the Valley Tan was taking, but that some of the officers at the camp had sent word to Anderson that if he did not "pitch in like hell," they would not patronize him.32 The reasons for Hartnett's continued support of the Valley Tan's anti-Mormon stint were clearly economic. The troops at Camp Floyd were also pleased to support the Valley Tan, for it substantiated the

29Donald R. Moorman and Gene A. Sessions, Camp Floyd and the Mormons: The Utah War (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992), 88.

30Much of the anti-Mormon stint of that Anderson took came from the fact that his patrons were the troops at Campo Floyd who had heard and experienced only bad things about Mormons.

31Harold D. Langley, ed., To Utah with the Dragoons and Glimpses of Life in Arizona and California, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1974), 133.

32Journal History, January 6, 1859, 2.
rumors they had heard in the East regarding the Mormons. As the Deseret News' historian, Wendell Ashton, observed, "Utah had become a place of two camps--the army and its followers on the one hand and the Mormon settlers on the other. Each now had a newspaper."33

It is interesting to note that during this time of very serious accusation against the Mormons, the Church's Deseret News made no attempt at specific counter-attacks or articles defending the Church's position. In fact, the Deseret News never even mentioned the existence of the anti-Mormon paper, nor of its demise seventeen months later. This practice of silence was contrary to the common practices among frontier newspapers of the time,34 but was based on a policy of Church leaders, who thought it was best not to advertise for the opposition by quarrelling with them.35 However, at one point when the Valley Tan was about to perish for want of paper the Deseret News loaned them enough paper to continue until supplies came from the East.36 Furthermore, many Mormons advertised in the Valley Tan, thus financially supporting its publication. The reasons for such actions are difficult to assess,


34Mclaws, 172.

35Journal History, December 24, 1858.

although economic gain in the case of the advertisers would probably be most valid. In addition, Barbara Cloud, in her study of frontier newspapers, explained that it was not uncommon for even opposing newspapers to help each other, for they never knew when that help might be reciprocated.37

Even though some help was given to the Valley Tan, Brigham Young and other Church leaders were not known to speak publicly of this opposition paper. However, Young's concern is noted privately in a letter written to George Q. Cannon of the Church's Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Young wrote, "This miserable little sheet, which is published here weekly, is doing its utmost through malicious and false statements to revive old issues, and keep alive the excitement against us; doubtless being sustained by those who are more or less interested in sucking government pap."38 Young added that the paper had little support outside of Camp Floyd and probably would not last long. However, as evidenced by Young's many comments in his writings and in other records, he became very concerned with the contents of the Valley Tan and often read certain issues with other Church leaders, searching for attacks on the Church. In a letter, Young even referred to the attacks of the Valley Tan as the "one-sided warfare."39

37 Ibid.

38 Journal History, December 24, 1859, 6.

39 Valley Tan, December 3, 1858.
Another critic of this opposition paper was John Taylor, another member of the Mormon Church’s Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. In a letter dated January 12, 1859, to George Q. Cannon, Taylor observed that the Valley Tan was a “scurrilous paper” that few would notice, and it “being weak, sickly and dying, we will leave it to its fate.”40 It was even reported to Church leaders that the federal judges and other appointees were meeting with Anderson to devise a plan to use his newspaper to bring about a “collision” between the Mormons and the army that would end in wiping out the Mormons. Such rumors gave leaders even more incentive to keep the allegations from being read by their Church members.41 Because of this policy of silence, the Valley Tan went largely uncontested by the Mormons until the late summer of 1859 when the third Utah paper, the Mountaineer, appeared. However, because of editorial changes, Anderson would never know the Mountaineer but would do everything in his power to expose the many “strange” doctrines and practices of the Mormons in Utah.

40Journal History, January 12, 1859, 8.

41Ibid, December 24, 1858.
CHAPTER THREE

THE ONE-SIDED WARFARE

Kirk Anderson worked to expose the Mormons using many issues, but his favorite ammunition concerned the Church's doctrine and alleged practice of blood-atonement. During the Mormon Reformation of 1856-57, Church leaders taught that there were some sins for which Christ's sacrifice did not atone, therefore, the sinner's blood must be shed for the atonement. Brigham Young even went so far as to state that loving your neighbors may include spilling their blood to allow them to atone for some grievous sins. Orson

42The Church doctrine of blood-atonement has always been based on a voluntary submission of one's life for atonement of grievous sins and was taught by early Church leaders to stress the seriousness of such sins. The Church does admit, however, that there may have been occasional acts of violence committed in the name of blood-atonement by Church members, but these acts were typical of the period of the American West and were in no way sanctioned by the Church or its leaders. [Ludlow, s.v. "Blood-Atonement," Vol 2, 131].

Hyde confessed that he knew of several men who had confessed adultery to President Young and asked the Prophet to have them killed.44

Anderson also accused the Church of appointing a band of men to assassinate apostates. They were known as the "Danites."45 During a reformation speech, Young made reference to this group when he threatened, "If men come here [Utah] and do not behave themselves, they will not only find the Danites . . . but the scoundrels will find something biting at their heels."46 This issue of the Danites and of the doctrine of blood-atonement plagued the Church and Anderson put it to his full use in stirring up trouble between the soldiers and the Mormons.

The first attack on the doctrine of blood-atonement came November 19, 1858 with an article written by "Veritas" (meaning truth). The writer, supposedly a member of the LDS Church charged a fellow Mormon with killing a man who was suspected of rape and apostasy, and with castrating another

44Orson Hyde, "Mormonism," 179, as recorded in William A. Linn, The Story of the Mormons from the Date of Their Origin to the Year 1901, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1902), 455.

45The Danites were first organized by Sampson Avard in 1838 during a time of intense persecutions in Missouri. Avard had misunderstood Church leaders counsel concerning the Church's stand, for when Joseph Smith heard of the things Avard was involved in, Smith removed Avard from his command. As far as the Church was concerned, this was the end of the Danites. The term has come to signify anyone committing a secret, unauthorized, violent act, in the name of the LDS Church. (Ludlow, s. v. "Danites," Vol 2, 356-57).

for some alleged crime. Anderson claimed that both of these acts were carried out without even an investigation or trial. Veritas concluded, "Have not the citizens been insulted, assaulted, wounded, and killed, without the least notice of it being taken by the authorities."47 The Deseret News did not respond to this article, nor to the charges. Two weeks later, Anderson lashed out at the editor of the Mormon newspaper and Church leaders for not responding to what he felt was an important issue. He went directly at the Church leaders. "Out of their own mouths will we condemn them," he assailed. Later, in the same issue, Anderson condemned Brigham Young, Lorenzo Snow, and Heber C. Kimball to the "blackness of darkness forever."48 These bitter confrontations marked the beginning of what became the "one-sided warfare."49

During this time of vicious attacks, it would be easy to imagine that there might be some who would seek revenge for Anderson's writing. Soon after these attacks on Church leaders, Anderson claimed that "at the corner of East Temple and First South . . . at least eight men in number, armed with guns, and who as we approached within a few feet in front of them, cocked their guns and placed themselves in front of us in a hostile manner." Anderson

47 _Valley Tan_, November 19, 1858.

48 Ibid., December 3, 1858.

49 Ibid.
stated that one of the men fired his pistol, but that no one was hurt. The article was headed, ‘To the Police of Great Salt Lake City.’ He may have used this incidence to bolster his evidence of the band of Danites or simply to justify his hatred of the Mormons.

In an obvious attempt to perpetuate his allegations using an instance that might be familiar to many, Anderson made a seemingly innocent inquiry in his newspaper. Many later attacks on the Mormons would be inspired by this controversy over the blood-atonement issue. He questioned, ‘What has become of the deaf and dumb boy that used to roam the streets? . . . We ask for information.’ Most assuredly, Anderson received information regarding the disappearance; because in the very next week’s issue Anderson published the following letter from an unidentified Church member:

Sir:—I have not the pleasure of your acquaintance, but I am very glad to see the course pursued by you in your paper; I think it will be approved of by many of our Church members at least by all those who are opposed to many acts of violence that are done under a pretended right and color of our faith. I never did and never can believe in the doctrine that it was right to take a person’s life, for the purpose of saving him; yet many of my brothers differ with me on this—they think that when there is danger of Apostatizing they should by a premature transition from this world be secured the happiness of a better one.

You inquire in your paper of last week about the deaf and dumb boy. For your information I will say that he was killed about three or four weeks ago about twelve miles east of here, in the Kanyon [SIC] on

50 Ibid., November 26, 1859.

51 Ibid., December 10, 1858.
the road to Bridger; and near the house of Ephraim Hanks. The person who killed him is a policeman of the city. . . . The boy was shot through the arm, and also a second shot through the breast, that not killing him his throat was cut. I am glad to see you notice these things, it may have a tendency to prevent such actions in the future.52

This testimony, if true, would be hard evidence to support the accusations of the Valley Tan. An editorial was also written that week by a perplexed Anderson wondering why such evidence as this was not printed in the Deseret News and why a thorough investigation had not been carried out.53

During the next week an investigation was finally conducted and a letter appeared in the Deseret News accusing the deaf boy, Andrew Bernard, of robbing many, of attempted murder of a child, and of being a “dangerous menace to society,” and that a “premature transition was necessary for his salvation.”54 This was the connection to the issue of blood-atonement Anderson was searching for. However, in order to lessen the brutality of Bernard’s death, the newspaper included an article that described how when police arrested Bernard, he pulled a knife and a fight ensued. They claimed that during the fight, Bernard was accidentally killed in self-defense and his remains interred in the cemetery. The Deseret News called this “full, fair, open, even-

52Ibid., December 17, 1858.

53Ibid.

54Deseret News. Salt Lake City, Utah, December 22, 1858.
handed justice to all.\textsuperscript{55} It is not clear if this article was included as a direct response to the findings of the \textit{Valley Tan} or as just information to its readers, for the \textit{Deseret News} never acknowledged Anderson's claims nor findings.

What was clear was that Anderson was furious. In the \textit{Valley Tan}'s December 24, 1858 issue, he devoted four columns to the subject of murder. It was entitled "Cruel Murder of the Deaf and Dumb Boy. The Danites at Work". Apparently, the boy's remains were exhumed from the cemetery in order for a further investigation to take place. Through a careful examination of the wounds on the body, Anderson emphasized the impossibility of the murder being in self-defense.\textsuperscript{56} With a striking threat, he concluded, "the 'Destroying angels' or rather the avenging devils that are peculiar to the hierarchy and theocracy that has so long prevailed in this Territory should bear in mind that Heaven is not only retributive, but that temporal laws can and will be enforced."\textsuperscript{57} Anderson made it known that he was not happy with the policy of the \textit{Deseret News} and the Mormon Church. It seems as though challenge after challenge and accusation after accusation went virtually unanswered by the Mormon Church in their ultra-conservative newspaper.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{56}Owing to Anderson's description in the \textit{Valley Tan}, it seems as though he was present during the autopsy, but he does not specifically say whether he was or was not.
\item \textsuperscript{57}\textit{Valley Tan}, December 24, 1858.
\end{itemize}
But this did not thwart the efforts of Anderson and the *Valley Tan*. A short time later, he printed a letter written to the editor. In it allegations were made against the *Deseret News* claiming that while the Mormons heralded a shooting between two gamblers in other territories as a reflection of the degradation of society, they ignored the brutal murders of three citizens of their own territory. The writer, signed E.X.Y., then accused the Danites of these murders. Anderson also continued his attacks in the next week’s editorial. He charged, “The truth is that Utah is under ecclesiastical government . . . The Church has its own laws, its own mode of execution. Obedience to counsel in all things is its fundamental requirement.” Furthermore, Anderson believed and often used the relationship between the Mormon doctrine of blood-atonement and the Mountain Meadows Massacre to justify his claims. It seems he was familiar with the history and doctrines of Mormonism, as any good reporter that wanted to be successful would be.

Due to the attention Anderson began getting behind closed doors with Church leaders, it seems that they began to become more concerned with the “miserable little sheet.” On December 7, 1858 many prominent men in Salt Lake City including Daniel H. Wells, Albert Carrington, George A. Smith, Brigham

58Ibid., January 18, 1859.

59Ibid., January 25, 1858.

60*Journal History*, December 24, 1858.
Young, and others spent the evening discussing the course of policy regarding the *Deseret News*. Less than three weeks later, Governor Cumming declared that there must be peace in the Territory and pointed directly to those writing slanderous letters as being the rowdies. That same night, Brigham Young, in a letter to George Q. Cannon downplayed the role of the paper as being only the "organ for the clique." But Young was so upset about the statements made by Anderson that he told Cannon that Anderson was "rampant for martyrdom." In the history, it was also mentioned that Young sent the entire file of the *Deseret News* and *Valley Tan* to Cannon in St. Louis for his inspection. He must have wanted the input of one of his long time friends and fellow Church leaders concerning the dilemma. President Young also decided, "It [the *Valley Tan*] must be very limited in its circulation, therefore to mention it in the *Deseret News* would be an advertisement in its favor." Thus, even though they were concerned with the discussion of the *Valley Tan* the policy of silence stood.

61 Ibid, December 7, 1858.

62 Cannon would have also been helpful, for he was a newspaperman. He had established the *Western Standard* while on a mission to San Francisco and may have been able to provide some input to Young on the nature of frontier newspapers and their workings. [B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints: Century One*, (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1830), 66-67.]

63 *Journal History*, December 24, 1858.
Apparently, someone from the Church had also been getting reports from the “other side,” because in the Church’s Journal History it is reported that Judges Sinclair and Cradlebaugh and a dozen other unnamed men had recently met in the upstairs of a local saloon to devise a plan to stir up a “collision” between the Mormon citizens of Utah and the non-Mormons that would lead to the destruction of the Mormons.64 No doubt Anderson was in attendance and the Valley Tan was mentioned as being a device that would be useful in bringing about this collision. The plan is mentioned again in the Journal History on January 6, 1859. Daniel H. Wells and John Hartnett had a discussion about this supposed “collision.” Wells told Hartnett that the Church was not afraid of a confrontation but reminded the newspaper owner that as a federal appointee he was to protect the rights of the people.65 Elias Smith, future editor of the Deseret News, also commented on this planned collision in his journal. He observed that the Gentiles had been acting unusually strange about the city lately, then concluded that they surely could see their “approaching downfall” and must do something to prolong the continuance of the army in Utah.66 The judge’s plan for a collision was surely being put into place with

---

64Ibid.

65Ibid., January 6, 1859.

66Elias Smith, “Journals, 1836-1888,” Salt Lake City: Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, November 21, 1858.
Figure 4. Judge John C. Cradlebaugh.

[Kate B. Carter, Our Pioneer Heritage (Salt Lake City: Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, 1958)]
Anderson and his newspaper playing the central role of spokesman and booster.

Part of Anderson's newspaper strategy of getting his word out was to get the news first from the overland stage. Messengers bearing important news from the East, in particular President Buchanan's message to Congress, refused to distribute their papers to anyone but the Valley Tan. This made the editor of the Deseret News, Albert Carrington, furious, for it happened continually. Carrington wanted to print an extra edition of the Deseret News to beat out the competition. However, when he saw that he could do nothing about the "conspiracy," the editor resigned to having the message second hand.67 Elias Smith also mentions this episode as particularly disappointing.68

Another strategy of Anderson's to publicize his work was to place copies of the Valley Tan on each of the desks at the Territorial Legislature. According to the report, they all returned their copies to the secretary because they didn't want government money to have to pay for the newspaper. The members of the legislature accused Hartnett of placing them there to promote his enterprise, but he denied involvement.69 Kirk Anderson, who was present

67Journal History, December 25, 1858.

68Smith, December 25, 1858.

69Journal History, December 28, 1858.
when the newspapers were returned left the hall furious.\textsuperscript{70} The Valley Tan was quickly becoming commonplace in Utah and Anderson seemed to know how to continue in its perpetuation.

Besides being weary of Anderson and his paper, Brigham Young was also concerned with the federally appointed judges. Young stated, "The judge and the Valley Tan, his organ, are pursuing the opposite of peace."\textsuperscript{71} Working in association with Anderson, the actions of the District Court in Provo were in direct connection with the blood-atonement issue. These federally appointed judges were usually not in support of the Mormon cause.

Judge John C. Cradlebaugh, Associate Justice of the Territorial Supreme Court, upon arrival in Utah, seemed friendly toward the Mormons. However, soon after his arrival this middle-aged lawyer from Ohio began to work his best to stir up conflict between Mormons and Gentiles particularly in Utah County.\textsuperscript{72} Within weeks of his arrival, he had became a thorn in the side of the Mormons, particularly with regard to the many alleged murders in the territory.


\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., January 6, 1859.

\textsuperscript{72} Furniss, 208.
Anderson, Hartnett, Cradlebaugh and the other federally appointed officers soon came to be referred to as the "drunken clique"\textsuperscript{73} by Brigham Young.

Kirk Anderson was always anxious to support the Utah Territorial Courts. He particularly liked to print the things that supported his agenda. For example, he printed Judge Cradlebaugh's advice to the jury in the Mountain Meadows Massacre case. Cradlebaugh instructed the jury to bring indictments against the guilty parties, no matter who they were. The judge proclaimed, "No person can commit crimes and say they are authorized by higher authorities, and if they have such notions they will have to dispel them."\textsuperscript{74} Anderson believed that this was the most "scorching" announcement that was ever declared from the bench in Utah and he praised Cradlebaugh for his courage.\textsuperscript{75} The \textit{Deseret News}, edited by Judge Elias Smith as of February 1859, also printed the charge in full, but made no editorial as to the comments of the judge.

After two weeks into the Mountain Meadows Massacre case, Judge Cradlebaugh was still not satisfied with the jury, so he dismissed them. In his dismissal, he accused Church members of being responsible for some of the killings. He concluded as follows:

\textsuperscript{73}\textit{Journal History}, December 24, 1858.

\textsuperscript{74}\textit{Valley Tan}, March 15, 1859.

\textsuperscript{75}ibid.
Until I commenced the examination of the testimony in this case, I always supposed, that I lived in a land of civil and religious liberty, in which we were secured by the Constitution of our country, the right to remove at pleasure, from one portion of our domain to another, and also that we enjoyed the privilege of worshipping God according to the dictates of our own conscience. But, I regret to say, that the evidence in this case, clearly proves, that so far as Utah is concerned, I have been mistaken in such supposition. Men are murdered here. Coolly, deliberately, premeditatedly murdered--their murder is deliberated and determined upon by church council meetings, and that too for no other reason, than that they had apostatized from your church, and were striving to leave the territory.

You are the tools, the dupes, the instruments of a tyrannical Church despotism. The heads of your Church order and direct you. You are taught to obey their orders, and commit these horrid murders. Deprived of your liberty, you have lost your manhood, and become the willing instruments of bad men.76

Of course, there were petitions and letters printed by the Deseret News in response to this decree, and its editor remarked, "If courts are permitted to be held without authority of law, and judges to act in the capacity of accuser, prosecutor, witness, and juror at the same time . . . then is our nation ripe for destruction."77 Meanwhile, the actions taken by Judge Cradlebaugh were seen by Anderson as "unprecedented" and he again praised the judge for his leadership and courage.78

76Ibid., April 12, 1859.

77Deseret News, March 30, 1859.

78Valley Tan, March 29, 1859.
According to the Valley Tan, murder was everywhere in the Territory and Anderson accused the Mormons of every one of them. The April 5, 1859, issue carried a front page, four column article entitled “the Murder of the Parrishes and Potter at Springville”. Anderson accused a Mormon bishop of conspiring with two other men in the brutal killing of three apostates, a father and his two sons.\(^79\) Two weeks later, almost the entire April 19, 1859, issue was devoted to the investigation of the Parrish murders and other killings. Also included here was a brief history of the Danite organization and a burning editorial entitled “Murder Will Out--An Incredible Catalogue of Crime”. In this editorial Anderson left no doubt what he meant by the Mormon practice of blood-atonement and that he believed it to be abundant and calculated within the territory.\(^80\) The Deseret News printed the claim that the Parrishes were killed in self-defense without making any reference to the blood-atonement issue.\(^81\) It is doubtful that this rather weak defense changed the attitude of the people regarding the verdict.

Anderson continually challenged the Deseret News to provide information on several unsolved murders in the Territory of which he had been getting letters. He lists:

\(^79\)Ibid., April 5, 1859.

\(^80\)Ibid., April 19, 1859.

\(^81\)Deseret News, April 6, 1859.
The murder in the fall of 1857 of John and Thomas Aiken, Honesty Jones, Mr. Eichard and other gentlemen, residents of Mariposa county, Cal., who came to this place on business with the army. . . The murder of two Irishmen. . . The murder by a Bishop of one of his wives because she had apostatized. . . The murder of Jacob Lance, at Lehi, who having apostatized, was very much feared by the church authorities. . . The murder of Yates, a mountaineer, taken prisoner near the camp of the army at Ham’s Fork. . . Also the castration of Lewis by a Bishop of one of the southern settlements. . . These questions are pertinent no matter by whom committed, whether Indian, Gentile, or Mormon, and deserve the severest punishment. Let those who know speak out.82

As in the past, The Deseret News ignored the challenge.

These were to be some of the last words written in the Valley Tan by Kirk Anderson, for in the May 17, 1859 issue it was announced that the editorship would be given to John Hartnett, the owner, until a new editor could be found. It is not clear why Anderson was resigning his seemingly successful position as editor. One source explained that Anderson returned to the East because of bad health.83 The California Bulletin reported from a “very reliable source” that Hartnett and Cumming had tried to coax Anderson to follow a more pro-Mormon policy. However, when Anderson refused, Hartnett used Anderson’s indebtedness to him for the Valley Tan press as blackmail and Anderson left in shame.84 The Church also reported that Hartnett’s insistence

82Valley Tan, April 26, 1859.

83Journal History. April 1, 1859.

84Valley Tan, June 29, 1859. Hartnett denied that he and Cumming had tried to persuade Anderson toward a pro-Mormon policy.
that Anderson "settle down" in his attacks against the Mormons may have forced the editor to leave. 

In his final editorial, Anderson summed up his efforts of exposing the Mormon Church and their monstrosities. He took pride in the fact that he may have had a small part in bringing a halt to these murders and other injustices. It is difficult to assess the success of Anderson in his quest to end these murders, or if he was even being truthful regarding them. Perhaps the murders and other crimes suspected of the Danites may not have been quite as he had alleged. For if the Danites had been as active as he supposed, Anderson probably would not have been alive past the first couple of issues of his Valley Tan.

He concluded his terminus by stressing that the Valley Tan would be around forever and that as to his words, he had no apologies nor retractions to make. No comments can be found regarding Anderson's departure or final editorial in the Deseret News. However, as a result of his success as an anti-Mormon writer, they were no doubt happy to see him go. After Kirk Anderson had left the paper, he returned to the East in May 1859. By

85*Journal History*, June 29, 1859. Hartnett also denied the Church's allegation.

86*Valley Tan*, May 17, 1859.

87Ibid., April 1, 1859.
default, the editorship was taken over by Hartnett, the owner of the Valley Tan, until a new editor could be found.

With the editorship now under John Hartnett, the attacks on the Mormons temporarily subsided. Hartnett announced that he did not expect to be the editor for very long, that it was his goal to enlarge the paper, and that he did not intend to use the strong language of the former editor.88 This may show at least some disapproval of Anderson by Hartnett, but there is no real evidence that the owner was displeased with the profit that the anti-Mormon Valley Tan must have been giving him. Hartnett stuck to printing the news and did not continue in the sensationalism for which the Valley Tan had become famous.

However, when Hartnett turned the editorship over to Thomas Adams with the June 22, 1859 issue, Adams resolved to take up where Anderson had left off, assuming the role of expositor and truth-teller. He explained that there were two sides to all questions and that his paper would cover the opposite side of the Mormon view. “The main object... is to have an opposition paper.”89 In spite of Adams’ resolution, the attacks made under his editorship

88Ibid., June 1, 1859.

89Ibid., June 22, 1859. Having two or even more newspapers was very common and essential in most frontier towns. This served to promote the interests and beliefs of a variety of people. This author believes it was healthy for Utah to also have opposing newspapers.
were less frequent and much milder than these to which the readers of the Valley Tan were accustomed.

Its readers could still sense that the historically-radical paper was anti-Mormon, but it became ever more conventional under Adams. His writings could be interpreted as implicating Mormons for some bad deeds, but his strategies were not as specific and calculated. Perhaps, he may have been persuaded by Hartnett to settle down for a time, for there are many signs that a change had occurred. For one, the Valley Tan began to support certain Mormon candidates for public office. But this may have been because there was no one else to choose from. Secondly, Adams printed excerpts from some of the sermons given in the tabernacle by Mormon leaders. He printed sermons of Heber C. Kimball, George Q. Cannon, Brigham Young, and others. He actually seemed to complement a sermon given by Orson Pratt, with these words, "It was agreeably free from that disgusting vulgarity and forensic braggadocio which some Elders cannot preach without, and calculated to edify all." Brigham Young even noted that the Valley Tan had become "extremely civil". However, the Mormon President may have spoken too soon, for the

90 Alter, 382.

91 Valley Tan, September 14, 1859.

92 Journal History, June 30, 1859, 4.
events unfolding in Salt Lake City would spark further controversy between the newspapers.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE MOUNTAINEER, 'WE SHALL NOT HESITATE TO TELL LIARS OF THEIR FALSITY'

The Mountaineer, another pro-Mormon newspaper, appeared during the lull of direct attacks against Mormons in the Valley Tan. However, this new organ had its roots in the many past attacks against the Mormons and they surely made their mark toward defending their faith. The motto of the Mountaineer, "Do What is Right, Let the Consequence Follow," became a warning to Adams and to any other who would dare to challenge the rights of the Latter-day Saints to practice their religion. This paper was edited by three stalwart Mormons who were also fellow law partners: Seth M. Blair, James Ferguson, and Hosea Stout.

Blair, age 41, was a native Missourian and had previously been one of Sam Houston's Texas Rangers. He was also Utah Territory's first United States District Attorney. Ferguson, a young Irishman age 32, had marched with the Mormon Battalion in 1846, was the adjutant-general in the Utah militia, and had been among those who fought to keep Johnston's army out of the valley. Stout, a Kentuckian and senior member at age 50, had been captain of the police in Nauvoo and at Winter Quarters and served as the first attorney
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THE MOUNTAINEER.

Miss Foustik was strolling through the streets, and noticed a young man, whom she thought was President Politer. She said to him, "Hey, Politer, what are you doing out here?"

"I'm just taking a walk," he replied.

"What an unusual time for a walk," she commented.

"I'm just taking a walk," he replied again.

Miss Foustik was strolling through the streets, and noticed a young man, whom she thought was President Politer. She said to him, "Hey, Politer, what are you doing out here?"

"I'm just taking a walk," he replied.

"What an unusual time for a walk," she commented.

"I'm just taking a walk," he replied again.

The young man walked off, leaving Miss Foustik to wonder what was going on.

---

Figure 5. The Mountaineer newspaper, September 3, 1859. [Photo courtesy of Harold B. Lee Library, Special Collections, Brigham Young University].
Figure 6. Hosea Stout, Founder of the *Mountaineer*.

Inside cover].
Figure 7. The Council House, Office of the *Mountaineer*.  
[Brooks, 647].
Edward Tullidge, in his *History of Salt Lake City*, described Ferguson as having a "capacious intellect" and as being a "brilliant writer and gallant soldier, who was ready to defend his people with his weapon as with his pen." Tullidge described Blair as a "compeer every whit worthy of his dashing journalistic brother." 94

The editors set up their print shop in the basement of their law office in the northwest corner of the Council House. They, too, had to get many of their startup supplies from the office of the *Deseret News* because of the spontaneity with which they undertook "this new enterprise." However, the Mormon organ must have been pleased with the prospect of another on their side.

The *Mountaineer*'s beginnings were rather unique. As recorded in the *Mountaineer*, all three partners were working late on a Saturday night the 20th of August, 1859, reflecting on the present condition of affairs in the city. When all at once they concluded that "with God's help" and with a little assistance from their friends at the *Deseret News* they could "offer to the public a newspaper in which our feelings and the feelings of our friends and fellow

---

93 Ashton, 100.

94 Tullidge was referring to Ferguson as Blair's journalistic brother. [Edward W. Tullidge, *History of Salt Lake City* (Salt Lake City: Star Publishing Company, 1886), 1071.]
citizens might be found." It seems that they had been concerned for some time about the actions of the Federal Courts and of the journalism in the Territory and had finally decided to act.

They immediately went to Brigham Young, and on Monday night, August 22, in conference and with the full support of the First Presidency of the Church, it was decided that the first issue would come out the following Saturday. The next day, another meeting was held in which more of the Mormon hierarchy were present and the issue of the Mountaineer's launch was discussed. They had decided that with help from the Deseret News press they could have the first issue ready for that very weekend.

This first edition of the Mountaineer was published on Saturday, August 27, 1859, at a cost of six dollars per annum in advance (two dollars less than the Valley Tan). Their office was located in the basement of the Council House on the corner of 300 North and State Street. The subscription agents, listed in the first number and based in all fourteen of Utah's counties, were instructed to collect cash from the subscribers of at least one-third of the cost; the balance

---

95Mountaineer, August 27, 1859.

96Because of the earlier concerns of Brigham Young about the Valley Tan and based on the very nature of the newspaper, Young probably had an even greater role in the setting up of the Mountaineer.

97Journal History, August 22, 1859.

98Ibid., August 23, 1859.
could be paid in eggs, stock, vegetables, hay, or other commodities at the going market rate. Later, they made the paper available free of charge to those who could not afford it. It was printed in the traditional four-page style, but it had six columns per page and was considerably larger than the Valley Tan and twice the size of the Deseret News. Stout reports in his diary that they printed 2400 copies in the first issue, of which 1000 were distributed on the first day.99

The Mountaineer did much to advertise and encourage support for their new paper. In their first issue they printed this poem:

What, What! another paper? well I vow
I know not to what times are coming now;
Already sure we've news and lies enough,
the world is running over with such stuff: . . .
Then while in your defense we now engage,
we ask for your favor and your patronage,
that truth may triumph, and true worth appear,
will you not recommend the Mountaineer?100

Then, two weeks later in an effort to encourage everyone to have a copy of the Mountaineer, the editors printed, "A Curiosity." It read, "we actually saw, the other day, a man who did not subscribe to the 'Mountaineer.' He said he had no doubt but what he could pay for the paper, but he thought he should borrow from his neighbor. We have read in some book or other about certain

99Brooks, 701-702.

100Poem by W. G. Mills, Mountaineer, August 27, 1859.
virgins who thought to borrow oil from their neighbors, instead of providing for themselves." Blair, Ferguson, and Stout were serious about this new undertaking and the impact they thought it would have.

The Journal History of the Mormon Church reported that the paper was received by the public in a very welcome manner. Because the paper was essentially pro-Mormon and endorsed by Church leaders, the Deseret News, now edited by Judge Elias Smith, heralded its beginning and urged its readers to support the new publication. Unlike its counterpart, the Mountaineer came out in open opposition to the allegations printed in the Valley Tan and to other untruths in print. Because it was privately owned, the Mountaineer could attack the Valley Tan in a way the Mormon-owned paper dared not. In their opening editorial, the editors explained the purpose of their paper:

If we shall see slander, we shall tell of it; and if we know ourselves shall not hesitate to tell liars of their falsity . . . . We are ready for the contest and we know our side . . . . We do not now appear in our religious character, nor as advocates of our faith. We come before our friends as the advocates of the common rights of man. We propose to tell the truth and nothing else.103

101 Mountaineer, September 10, 1859.

102 Journal History, August 27, 1859.

103 Mountaineer, August 27, 1859.
This practice of having a non-church owned, but pro-Mormon, political paper was carried on throughout much of the nineteenth century.104

The editors and owners of the Valley Tan seemed quite annoyed by the prospect of this new paper, which Hartnett reportedly claimed would only “back the damned lies published by the Deseret News” and that it was only a “trick of President Young’s.”105 There were even reports of some protests by the Gentiles to the start-up of the new paper. The Mountaineer reported some riots and a few drunks galloping up and down the streets, shouting and yelling at the prospect of the opposition.106 However, Adams seemed to sense the new challenge and his response in the form of a renewed effort to be an “opposition paper” is clear. But Utah’s newest newspaper appeared to be up to the challenge.

The recurring theme supported by the Mountaineer was the editors’ perceived violation of the “rights” of Mormons as United States citizens. The editors explained that their paper was “established for the express purpose of defending the character and interests of the citizens of this territory against the misrepresentations, aspersions, and malicious slanders which have so

104 McLaws, 173. One example of this is the Daily Telegraph, set up by T. B. H. Stenhouse to combat the anti-Mormon Union Vedette out of Fort Douglas.

105 Journal History, August 23, 1859.

106 Mountaineer, September 3, 1859.
constantly circulated through the public papers."\(^{107}\) Their purpose was clear and their sincere efforts toward that purpose are noted.

The first attempt at refuting the stories coming out of Camp Floyd based on these rights came through the publishing of a letter from Colonel G. H. Crossman regarding an alleged counterfeiting scandal involving Brigham Young. The \textit{Valley Tan} supported Crossman and had felt they had some damning testimony with which to convict Young. In response, the editors of the \textit{Mountaineer} explained, "He [Crossman] has not only avoided the facts, but has told some things he has not the ability to verify."\(^{108}\) Ironically, a short time later, Brigham Young was cleared of any wrong doing in the case, while Crossman was arrested as an accomplice to the scandal.\(^{109}\)

The \textit{Mountaineer} agreed with the prevailing Mormon position that Camp Floyd and the Gentile intrusion was the source of all the troubles in Utah and that the Gentile newspaper was little more than a pack of lies. They would do their best to prove this through the persuasive discussion of three key issues: 1) the lack of integrity of the judges and other federally appointed officers in the Territory, 2) the reasons behind the growing violence and crime in Utah and how it could be stopped, and 3) the issue of unpunished crime. In many

\(^{107}\)Ibid., August 27, 1859.

\(^{108}\)Ibid., August 27, 1859.

\(^{109}\)Ibid., October 8, 1859.
ways, these problems are interrelated and can be looked at together. By the second issue it could be seen that the *Mountaineer* was organized, professional, and on its way to making a voice for itself in the Territory.

The rather predictable responses of the *Deseret News* to the *Mountaineer* were printed in its second edition. They said that the newcomer had put forth good a effort and hoped it would continue to "do good service" by standing up for the rights of man.110 The *Valley Tan*, however, commented, "The editors 'throw down no gauntlet', but in effect, say--'knock this chip off my shoulder, if you dare.'"111 And "dare" they did. Within the *Mountaineer's* first fifteen issues, thirteen of the editors' comments, which usually comprised the largest and most important contribution by the newspaper, sought to directly or indirectly refute the *Valley Tan's* attacks. Of the other two editorials, the first was a plea in support of General Sam Houston's bid for the Presidency,112 and the other called for support of stronger public education in the Territory.113

110*Mountaineer*, September 3, 1859.

111*Valley Tan*, September 3, 1859.

112Blair and Ferguson were encouraged by Brigham Young to endorse Sam Houston for the 1860 Presidential race. [*Journal History*, October 4, 1859.]

113*Mountaineer*, November 26, 1859.
It is obvious that the language and tone of the Mountaineer were very different from those of their opposition. Even though the Mountaineer often responded to the Valley Tan's allegations, its editors especially wanted to remove the blame for the problems from the Mormons and their leaders and give it to the federal officials and judges while appealing to the unfairness of all that had transpired previously. However, the Valley Tan would not make this task easy for the newcomer. They even mocked the Mountaineer for their "less than favorable" coverage of the fighting between the military and the Indians on the Northern frontier. Every chance they had, the Valley Tan was working to decrease the credibility of this new paper.

It was agreed by both warring newspapers that there was too much crime in the Territory and that the guilty parties must be brought to justice. Most of the battle revolved around defining who was committing the violence and who was letting the guilty go free. The Valley Tan's first issue after the arrival of the Mountaineer outlined two murders in which the victims, John McNeil, who had brought criminal charges against Brigham Young, and Sergeant Ralph Pike, who had almost killed Howard Spencer, were killed before their separate cases could be resolved. In both instances, the
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115 For more information on the Spencer-Pike incident see, Audrey M. Godfrey, A Social History of Camp Floyd, Utah Territory, 1858-1861 (Master's Thesis, Utah State University, 1989) 179-183.
perpetrators were never captured. The Mountaineer, also wanting to stop these senseless murders, recognized the atrocity and presented their view to the problem: "On murder, black-faced, glare-eyed murder, we set our heavy heel. For in it there can be neither excuse or palliation; and blood, blood only can cleanse the bloody hand . . . [L]et the heaviest penalty fall upon those who having lived here long should be so much the more wise and interested." The Valley Tan was drawing the Mountaineer into a discussion of the issues of blood atonement, and this was exactly where the Mountaineer didn't want to be.

The following issue of the Valley Tan, September 7th, outlined two more killings that had taken place over the past week; Adams asked why their murderers were not in jail. The Mountaineer simply replied, "Our judges trample the laws under their feet." Their editors followed up in the next issue with a very heated editorial on the federal appointees in Utah. By name they accused each major office-holder, including the postmaster, of negligence, and even crimes. The judges were labelled "prejudiced" and "baneful." The editors of the Mountaineer were hopeful that this would bring the controversies to a more
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debatable level. However, Blair and Ferguson would have to debate without the help of Hosea Stout. With this issue, Stout left his editorship because of "a press of other business." Probably his responsibilities to his law practice became too great, but he still agreed to act as a consultant to the paper. The Deseret News responded that the Mountaineer would still "hold up," but would not be as "Stout."\textsuperscript{120}

The Valley Tan also experienced an editorial change in its next number. A new editor often meant a renewal of the old issues, and such was the case with their new editor and former reporter, N. H. Maguire, who vowed to uphold the federal government appointees. In his first number, he responded directly to the Mountaineer's challenge, "The whole people of the country are the peoples of the territory. States in embryo, going through the constitutional routine for state independence, cannot have Brigham Young for governor, judge, secretary, jury, marshall, and all."\textsuperscript{121}

In his salutary editorial he further exclaimed, "It is not probable that here, in the very center of our common country, we will relinquish one iota of our individual rights." The Gentiles, he wrote, would be willing to tolerate other religions, but not as long as those religions taught that "deliberate murder appeases the wrath of God" and that a "plurality of wives" is moral. With

\textsuperscript{120}\textit{Deseret News}, September 21, 1859.

\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Valley Tan}, September 21, 1859.
regard to blood atonement he asked, "Is not this unconstitutionality? Is this ‘equal and exact justice to all men’?" He compared the Mormons as slaves to an oppressive prophet and declared, "Shame on you for not trying to escape." It seems that Anderson was this man's hero as he referred to statements made by the founding editor.

Acting under the assumption that Church members were reading his first issue, Maguire further explained to the Mormons what they might look forward to under his administration: "We wish to show you your superlative impudence and inexcusable ingratitude in vituperating against that country, and the officers of that country, under whose flag you are protected and at whose soil your subsistence is drawn. . . ." Then, in the same editorial, Maguire began to show off his talent for accusation and over-wrought prose:

You writhe in the gatling chains which you have imposed upon yourselves, in all the hellish misery of self-destroying fiends, and when you see delegates of liberation standing over you, hammer in hand, to burst asunder your fetters, like the Blacksmith's viper, you hiss and dart the tongue of malignity with ever-increasing fury as each succeeding effort goes to prove the utter abortiveness of all your attempts to sink your venomous fangs. Was ever before such a deplorable picture presented to the eyes of man?"123

Wisely, the Mountaineer did not respond directly to Maguire's viciousness, for this may have been just what Maguire wanted in order to stir up a "collision."

122Ibid.

123Ibid., September 28, 1859.
Maguire’s first defense of the federal appointees was ironically that of John Hartnett, his boss at the Valley Tan. The Mountaineer had reported that Hartnett had left the territory to go back east and had not been paying his debts in his absence. They further commented that this was typical of his term of office, that of irresponsibility and misuse of money, and threatened that there were those who would sue Hartnett if he did not meet his financial obligations.124 Maguire sought to clarify the heated situation by explaining that Hartnett had left an agent to take care of his affairs, and it was he who was at fault. Then, in defense of Hartnett’s character, he printed, “His entire life is a refutation of charges made against him to all who know the man, and it is only to those who are unacquainted with him that the article can possibly do him any injury.”125 At the same time the Mountaineer called Hartnett, pompous,126 the Valley Tan called him humble and modest.127 It is clear that these two papers were very much opposed to one another.

Besides the anti-Mormon issues, Maguire was also very interested in the social and artistic events going on with Camp Floyd. In his first few issues as editor, he also highlighted the Military Dramatic Association, which was to open
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a newly built theater for their performances the following Saturday, the Soldier's Circus first opening, and the new Germania Singing Club, which had opened on August 21st in their new social hall. But, even in these social reports, they still had to further their anti-Mormon cause. The main source of the antics came from "burlesques" and "personifications" on Mormons and their leaders. One contented soldier replied, "With the 'Soldier's Circus,' with Willis as clown, the 'Military Dramatic Company,' and the 'Valley Tan' to drink, and the 'Valley Tan' to read, we are all right."128

The Mountaineer also covered social issues occasionally, but it tried whenever it could to seek for a means of controlling the discussion by putting the editorials on a more rational level. They seemed not afraid to print what they felt was the truth even if that truth came to be understood through an interview that Horace Greeley129 conducted with Brigham Young on his trip to California. Greeley's interview with the Mormon prophet was the first formal

128Ibid., September 14, 1859.

129Horace Greeley was a prominent American publisher and author. He founded the New Yorker magazine and was the editor/publisher of the New York Tribune. [Marquis' Who's Who, Who Was Who in America, Historical Volume, 1607-1896, (Chicago: Marquis Publications, 1963), 216.]
interview that a newspaperman had ever had with a famous personality and paved the way for an important part of American journalism.130

In the interview, Young admitted that some Mormons were guilty of crimes against Gentiles. Furthermore, he attempted to justify the crimes that Mormons had committed by discussing the Mormon people’s belief that they are God’s chosen people, in God’s chosen place, called to set up God’s kingdom on earth. He further explained that the Mormons felt as though this infiltration of Gentiles was hindering their sacred work and that they must be stopped “by any means.” Young did not accept “the current Gentile assumption that the Mormons are an organized horde of robbers and assassins,” but he agreed that “There [was] some basis for the current conviction of Mormon guilt that ‘Mormon witnesses, grand jurors, petit jurors, and magistrates’ determinedly screen the guilty.” Again, he stated that the majority of Mormons are innocent, but “some are guilty,” and that he knew of certain crimes that had been committed by Mormons.131


131While the Mountaineer never denied that the Mormons were not involved in any crimes, these statements by Brigham Young would lead their reader to believe that the problems in Utah were perhaps more complex than either paper was admitting.
He also agreed with the Gentile assumption that it was unlikely that any Mormon suspected of killing a non-Mormon or an apostate would ever be convicted by a Mormon jury in this Territory. In conclusion, Young called for a removal of the federal appointees and the restoration of his governorship. For him the solution was to “Let the Mormons have the Territory to themselves.” Greeley conceded that this might be the best solution.\textsuperscript{132} In the next issue of the Valley Tan, Maguire condemned Greeley for his concessions and wondered how Greeley could come to that conclusion after Young's admitting the “barbarity” of some Mormons.\textsuperscript{133}

In the next two issues of the Mountaineer the editors left the Valley Tan alone and kept their promise of fighting falsehoods wherever they found them. In the October 8th issue they challenged the allegations of the California press, particularly that of the San Francisco Bulletin, on the subject of lawlessness in Utah. On October 15, they defended the Mormon position by using their old standby, that of blaming the federal judges for their lack of duty. Blair's sarcasm told of his feelings: “Go on gentlemen, continue lying. Suppose you say that the Mormons are guilty of all the murders, rapes, robberies, and

\textsuperscript{132}Mountaineer, October 1, 1859.

\textsuperscript{133}Valley Tan, October 5, 1859.
villainies of your own Pacific State. We shall have then just as good an opinion of your veracity."\textsuperscript{134}

Later, they also defended their people against the editorials of a new publication out of New York entitled, \textit{The Century}, edited by T. L. McElrath and Thomas Lewis. The fledgling editors had commented extensively on the supposed horrors of Utah, of its rebellion from the United States, and of the presence of the army there. The editors of the \textit{Mountaineer} called McElrath and Lewis, "weak-headed, irresolute, self-displayed, scrupulously dishonest wretches, beneath the lowest mould of human common sense."\textsuperscript{135} Blair and Ferguson seemed to know what was being said about the Mormons around the country and were always willing to take their defense.

At the same time, the \textit{Valley Tan} was undergoing another editorial change\textsuperscript{136} after only a month of Maguire and what seemed a bright future for the anti-Mormon press. In the October 19th issue it was announced that Stephen DeWolfe, the acting United States Attorney in Utah, would be taking over as editor. DeWolfe was a 27 year old attorney from Kentucky, who was
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either not married, or lived alone. In his first issue DeWolfe proclaimed that the paper would continue "to advocate whatever is just and laudable in morals and in government and to denounce whatever is vicious, corrupting, and degrading, no matter on what pretenses sustained, or by whom, or how extensively practiced." He denounced the allegations of others who claimed that his paper was established only for a few federal officers and that it was not reflective of the state of affairs in Utah. He claimed that the paper was still needed because the murders continued with a man named Vincent, who was shot through the head. "How long, oh, how long are scenes like this to continue," he lamented. DeWolfe vowed to do all in his power to find the Mormon "band of assassins."

On October 22, 1859, the Mountaineer turned the tables on the Gentiles and counter-accused them of the murder and scandal taking place in the Territory. They listed many of the people arrested at Camp Floyd who were never convicted because of the judges' loyalty to the army. The editors of the Mountaineer had always been concerned with the growing violence but felt that the notion of a Danite band was "ridiculous fiction." However, they soon admitted that there probably were some Danites, but that they did not come under orders of Mormon leaders: "We have learned, and we think beyond
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doubt that such an order is in existence. A real bone and sinew combination of black hearts and bloody hands is in our midst." The editors warned all that might be joined with them to beware, for they would be looking for them.\textsuperscript{139}

Both sides were looking for the murderers and both sides were there to cover the first execution, "by a regular judicial sentence." It was of a gentile by the name of Ferguson. The \textit{Mountaineer} heralded this as the beginnings of bringing criminals to justice and the start of a more peaceful territory. The \textit{Valley Tan} downplayed this issue. Instead, they felt that the trial would have been much different if it had involved a Mormon. They also talked of four other murders of gentiles and apostates that had been committed by Mormons and explained that no reasonable effort was being made to even find the killers.\textsuperscript{140}

The tone of the editorials of both papers switched to the issues of the federal government and the rights of the people in Utah. The \textit{Mountaineer} led out in the debate by giving a history of the sufferings of the Saints and their struggles to survive and grow, only to have their sovereignty taken away again. They wanted only fair judgment.\textsuperscript{141}

In the November 9, 1859, issue DeWolfe replied by publishing the grand jury's report of Judge Cradlebaugh's justification for federal interference: the

\textsuperscript{139}\textit{Mountaineer}, October 22, 1859.
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Mormons were “treasonous, rebellious, and savage.” In addition, DeWolfe applied Senator Stephen A. Douglas’ lengthy discourse on popular sovereignty to the illegality of a territory establishing an institution that is at variance with the rest of the nation. He even suggested that polygamy was less justifiable than slavery because it did not exist at the time of the Constitution and was not anticipated by its framers.142 Coincidentally, on the same date, the Deseret News printed a sermon by Brigham Young which proclaimed, “The loyalty of the Latter-day Saints to the Government of the United States has never been disproved.” The Church President continued by contending that the allegations made by the Gentiles were malicious and wicked lies.143 The Mountaineer commented that the very notion of troops being sent to Utah was a sure sign of the “corruption of society.”144

The Mountaineer had previously published an article that may have sparked DeWolfe’s printing of the November 9th editorial. Blair had earlier explained the problem of unpunished crime in Utah by taking a shot at the judicial system in the Territory:

The judges were followers of the army and not officers of the citizens; because they came to be the partizans [SIC] of speculators, and not the ministers of justice; because they came to make war, and
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not establish peace; because creatures of the administration, they sold themselves to treachery to their creators; because finally, their hearts felt no enmity against guilt, but were ever at war with innocence.\textsuperscript{145}

Blair claimed that everything was in place for the establishment of justice, only that the system was corrupt.

For the next two weeks, there was somewhat of a lull in direct attacks by the rivals. At this point, the \textit{Mountaineer} seemed to be growing in popularity and wealth,\textsuperscript{146} for it added two more lines of advertising space, making eight full lines in all. They further commented on the large number of letters they received weekly. However, the editors vowed not to print those who did not disclose their author's name, in hopes of avoiding falsehoods.\textsuperscript{147}

They even began receiving some recognition abroad as it was reported that the \textit{Daily West} of St. Joseph, Missouri commented at length on the good work that the \textit{Mountaineer} was doing.\textsuperscript{148} The citizens of Beaver, Utah welcomed their addition to the circulation and hailed the \textit{Mountaineer} as a
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“friend” and an “able champion” of the rights of Mormons.\textsuperscript{149} The Mountaineer also changed its edition date from Saturday, to Wednesday, the same as the Valley Tan. Perhaps, this was so they would not have to always defend themselves against their rival. Blair and Ferguson had also taken up the popular topic of temperance and spoke often of its goodness. They seemed worried at the reported increase in the making and drinking of liquor; “even the Saints have taken to its use,” they cried.\textsuperscript{150}

During this time, the Valley Tan also received a new look. Beginning with its second volume, the editors of the Valley Tan also lowered the price to only six dollars starting November 16, 1859, added a new column, and enlarged its pages to the size of their rival--another attempt at competition with the Mountaineer. The advertising section was also enlarged and S. M. Blair, co-editor of the Mountaineer, could be seen among its advertisers. This seemed an important time for both papers as they increased in popularity and professionalism, thus giving credibility to their separate causes.

\textsuperscript{149}Ibid., November 26, 1859.
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CHAPTER FIVE

TURNING THE TIDE OF THE ‘ONE-SIDED WARFARE’

Even though there may have been a short lull in direct attacks, the editors of the Valley Tan were not famous for letting their jobs slide for long. Editor Stephen DeWolfe quickly stirred up the trouble once more with a “Catalog of Mormon Crimes,” in which he accused the Mormons of being bitterly hostile to the federal government, violating the Organic Act, committing murder and daily outrages against Gentiles, disabling the court system, making their own laws contrary to the Constitution, screening crime, oppressing right, prostituting their own females, and inciting the Indians to attack and murder.¹⁵¹ The Mountaineer, as if granting some truth to the claims of the Valley Tan, appealed to the Constitutional rights of the Mormons to have their different views without government interference. Appeals were again made to the Mormons sufferings at the hands of their persecutors and to the rights of United States citizens to live peacefully and without the occupation of troops.¹⁵² Blair continued by claiming that everything was in place for the

¹⁵¹ Valley Tan, November 30, 1859.
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establishment of justice, only that the system was corrupt. In a later issue, Blair further denied any involvement by Mormons in these murders by insisting that Brigham Young had always taught his followers that they were to "shed no blood".\[153\]

In response, DeWolfe provided his readers with a brief history of the cries of persecution and sufferings of the Saints. He claimed that these cries were one of the most effective agents used by leaders of the Mormon Church to keep alive the enmity and jealousy which they felt toward the government. He even alleged that the Mormons may have brought much of this persecution upon themselves by their taking what was not theirs by so-called "scriptural right."\[154\] In the same damning article, DeWolfe compared the Mormon's blood-atonement justice to the Spanish Inquisition.\[155\]

In this case, there was no direct response by the Mountaineer. Instead, the Mountaineer printed part of the interview that Brigham Young had with Horace Greeley. They quoted Young as responding, "We are now doing what becomes us as Christians, and we wish you were." The editors also became

\[153\]Ibid., December 3, 1859.
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very concerned about the growing amount of theft among the young men in Utah. Their solution would seem familiar to us today. It was for reformation above punishment-- to get the boys off the streets and into the libraries to be educated.¹⁵⁶

Most of the month of December, 1859 was relatively uneventful in the fight between the two papers. The Valley Tan printed the story of a Mormon once employed by their paper, but now being forced to leave. Apparently, Thomas D. Brown was excommunicated before a High Council Court for writing an article in which he charged Brigham Young with embezzling from the tithing and property of the Church and from the taxes of the territory.¹⁵⁷ There is no comment made regarding these charges in either of the Mormon newspapers, nor in the Church's Journal History.

The Mountaineer focused much of its issue that week on Governor Cumming's message to the legislative assembly. The very first item discussed by Cumming is the increase in crime and the escaping of those guilty. He calls it the worst problem facing Utah.¹⁵⁸ The Mountaineer later critiqued the message and placed the blame for the crime indirectly on the troops by referring again to the supposed "collision". They wrote, "Suppose that these

¹⁵⁶Mountaineer, December 10, 1859.
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communities, proportionately small in numbers, have forcibly palmed upon them the vagabond offscourings of the universe, with an unconcealed intention of breaking up social relations and introducing anarchy and disunion; where then does the dishonor nestle?" They then asked why the army did not clean up all of this crime that had suddenly come upon the territory. The Valley Tan did not answer the question.

Instead of directly addressing the issues that seemed so important to both papers, the editors devoted most of their attention to the Harper's Ferry incident and to the growing tension between the North and South. Both newspapers used their last issue of the year to discuss the state of affairs in Utah. The Valley Tan heralded the army and federal officers for putting down the treason and rebellion and for bringing growth and prosperity to the territory. They cited the improvement in the dress and style of the Mormons as an example of their improved financial condition. The Mountaineer heralded the events of the world and nation over the past year and acknowledged Utah as a sustaining force for good in upholding and sustaining worthwhile virtues. However, without placing blame, it called again on the need for the people of the Territory to take a stand against crime and violence.

---
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The resuming battle in January was also relatively uneventful for both newspapers. The **Mountaineer** continued to champion the education of the citizens of Utah as the solution to the Territory’s ills, even advocating the start of evening classes so more could participate. Interestingly, in the same issue they printed a letter from a curious Gentile who had “not been prompted by any idle curiosity to make these inquiries, but from a desire to gain correct information.” He wanted to know if the Mormon Church continued to fellowship the rowdies and desperadoes who were members of the Church. He had lived in the Territory for six months and was convinced that there were some Mormons who had fallen into this category. The **Mountaineer** responded that, no, the Church does not continue to fellowship them and they hoped that his attitude regarding the general body of the saints would change after being with them longer.\(^{162}\) This is part of the evidence that seems to point to the fact that there were Mormons that may have been committing some wrongs in the Territory. However, why and under whose direction these crimes were committed remains unexplainable. It is one’s word against the other. The **Mountaineer** never strayed away from the real issues and always seemed honest in its assessment.

In its never-ending effort to protect Mormon ideals, the **Mountaineer** also kept themselves abreast of the comments made in the newspapers of the East

\(^{162}\)Ibid., January 14, 1860.
and of California. They even printed a response to the comments of Governor-elect, Isaac Roop, of Nevada. He had stated that the people of Utah were very strange and different. The editor of the Mountaineer did agree with the governor that Utah and the Mormons were different, but explained that they were only different because they were a "bulwark of truth and justice."163

There must have been many Mormons who appreciated the work of the Mountaineer.

Both papers printed many of the articles from the Eastern press that came in weekly with the mail. The Valley Tan would usually get the first chance to print the important news.164 This did cause some problems between them, but the Mormon papers had gotten used to it. However, at the end of January the controversial message of President Buchanan to Congress was printed in both of the papers and would start up the final war between them. The Valley Tan was, again, the first to "pitch-in."

In response to President Buchanan's message to Congress, in which he stated that the Mormons could not be trusted, DeWolfe wrote that he had received threats from the Church in regard to some of the things he had alleged in his newspaper. He added that murder had been sanctioned from the

163 Ibid, January 14, 1860.
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pulpit by Church leaders and that it had been proven that many men had been killed in the Territory as a result of collusion with high ranking Church officials. DeWolfe claimed that the Mormons had a very lenient system of justice; they could sacrifice anyone they pleased in the presence of witnesses and there was not a jury in the Territory that would convict them. DeWolfe further estimated that over two hundred murders\textsuperscript{165} had been committed by Mormons in the Territory over the past three years and that not one of the "animals" had been brought to justice and punished. He then challenged the Church to deny these claims and threatened to publish the records of proof.\textsuperscript{166}

The \textit{Mountaineer}, while not attempting to offer any evidence, simply responded by calling the writers of the \textit{Valley Tan} "contemptible vampires" and condemning them for lying against and slandering the honest and upstanding leaders of the Church.\textsuperscript{167} However, this issue was overshadowed by the report of the Secretary of War about the situation in Utah. The \textit{Mountaineer} reported that Floyd felt that the necessity for troops in Utah has waned, because of no Indian hostilities, and that the troops would soon be leaving. Floyd also reported that Utah was a better place for the troops having been there and

\textsuperscript{165}DeWolfe's estimate included those killed at the Mountain Meadows Massacre in 1857 and may have been somewhat embellished to emphasize his point.
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concluded from the reports he had received that the murders were the work of the Mormon people and were “sanctioned, if not directed” by the leaders of the Mormon Church.\textsuperscript{168} His comments confirmed the idea that the issue of blood-atonement was known and discussed at the national level.

Besides, blood-atonement, another issue was also brought up by the editor of the Valley Tan. While not aware that this would be the next to the last issue of the Valley Tan, Dewolfe struck a hard blow at the very core of the Mormon faith: revelation. He condemned those who suffered the poor to pay tithing just because of a supposed revelation, while many leaders of the Church, who professed to have been given the instruction, lived in wealth.\textsuperscript{169} The Mountaineer, tired of this endless persecution and upset by the statements of the Indian Commissioner that the Mormons had oppressed the Indians,\textsuperscript{170} did not defend the Mormons, but seemed to throw up their hands in desperation: “So long has the custom prevailed, that it seems to have finally become a law that the people of Utah, or what is commonly termed the Mormons, are proper subjects for the abuse and slander of everybody.”\textsuperscript{171} They elected not to give

\textsuperscript{168}ibid.

\textsuperscript{169}Valley Tan, February 8, 1860.

\textsuperscript{170}In retrospect, the commissioner was right. However, the Mormons truly believed that they had brought the Indians only good and had greatly improved their lives.

\textsuperscript{171}Mountaineer, February 11, 1860.
in to the irrationality of those around them by entertaining their challenges. Luckily for the Mountaineer their new press, type and office fixtures had just arrived from California and greatly lifted their spirits.

The Valley Tan did not let up. In what would be the last issue of the Valley Tan, DeWolfe published a letter from Judge Cradlebaugh to the editor of the Deseret News in which the judge outlined the serious accusations he had against the Mormon Church. These allegations included their subjection only to a theocratic government, treason against the United States, the evil practices of polygamy and blood-atonement, and their teaching that it is all right to rob and castrate Gentiles. Judge Cradlebaugh explained that he had ample proof of all of these allegations and would be glad to discuss them with the editors of the Mormon newspapers or federal authorities to substantiate each specification. DeWolfe followed with what seemed to be a very logical plea to editor Smith of the Deseret News:

One thing is certain, whether he represents the religious tenants [SIC] of the Mormons or not, as their political representative and delegate, it would certainly appear to be his duty to vindicate his constituents from such charges as the Judge has made against them, if he felt able to do so. Mormon newspapers and leaders are in the constant habit of evading the charges so frequently made against them by attributing them to slander, and the statement of hired and irresponsible letter writers. But here the charges come in no obscure form, and from no obscure and irresponsible source; they are clearly and specifically set forth; the man who makes them occupies a position of responsibility and honor, that entitles his statements to some weight and

172 Valley Tan, February 22, 1860.
consideration, if not disproved or denied. He assumes the burden of establishing the charges that he has made against the Mormon Church and people, if their delegate in Congress will only meet him in public discussion of those charges; and if this is declined, the Mormons cannot hereafter, as they have heretofore, skulk down behind the plea that irresponsible persons have lied about them; nor can they elsewhere, as they have attempted to do here, stifle the freedom of speech by bravado or threats of violence.\textsuperscript{173}

Unfortunately, the Mormon Church did not accept the judge's challenge, for it would have been interesting for this study to report how such a confrontation might have proceeded. The \textit{Deseret News} and \textit{Mountaineer} newspapers also had no comment.

It is likely that with these allegations and no response by the Church, the attacks by the \textit{Valley Tan} would have become much worse. However, much to the dismay of DeWolfe and the other Gentiles in the Territory, they ran out of sufficient paper on which to print their accusations and after this issue, it was unlikely that they would be loaned paper by the Mormons as before. Indeed, February 22, 1860 was the last issue of the \textit{Valley Tan}. It had been almost 17 months of challenges to the Mormons, their way of life, and their ability to exist within the United States.

The \textit{Valley Tan} discussed many issues that would have never been brought up by the \textit{Deseret News} press and most likely the \textit{Mountaineer} would have never started had there been no \textit{Valley Tan}. Owing to admissions by

\textsuperscript{173}Ibid.
Brigham Young, himself, and by the Mountaineer that the Mormons were not a perfect people, and possibly the presence of an opposition paper was good, for it caused many to reflect upon the state of affairs in the territory and to look for change. However, many of the Valley Tan's accusations were falsely construed and came from misinformed sources, but its very presence in the heart of Mormondom may have done the Saints a favor.

There was no "farewell" article by DeWolfe, as he announced that he intended to continue with the paper as soon as materials were available. Its conclusion was not caused by the competition of the Mountaineer, for the Valley Tan seemed to be at its peak, being led by the judges and other federal officers. However, several other factors may have caused its terminus. The most logical reason was the lack of paper at the office of the Valley Tan. It is not known if the shipment of paper DeWolfe was waiting for ever arrived, but it may have not made much difference. The deployment of all but about 300 soldiers at Camp Floyd during the next month would have also contributed to the decision not to start the paper again.174

Another contributing factor to the demise of the Valley Tan may have been the resignation of George Hales, foreman of the Valley Tan office since its beginning. Hales was told by Church leaders that he must quit his job or be cut

174Moorman and Sessions, 274.
off from the Church. After Hales did resign, he probably would almost have been irreplaceable, since no other Mormon would have accepted the position. Finally, and maybe more importantly, John Hartnett, the financial supporter of the Valley Tan, became ill and left the Territory sometime in March. News of his death was recorded later in the Mountaineer.

Surprisingly, the end of the anti-Mormon paper was not recorded in either the Deseret News or the Mountaineer. They may have not wanted to give any cause for someone else out at the camp to take up the idea of opposing them. Besides, they were never the offensive part of the fighting and did not want to stir up further trouble now. However, there were some personal reactions, outside of the local press, to the end of the gentile newspaper. Richard Burton, a renowned world traveller and famous author, who visited Utah just after the termination of the Valley Tan, declared that for one, the Valley Tan was just too expensive, but most importantly the newspaper did not last long because of its “over-indulgence in Gentile tendencies.” He declared, “It died a slow and lingering dysthesis.”

175 Valley Tan, February 22, 1859. It is not clear why the leaders of the Mormons waited so long to give this ultimatum to Hales. Possibly, because of the recent strong attacks by the Valley Tan, they had begun a grand effort to stop its existence.

176 Mountaineer, April 21, 1860.
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Kenner, an early Utah historian, commented that the Valley Tan was “unable to exude its virus as fast as the same was generated [and] it passed away through the congestion of the spleen . . . unhonored, unwept, and unsung.”

The general consensus seems to be that the editors of the Valley Tan were at the very least, inaccurate in their accounts and at the very most, outright, blatant liars. It is a fact that during these months there was an increase in the crime and violence in Utah. It is hard to believe that all of it came from the troops and from some of the evidence, the Mormons may have become more active in making a stand against the invasion of troops into their beloved Zion. They were a strong and proud people who had their homes, families, and faith to protect. This opposition in the form of a newspaper may have actually been good for Utah for it served as a check to the zealots and as a warning to Church leaders that there were those who were watching them and reporting on their actions and teachings.

As was mentioned before, these people were not strangers to persecution and suffering and they may have decided that they had had enough. However, there is no evidence, except for the speculation of the editors of the Valley Tan, to suggest that the general authorities of the Mormon Church were ordering or directing any such work. However, these issues were real and Church members and leaders wanted to avoid the

rumored "collision" between the troops and the Mormons. These were different times and it would be wrong for us to judge them on the standards of today. The Mormons at that time may have been willing to do more than they would do today under the same circumstances.

There were a few who agreed with the conclusions of the Valley Tan. Richard T. Ackley, while passing through Utah on his way to California, observed, "There never was a place where there were so many desperate fellows as Salt Lake City. The Danites . . . were particularly destructive."179 Another author observed that had the army not come to Utah and taken a stand against the Mormon practices, the killings may have been much worse.180 One writer, obviously familiar with the words of Church leaders regarding the doctrine of blood-atonement, had this answer in defense of the Church: "It is obviously a perversion and distortion of their [the Mormon] theology to argue or insist that the Mountain Meadows Massacre had its origin in the orthodoxy conception of blood-atonement."181 Either way, the end of the Valley Tan was


181Andrew L. Neff, History of Utah, 1847-1869 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1940), 412.
sure and the Mountaineer would become free to continue its purposes unabated by its former enemy. The Mormons would have no journalistic opposition in Utah Territory until 1863 and the coming of the Union Vedette.
CHAPTER SIX

'THINGS SURE SEEM BRIGHT'

Even though there was no direct opposition in the press toward the Mormons, Blair and Ferguson, as editors of the Mountaineer, continued to defend the rights of the citizens of Utah and to correct errors wherever they could find them. For there was still much in the national press in opposition to their cause and still many wrongs committed at home that they wanted to make right and bring to the attention of the citizenry. In doing so, the Mountaineer distinguished themselves further from the Deseret News, thus maintaining their appeal to the people. According to the paper's own reports, its circulation and popularity continued to expand daily, giving many in Utah the opportunity to hear the "truth".

Even though the Valley Tan had been such a part of their weekly editorial, the editors of the Mountaineer did not even mention the end of the opposition paper. Probably for the first few weeks, they were not sure if the Valley Tan would be coming back, but after a month they must have been confident of the opposition's demise and soon they announced that things were "looking up." The editorial featured a discussion of the future of the Mormons
in Utah. “Things sure seem bright,” they exclaimed.182 According to the

*Mountaineer*, some exciting things were happening in Utah.

Even without their opposition, the *Mountaineer* remained much as they had been before. They continued to defend the truth and bring to Utahans all they felt was noteworthy. On the first page of the paper was printed Selected Poetry and Original Essays, along with Selections from other current periodicals, and a Miscellaneous section containing short, interesting news clips. The second page always began with the all-important Editorial, followed by the Local News, Home News, from around the United States, came next, then Foreign News, which often continued into the third page. The bulk of the last two pages were for the Advertisements, such as for the Tenth Ward Distillery, which made an “unadulterated article of pure grain whiskey,” or for “John Taylor, Tailor.” There were also two small sections called Gleanings and Varieties, which contained short stories with moral value and little statements of wisdom.

In order to include all of these items, the editors relied heavily on other periodicals and often gleaned much of their print from them. They used many sources, including nationally recognized periodicals like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *National Intelligencer*, and *Vanity Fair*. Smaller, local newspapers were also used, such as the *Memphis Bulletin*, the *Shasta Herald*, the *Butte Record*, and the *Omaha Nebraskan*. Articles coming from these

182*Mountaineer*, March 17, 1860.
sources were often helpful, or just plain silly. They included, "The Art of Dining in a Hotel," "Fanny Fern on Lovers and Marriageable Daughters," "Coercing Hens," "Objects, Advantages, and Pleasures of Science," and "One Hundred Girls in a Telegraph Office." Surprisingly, the news and other articles from the East was only one to two weeks old when printed in the Mountaineer and using these material from these other sources lent credibility, fun, and interest to the frontier organ.

Of course, local news was the most important to the citizens of Utah Territory and one of the first items of big news reported by the Mountaineer was of the departure of General Johnston for Washington, D.C. on March first.\footnote{183} This was the first real sign that the Army's duties were changing. Any rumors that the troops were being diminished or removed were also promptly printed in a prominent place. Most of the Mormons were hoping for any signs that would signal an end to the occupation at Camp Floyd and the federal appointees.\footnote{184} This inevitable changing of the opposition may have also led to an editorial change in the Mountaineer.

In July it was announced that Seth M. Blair would resign and turn the complete editorship and proprietary responsibilities of the Mountaineer over to

\footnote{183}{Ibid., March 3, 1860.}

\footnote{184}{There may have been some Mormons not ready to see the troops go because of the economic boon they had been to some.}
his longtime partner, James Ferguson. Ferguson had been involved with the paper since its inception, but Blair had been its senior editor. Blair announced that he wanted a "more quiet and retired life." He gave two reasons for his leaving. First, he said he was tired of the practice of law and second, his health required a more outdoor life. He left Salt Lake City and moved to the growing area of Cache Valley to run a saw mill.185 He left with these departing words, confident that the work he had done was a boon to mankind:

That the Mountaineer may continue to live and flourish, and the number of our newspapers be increased, and other periodicals and magazines swell their number, until a taste for literature shall triumph, and ignorance and vice shall flee from the presence of wisdom and knowledge, and virtue and morality supplant the spirit of tyranny and oppression, and a love of liberty and truth eternal be cherished; and that I may live until I see a universal brotherhood cover the land, and the King of Peace reign, is my ardent desire.186

Ferguson humbly accepted the position of sole editor and proprietor, feeling not qualified for the position, and expressing his wishes that Blair could have stayed a little longer.

Shortly after Blair's retirement, the first volume of the Mountaineer came to a close. Ferguson announced that this would also be the last issue for now because they had run out of paper, and a new supply could not be shipped in

185Mountaineer, July 14, 1860.
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Figure 8. Seth Millington Blair, Founder of the *Mountaineer*.
[Esshom, 245].
Figure 9. James Ferguson, Founder and surviving editor of the Mountaineer. [Esshom, 114].
for a couple of weeks. However, in this issue, he both looked back and looked forward to the challenges of his newspaper:

It has been our duty to record many a tale of blood and villainy which we would fain have not been called upon to do. When we appear again we trust that the next act in the drama will be less gloomy. But we may be mistaken. It is true that the army and its disgusting appendages have nearly all evaporated. They have been directly or indirectly the source of most of the recent troubles in Utah. And now it may be feared that the crocodile's egg they have left is hatching in the sun. Let us all, however, hope for the best.187

The Mountaineer was not published for a couple of weeks, but did come back again with a new resolve and a bigger space in which to cover it. With the commencement of its second volume, the Mountaineer increased its space by 25% by making the pages larger and adding another column. But more importantly, Ferguson vowed to hold true to his motto, "Do what is right, let the consequence follow".

The editors of the Mountaineer spent their remaining seventeen months without opposition from the Valley Tan dealing with four major themes in their quest to defend the truth that had become so distorted: 1) the corruption of the federal judges and the increasing crime which they fostered; 2) the Indian problems because of a dishonest superintendency; 3) the growing issue of polygamy on a national scale; 4) and the national issues of the election of 1860, the growing secession crisis which followed, and the impending Civil War.

187Ibid., August 18, 1860.
It is a good thing that Utah still had a paper that was willing to discuss these issues. The LDS Church’s paper, the Deseret News, did not take issue with these problems and continued to be the mouthpiece for the Mormon Church and its leaders. The Mountaineer then, enjoyed the distinction of being the newspaper in Utah for the “roughs.”

Out of the sixty-five issues printed after the demise of the Valley Tan, nineteen of the editorials dealt directly with the federally appointed judges and the problems with the courts allowing criminals to go unpunished according to their religious or political affiliation; thirteen talked directly about the troubles with the Indians; seven discussed the nationally growing issue of polygamy in Utah as one of the twin relics of barbarism; and eleven dealt with the election of 1860, the growing secession crisis which followed, and the impending Civil War. The remaining 15 editorials dealt mostly with relatively insignificant issues not pertinent to this study.

Beginning with its first issue after the demise of the Valley Tan, the Mountaineer spent its first editorial and many others dealing with the problems of the federally appointed judges in the Territory. Apparently, Judge Delana R. Eckels had written an article to the New York Times reporting that the Mormons were advocating some very terrible things: that they followed Brigham Young without question as a prophet, that the local newspapers were

188Mountaineer, May 19, 1860. The Mountaineer took pride in printing this statement from the Territorial Enterprise of Carson Valley, Nevada.
encouraging citizens to arm themselves and organize militarily, and that their leaders were importing cannons into Utah. To these charges, the editors plead guilty and asked the judge to refute what had been said. For the editors stated that they did believe Young to be a prophet and they had found that when they followed his counsel, they prospered. They further replied that most all states had organized militia to protect and defend themselves, especially on the frontier, so why not Utah, and that they knew nothing of the importing of cannons, but what if they had been imported? Was that not allowed in this country? The editors further criticized Eckels for trying to stir up national hate and mistrust instead as a federal judge protecting the people of Utah. In the very next issue, they continued to slam Eckels for his complaining about justice in Utah, "Is it proper and right that he should be eternally murmuring about the interruption of justice in Utah, when he himself is the magnificent ermined barrier in her path?"

The main issue that the editors of the Mountaineer were trying to exploit was the complete lack of justice in Utah because of the corruption of the federal judges and the power they were able to hold. "Give us but one honest judiciary in Utah and Utah will purge itself from every accusation," they

189Mountaineer, February 25, 1860.
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exclaimed. 191 By the next month the editors became very specific about instances where Judge Eckels and others had let criminals go free with or without trial when their guilt was certain. Frustrated, by the actions of these judges, they questioned,

What can be said of an officer of the government, holding a commission under the national seal, who thus unblushingly drives around the country, turning loose the characters whom the laws and honest verdicts of the citizens condemn? Is he less guilty than the felon who wore the shackles? Is he not an accessory after the fact in all these cases, and an accessory before the fact in crimes yet to be perpetrated and yet untried? 192

In the very next issue the editors urged their readers to take “extreme measures” 193 to stop the extremes of the federal judges. It is not clear what extreme measures were taken, but in the April 21 issue, their Washington correspondent 194 reported that Judges Eckels, Sinclair, and Cradlebaugh had all resigned their posts and were returning to Washington. 195 Whatever was done, it worked. Perhaps these men were frustrated by not having a journalistic

191Ibid.

192Ibid, April 7, 1860.

193Ibid., April 14, 1860. It is not clear what was meant by “extreme measures,” but physical force may have been an option implied.

194The name of this Washington Correspondent is not mentioned, but they received news from him via the telegraph, so it was always current.

195Mountaineer, April 21, 1860.
voice in the Territory, or perhaps some men had taken some "extreme measures." Either way, this ended the great troubles that the Mormons had had with all three of these men.

Soon, however, Washington would appoint two more judges to Utah. Judges J. F. Kinney and Henry R. Crosby arrived in Salt Lake City in October. Ferguson watched the new judges closely and criticized them a little, but mostly he was pleased by what he observed. However, another problem soon presented itself with Judge Cradlebaugh's appointment to the Nevada Territory. He had a larger influence and support there, became closely associated with a newspaper out of Carson Valley, the Territorial Enterprise, and continued to be a thorn in the side of the Mormons for some time to come.

One solution the editors had to the problem of the corrupt judges was to give more of the power to the local courts, which were run mostly by Mormons. They took note in their editorial of the recent actions of the Probate Judge, Elias Smith, a Mormon and editor of the Deseret News, as being willing to punish criminals for their crimes, no matter what their political or religious affiliation. Another solution presented by the editors of the Mountaineer to the growing crime was more education on the part of everyone. In an important editorial, they appealed to the citizens to support the recent growth of academies of education around the state and proclaim that it was the

196 Ibid., March 24, 1860.
citizens responsibility to prepare and protect themselves from the evils of the world.\textsuperscript{197} Of course, it was suggested that good parental control might do more than education and a few weeks later a plea was made to parents to control their boys from running all over the city at all hours of the night. This was considered both for the protection of the boys from the roughs, and so they would not be involved in crimes.\textsuperscript{198}

Another large problem addressed by the \textit{Mountaineer} that involved the corruption of federally appointed officials was the Indian problem. The first editorial talk of these problems came with the April 21, 1860 issue. In this case, the editors blamed the entire problem on the Indians. They claimed that the Mormons came in peace to these valleys and had done nothing but helped to improve the lives of their native friends.\textsuperscript{199} It wouldn't be until a few months later that the editors would begin to take a good look at the problem and discuss what was really going on.

In many of the \textit{Mountaineer's} thirteen editorials on the Indian problem in Utah, the editors recounted outrages done by Indians, skirmishes fought, and talks made. After some time they begin to look to the Indian Superintendency in Utah as the source of their troubles. The Indians were being cheated out of

\begin{itemize}
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\end{itemize}
the food and other supplies they were promised from the treaties. It was because of their destitute condition that they have become violent and desperate. The editors insisted that the situation had never been this bad when Brigham Young was the superintendent. Furthermore, they claimed that men were appointed from New York or Boston who knew nothing of the Indians, thought they were ignorant, and tried to cheat them.200

In the next week's editorial entitled, "Indians Again," a letter was printed from W. W. Sterrett of Antelope Springs, who experienced the problem first-hand. He said that the Gosh-Utes[SIC] of that area stole and plundered for food and clothing only because they are totally destitute. He announced that they were being cheated and with just a little help from the Superintendent many of their problems would be solved.201 There is no evidence in the Mountaineer that the Indian problem was ever solved, because after this date most of the attention of the editors turned to the impending Civil War and to the shortage of paper.

The Mountaineer was always interested in defending what they felt was the truth whenever they could and they took full advantage of this with the debate in Congress over the Anti-Polygamy Bill. While this bill was before Congress, its arguments occupied a large portion of the newspaper and at

200Ibid., May 4, 1861.
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least five editorials were devoted to the Mormon's defense. It is rather interesting that the editors of the Mountaineer would challenge a speech by Representative Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, in support of the Anti-Polygamy Bill by using the argument of an individual territory's rights. To refute Morrill's claims, they asserted the same argument being used by secessionists over slavery, by saying that the Federal Government has no Constitutional right to make such a law and that popular sovereignty should be used to solve the issue.\textsuperscript{202}

About a month later the editors published another speech from Congress, this time from Thomas A. R. Nelson, of Tennessee. The editors of the Mountaineer could not believe what was happening to the nation and claimed that "the virtue of the nation is in danger," if bills like this could pass in Congress. They further argued regarding the Biblical rightness of polygamy and for the common rights of men and women.\textsuperscript{203} The next week, referring to the same text by Mr. Nelson, the editors claimed that they had done all they could to make everyone aware of the dangers that a bill like this proposed and that now it was up to the people to do all they could to stop such tyranny. In further defense of their cause, they claimed that an institution such as polygamy could have saved the life of a baby killed by her unwed mother

\textsuperscript{202}Ibid., March 31, 1860.

\textsuperscript{203}Ibid., April 28, 1860.
because she had no one to help her care for it. The debates and speeches surrounding the Anti-Polygamy Bill took up many of the columns of the Mountaineer in the month of May.

Part of this was the printing of Congressman Eli Thayer, of Massachusetts, opposition speech to the bill. He did not believe in polygamy, but believed in states' rights and that the Federal Government did not have power to enforce such a bill. He told those in the South to beware if this bill passed, because slavery would be the next to go. The editors of the Mountaineer liked this approach and declared that even if the bill passed it would not effect Utah in any way because of its unconstitutionality. The crusade against the "twin relics of barbarism" was heated and long, but the editors of the Mountaineer continued to defend the rights of the citizens of Utah wherever they felt they were being threatened.

Besides these threats that hit very close to home, the editors of the Mountaineer were also concerned with the growing national crisis that began to occur with the election of 1860. Leading up to the election, the Mountaineer had always supported Sam Houston for the presidency by request from Brigham Young. However, when Houston dropped out of the race the editors seemed to be lost as to who they should support. Even though they didn't

204 Ibid., May 5, 1860.
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have the right to vote, they couldn’t support Lincoln and the Black Republicans, even while acknowledging that he was in the lead nationally. They didn’t really like Douglas either. They finally threw their support toward Breckinridge, who was mostly supported in the South. This may have been largely because of his support for states’ rights.206

Once the election results were in, they printed all of the negative reactions from the South on Lincoln’s victory and the editors had nothing nice to say about the new President.207 Throughout the next few months the Home News section was greatly expanded and sometimes even the front page was used to report news of the secession crisis and the talk of war. A couple of times, the editorial was even dismissed to make more room for the news from the Eastern press. However, when the Mountaineer outlined the faults of both sides, they chose not to take sides in the debate. On the one hand, Sam Houston had declared that he was for preserving the Union, but did not like the way Lincoln was using coercion to do it. On the other hand, they also liked the South’s stand against the government’s interference of their basic rights of property, but disagreed with secession as the answer. In the end, the Mountaineer declared their political neutrality.208
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It was difficult for Utahans not to get excited over the rumors that all of the troops might be leaving because of the conflict, and the *Mountaineer* kept its readers up on the latest news. The attack at Fort Sumter and the mobilization of troops in the East was reported on and the last editorial was given just prior to the eighty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The question all over the nation was whether to celebrate this day with the impending war. The *Mountaineer’s* answer was, "Yes! We will celebrate the Fourth of ’76. We know no coercing North; we acknowledge no seceding South. We have no party; but our motto is, now and forever, our God, our Country, and Constitutional Liberty."209

In the midst of national crisis and political strife, the *Mountaineer* made a desperate plea for rags. Brigham Young had imported a paper mill that could make a linen paper. However, they needed the people of Utah to donate rags "to preserve our paper, our kids education, and our history."210 The lack of paper in these early days of printing was a serious problem and the *Mountaineer* would never recover from this one. Their last three issues were about half the size of a normal edition and all contained pleas for rags. In their last edition they reported:

---

209 Ibid., June 26, 1861.
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We are pleased to learn from our friend, A. C. Pyper, that there is a good prospect for a fresh supply of paper. Much means and labor have been expended in endeavoring to manufacture and introduce into the market this much needed article. We are sorry to say that we will be compelled to suspend operations in our office for a week or two for want of this material. It is hoped, however, that before long we will renew our publication without interruption. In the meantime, our friends will do us the kindness to exercise their patience.  

It's too bad Ferguson didn't know this was his last issue. We may have been able to report a salutary remark about all the good work he was able to do as editor of this paper.

The Mountaineer's last issue was published on July 20, 1861. The fresh supply of paper they were hoping for did arrive, but was given over to the Deseret News because they were also running short. The same immediate cause that had ended their rival, the Valley Tan, also caused their demise. But somehow the Mountaineer was no longer needed due to the breaking up of Camp Floyd and the departure from Utah of most of the Gentiles as a result of the Civil War. Several years later, the Deseret News commented that the Mountaineer had died of "Episinthic Impecuniosity." This might suggest that the people of Utah had stopped supporting the Mountaineer because of the changing circumstances around the state.

211 ibid., July 20, 1860.
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No matter the state of affairs at the ending of the Mountaineer. This newspaper played a vital role in an important and neglected time in Utah's history. It was a worthy opponent in the battle with the vicious Valley Tan and continued fighting all others who would dare. Its pages told of the issues important to its readers, the common people, and served the citizens as a watchword and a defender of the truth.

There is no doubt there was a surge in growing crime and violence in Utah Territory after the troops arrived at Camp Floyd in 1858. However, the purpose of this study was not to prove conclusively whether or not the Mormons or the troops at Camp Floyd were the source of the growing crime and violence in the Territory. The evidence would suggest that both parties were involved to some extent, although the author would add that there is not sufficient proof to indicate that general Church leaders were ordering any of this violence. The newspapers and their debates on this issue are perhaps the best sources to bear this out.

The choice of Blair, Stout, and Ferguson to publish a third newspaper, the Mountaineer, to intervene on behalf of the Mormon people proved somewhat successful. Although the Valley Tan continued its harsh attacks, and there seemed no end to the sharp blows hitting directly in the face of the Mormons, the Mountaineer was able to bring some order and balance to the journalism of the period. The Deseret News certainly was not ready or willing
to take on such a great obstacle and perhaps the Valley Tan would have run roughshod over the newspaper industry in Utah. The time was right for another newspaper, and the editors were equal to the task. Exercising a proper rationalism in the face of an irrational opponent served them well. Because of the Mountaineer's courage in the defense of truth, the Deseret News must have gained the insight and courage that would, ten years later, allow them to more actively participate in the great battles that would ensue between them and the anti-Mormon Salt Lake Tribune.
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ABSTRACT

The Utah War and its aftermath changed Utah and the Mormons forever. This change came because of the growing Gentile influence in the territory and was reflected most adequately in the current periodicals of the period. The Valley Tan and the Mountaineer are especially important because their opposition to one another brought many important issues to the forefront of discussion. These issues would be important to the Mormons learning to live and work with those not of their faith and to share in their Zion. These newspapers were successful in giving to its reader, both past and present, a glimpse into the troubles and pains of a very difficult time in Utah History.
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