

Brigham Young University BYU Scholars Archive

Theses and Dissertations

1971

Causes of the Mormon Boycott Against Gentile Merchants in 1866 and 1868

Peter Neil Garff Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd



Part of the Business Commons, and the Mormon Studies Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Garff, Peter Neil, "Causes of the Mormon Boycott Against Gentile Merchants in 1866 and 1868" (1971). Theses and Dissertations. 4708.

https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4708

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

B.Y.U. 378.2 618

CAUSES OF THE MORMON BOYCOTT AGAINST GENTILE MERCHANTS IN 1866 AND 1868

1-1

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Church History and Doctrine

Brigham Young University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Peter Neil Garff
May 1971

This thesis, by Peter Neil Garff, is accepted in its present form by the Department of Church History and Doctrine in the College of Religious Instruction of Brigham Young University as satisfying the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

(Completion Date)

Russell R. Rich, Committee Chairman)

Howard H. Barron, Committee Member

(LaMar C. Berrett, Department Chairman)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Definition of Terms	4
	Method of Procedure	6
2.	THE HISTORY OF EARLY UTAH MERCHANDISING	8
3.	THE BOYCOTT OF 1866	19
	Gentile Merchants and Brigham Young Exchange Letters	19
	Exorbitant Prices	22
	Johnston's Army	28
	The "Assassination" of Two Gentiles	40
	Land Jumping	47
	The Union Vedette	55
	Reaction to the Boycott	64
4.	THE BOYCOTT OF 1868	71
	Causes of the Boycott	76
	The Railroad	77
	The Salt Lake Daily Reporter	79
	Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution	84
	Effects of the Boycott	85
5.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	91
BIBLIOG	GRAPHY	96

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Smith, founder of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints (commonly known as the LDS Church or Mormon Church), said, "I calculate to be one of the instruments of setting up the kingdom of Daniel by the word of the Lord, and I intend to lay a foundation that will revolutionize the whole world." According to Hyrum L. Andrus, Joseph envisioned the kingdom of Daniel, included in the dispensation of the gospel restored through him, to be more than the true religion alone—it was to include religion, politics, and economics in its government and was to be so complete that it would make the Mormons independent "... of every encumbrance beneath the celestial Kingdom. ..."

In the viewpoint of Klaus Hansen, the Saints, after being forced out of Illinois, chose to come to Utah because it was a Mexican, not a U.S., territory at that time. They could therefore be free to establish a kingdom dependent upon no one but themselves and the Lord. Hansen disclaims the popular notion that the civil government was created

¹Joseph Smith, <u>History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints</u>, ed. <u>B. H. Roberts (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1950)</u>, VI, 365.

²Hyrum L. Andrus, <u>Joseph Smith and World Government</u> (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1962), p. 1.

³Smith, op. cit., p. 269.

because the Gentiles needed a civil magistrate. Had the Gentiles never come to Utah, Brigham Young still would have established a civil government upon precedents established by Joseph Smith in 1844.

Amasa Lyman, a member of both the Council of Twelve Apostles and Council of Fifty, ⁵ assisted in making plans for the Saints to leave Nauvoo, Illinois, and in formulating the civil government of Utah. His following statement made in 1856 supports Hansen's position:

Why did the Lord want us to leave Jackson county? It was because he could not build up his kingdom there--there was not room. Why were we driven from Nauvoo? For the same reason--the kingdom of God could not be built up there. Bro. Amasa, do you think the Saints will ever be driven from these valleys? I say, I do not think we shall. Why? Because of the very reason for which we were driven before. We are now in a place where we can build up the kingdom of God, but we never were before. Could we ever have obtained a state government or an independent organization in Missouri, or Illinois? No, because such organizations already existed there. Here, no such organizations existed--here was room--a vacant place. We are the settlers here, we are the people, and the laws of the United States authorize or permit us to be organized as an independent state or government, which organization as I said before we could not receive in the states, because they were already organized.6

This statement reflects the independence that Joseph Smith envisioned would characterize the Kingdom.

⁴Klaus F. Hansen, "The Metamorphosis of the Kingdom of God," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought (Autumn, 1966), I, 69.

The Council of Fifty, according to John D. Lee, an intimate friend of Brigham Young, was "the municipal department of the Kingdom of God set up on the Earth, from which all law eminates, for the rule, government & controle of all Nations, Kingdoms & toungs [sic] and People under the whole Heavens but not to controle [sic] the Priesthood but to council, deliberate & plan for the general good & upbuilding of the Kingdom of God on earth." A Mormon Chronicle: The Diaries of John D. Lee, 1848-1876, ed. Robert Glass Cleland and Juanita Brooks (San Marino, California, 1955), I, 80, quoted in Dialogue (Autumn, 1966), I, 65.

⁶Parowan Historical Record of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (September 14, 1856), p. 18, located in Church Historian's Office.

Because of the way Mormons believed and acted in relation to their doctrine of the kingdom of God, anti-Mormons had mercilessly driven them from their homes on several occasions in the past. In order to remove themselves from their persecutors and other encumbrances which might prevent them from building the Kingdom, the Saints sought geographical isolation by settling in Utah in 1847. However, the California Gold Rush of 1849 significantly affected the Mormons thereit helped to bring a rather quick end to Mormon isolation. Thousands of Gentiles passed through Salt Lake City on their way to the gold fields. Some remained in the city without continuing their quest; a number of others returned and settled there after the Gold Rush.

Conflict between the Mormons and the Gentiles commenced almost immediately. The Gentiles felt the Mormons had a theocratic government which controlled both church and state; the Mormons felt the Gentiles were encroaching upon the benefits of the community which they had built from an essentially barren desert.

Statement of the Problem

Mormon Church leaders believed that the Gentile merchants were a significant cause of the Mormon-Gentile conflict. To defend themselves against the merchants, in 1865 Church leaders began instructing the Saints to cease buying from the anti-Mormon merchants. In 1868, when the transcontinental railroad was about to reach Utah, the Church leaders felt the need to expand the boycott in order to protect the Mormon establishment from being weakened by a flood of Gentiles and a large quantity of low-quality merchandise expected to be brought by the railroad. The boycott expansion included all Gentile merchants,

whether or not they were anti-Mormon. The LDS Church then officially entered into merchandising by establishing Zion's Co-operative Mercantile Institution (ZCMI) which provided the Saintswith places from which to buy. As a complement to the boycott, Church leaders expected the Saints to trade exclusively with ZCMI. This policy of mercantile co-operation partially fulfilled its objective but served to widen the gap and intensify the conflict between Mormons and Gentiles.

Purpose of the Study

A number of major histories and theses on the LDS Church during the Utah period well explain the reasons for and the development of ZCMI and the reason for the accompanying boycott of 1868. However, the Church actually boycotted anti-Mormon merchants earlier than 1868. The reasons for the earlier boycott have been essentially unexplained. Furthermore, there are some minor reasons for the 1868 boycott which will be appropriate to explain. This study will, therefore, endeavor to explain the principal reasons for the Mormon boycott of Gentile merchants from 1865 to 1869.

<u>Definition of Terms</u>

Mormon Church. The term "Mormon Church," in reference to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, was commonly used by non-members because of their association of the Church with its Book of Mormon. Members, or Latter-day Saints, were therefore called Mormons. The Church soon unofficially accepted the name; consequently, when used, the name should be regarded as unofficial. While there seems to be an effort in the Church to emphasize its official name, the unofficial name will be used because of its popularity during the time

covered in this study. The term "LDS Church" will be used alternately. The term "Saint" will be used synonymously with the term "Mormon."

Gentile. Before 1900 Mormons commonly used the name "Gentile" to designate non-Mormons. Generally, no negative connotation was associated with the name. Some Gentiles were pro-Mormon; others, anti-Mormon. In this study, the term usually refers to anti-Mormons.

Church leader. In general usage, a church leader is anyone who is selected to preside over a congregation of church members or the Church as a whole. In this study, the term will refer only to the latter--that is, members of the First Presidency or Quorum of Twelve Apostles, two of the presiding quorums of the LDS Church.

The boycott of 1866. As was stated earlier, in 1865 relations between the Mormons and certain Gentile merchants became so strained that LDS Church leaders asked the Saints to boycott the businesses of anti-Mormon merchants. This request meant that no Mormon was to buy from anti-Mormon merchants. Conflict between Mormons and Gentile merchants intensified significantly during 1866 until on December 20 of that year a number of merchants sent an open letter to the LDS Church leaders, via the Salt Lake Telegraph, requesting that the Church buy them out so they could leave Utah and end the conflict. On December 22 and 23, Young responded to the merchants' letter. In so doing, he declined their offer and made the boycott more emphatic and definite than ever before, for reasons he thought justified. The boycott of 1866 is defined, then, as that boycott, levied against anti-Mormon merchants, which came to a head on December 20 through December 23.

The boycott of 1868. This boycott was initiated in a general conference of the LDS Church on October 6 through 8, 1868, and is defined as an expansion of the 1866 boycott to include all Gentile merchants, whether or not they were anti-Mormon.

Method of Procedure

A background on Mormon mercantile co-operation was obtained through studying general and prominent works on Mormon history in Utah, including B. H. Robert's <u>Comprehensive History of the Church</u>, Leonard Arrington's <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>, Hubert H. Bancroft's <u>History of Utah</u>, and Orson F. Whitney's History of Utah.

The sources from which the principal information was obtained for this study were Salt Lake City pro- and anti-Mormon newspapers and the <u>Journal of Discourses</u>, which contains speeches of LDS Church leaders. Pro-Mormon newspapers included the <u>Deseret News</u> and the <u>Salt Lake Telegraph</u>; anti-Mormon newspapers included the <u>Union Vedette</u> and the <u>Salt Lake Daily Reporter</u>. These newspapers, indispensable sources of information for this study, gave accounts of both Mormons and Gentiles who justified themselves and condemned the other for merchandising procedures.

Writings of some who organized the Godbeite or New Movement, a group who apostatized from the LDS Church in 1869 partly because of that church's economic policy, were consulted. These writings included T. B. H. Stenhouse's <u>Rocky Mountain Saints</u> and Edward Tullidge's History of Salt Lake and Tullidge's Quarterly Magazine.

Other miscellaneous sources were consulted for whatever information they might contribute. They include such works as Joseph Dwyer's

The Gentile Comes to Utah, R. N. Baskin's <u>Reminiscence of Early Utah</u>, J. H. Beadle's <u>Life in Utah</u>, and Stanley Ivin's Notebooks and Transcripts on microfilm at Utah State University library.

The information for this study was obtained from the libraries of the following institutions: LDS Church Historian's Office; University of Utah, Salt Lake City; Utah State University, Logan; Brigham Young University, Provo; University of California, Berkeley; and Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

Chapter 2

THE HISTORY OF EARLY UTAH MERCHANDISING

In order for the Mormons to establish the kingdom of God, they felt they must be economically independent from the world. Therefore, Deseret News editorials and speeches by Church leaders during the 1950s through the 1970s stressed the need for the Saints to manufacture their own supplies of all types, in order for them to become a self-sustaining people. The first Deseret News editorial that the writer found on the subject appeared January 14, 1852. It said in part:

. . . what is most needed now, at the present moment, the present year, by the Saints, to bring about this most desirable of all objects, a celestial salvation, or eternal happiness? We answer, without hesitation, domestic manufactures, homemade goods, implements, materials, and useables of all kinds that we cannot do without. . . .

There is scarcely a thing that can be named, which is indispensably necessary for our growing Territory, but that can be produced by our own industry within one year. . . .

If we go on as we have done, multiplying our obligations to the merchants, without means to pay, we are a ruined people.

Brigham Young said that he looked forward to the near future when, he hoped, the Saints would be able to sustain themselves. He encouraged them to prepare to produce all of the grain, vegetables, fruit, and clothing they would need, thus eliminating the need to import from the states and purchase from the local Gentiles. ¹

The Church leaders encouraged the Saints through the 1970s to

¹Brigham Young, <u>Journal of Discourses</u> (London: Latter-day Saints Book Depot), IX, 32.

Mews, sugar, iron, lead, cotton, silk, and wine. Despite the encouragement, however, home industry never did succeed in making the Saints independent. Theoretically, they were to depend upon the world only for those essentials which they simply could not produce themselves; otherwise, independence would be crippled. In the first few years of the settlement of Salt Lake City, therefore, the Mormons essentially ignored commercial trading and importing as occupations. In fact, Edward W. Tullidge states that for a Mormon "to become a merchant was to antagonize the Church and her policies" and that "it was almost illegitimate for Mormon men of enterprising character to enter into mercantile pursuits." This disregard for merchandising allowed the Gentiles to monopolize the business; that monopoly, in turn, significantly contributed to the commercial conflict which eventually resulted.

Evidentily, the first merchant who came to Salt Lake City for business was Captain John Grant, from Fort Hall located near Pocatello, Idaho. Young reported that he arrived during early December, 1847. After discussing his plans with President Young, Grant sent a letter to the directors of the Hudson's Bay Company to apparently order supplies. The following November, almost a year later, Grant arrived back in Salt Lake City ". . . with some pack horses, laden with skins, groceries and other goods, and opened a store . . . on the south side of Old Fort." A

²Edward W. Tullidge, <u>History of Salt Lake City</u> (Salt Lake City: Star Printing Co., 1886), p. 384.

³William L. Knecht and Peter L. Crawley (comp.), <u>History of Brigham Young 1847-1867</u> (Berkeley, 1964), p. 12.

⁴Ibid., p. 26.

His prices were high--evidenced by the fact that he sold coffee for one dollar a pint. Apparently, he would have charged more but took pity on the destitution of the Saints. 5

Of the itinerant, or temporary, merchants who did business in Salt Lake City from 1849 to 1851, Leonard Arrington reports three of the more important ones: the Pomeroy brothers, Louis Vasques, and John and Enoch Reese. Many overland merchants remained in Salt Lake City during the fall and winter before continuing on to California. They erected make-shift stands along the streets and even peddled their goods from door to door. Thus, merchandising was introduced into Salt Lake City, irregular, unorganized, and unsystematic as it was.

Some Gentiles who stayed through the winter joined the Church.

Most were sincere in their conversion, but a few were not and took
advantage of the Saints before deserting Salt Lake City the next spring.

In reporting this fact, Young added that while California emigrants
rested in the city, many wrote:

Livingston and Kinkead were the first permanent and orthodox merchants who came to the Salt Lake Valley. Arriving with \$20,000 in merchandise, they established business in an adobe house--one of the

⁵Kate B. Carter (comp.), <u>Heart Throbs of the West</u> (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1943), IV, 246.

⁶Leonard J. Arrington, <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u> (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1962), p. 81.

⁷Knecht and Crawley, op. cit., p. 66.

largest and most conveniently located in the city--which belonged to John Pack. ⁸ They were succeeded in 1850 by William H. Hooper who operated a business for Holliday and Warner. Hooper was later converted to the Church, thus becoming one of the few Mormon merchants in business in the fifties.

The California Gold Rush of 1849 was a great boon to the Saints. Strategically located between the States and the gold mining communities of California, Salt Lake City was called the "half-way house," where thousands of emigrants traveling to the gold fields stopped for rest and supply replenishment. At the onset of the gold rush, the Saints, in the midst of a famine, were destitute. Only three-fourths of a pound of food was allotted each person per day. Many dug roots as did the Indians; others "took the hides of animals which covered the roofs of their houses, and cut them up and cooked them." Their supply of clothing and hardware was no better.

In the midst of this poverty, Heber C. Kimball, first counselor to Brigham Young, publicly prophesied:

... to the astonishment of the congregation ... that "states goods" should be sold in the streets of Salt Lake City as cheap as in New York, and that the people should be abundantly provided with clothing. 11

Because the Saints profited so heavily from the first emigrants who

⁸Orson F. Whitney, <u>History of Utah</u> (Salt Lake City, 1893), II, 354.

⁹Hubert Howe Bancroft, <u>History of Utah</u> (San Francisco, 1890), p. 299.

¹⁰Edward W. Tullidge, <u>Life of Brigham Young: or, Utah and Her</u> Founders (New York, 1876), pp. 202-203.

 $^{^{11}}$ Ibid.

passed through Salt Lake City enroute to California, they believed that these travelers fulfilled Kimball's prophecy.

The emigrants, from whom the Saints profited, had hoped to obtain handsome profits by providing the California gold miners with necessary commodities; however, just before reaching Salt Lake City, they received news that ships bringing imports from various parts of the world had already reached California and would adequately supply the miners. Having journeyed too far from the States to wisely return with their goods, the emigrants abandoned them in the vicinity of Salt Lake City. Howard Stansbury, an explorer for the Corporation of Topographical Engineers, reported:

The road has been literally strewn with articles that have been thrown away. Bar-iron and steel, large blacksmiths' anvils and bellows, crowbars, drills, augers, goldwashers, chisels, axes, lead, trunks, spades, ploughs, large grindstones, baking-ovens, cooking stoves without number, kegs, barrels, harness, clothing, bacon, and beans were found along the road in pretty much the order in which they have been here enumerated. 12

In addition to goods collected along the roadside, the Saints profited from those bartered from the emigrants. One newspaper reported that "almost every article, except sugar and coffee, is selling on an average, fifty per cent below wholesale prices in eastern cities." 13

Business began to boom in the valley after the Gold Rush.

According to J. H. Beadle, editor of the <u>Utah Reporter</u> and Utah correspondent of the <u>Cincinnati Commercial</u>, Livingston and Kinkead reportedly sold \$10,000 worth of merchandise on their first day of

Howard Stansbury, An Expedition to the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah (Philadelphia, 1852), p. 63, quoted in Arrington, op. cit., p. 70.

¹³ Frontier Guardian (Kanesville, Iowa), September 15, 1849, quoted in Arrington, op. cit., p. 68.

business. 14 That amount was substantiated by George A. Smith, an apostle at that time. 15 These figures indicate how hungry the Saints were for those commodities unavailable to them in their isolation.

Many who were unable to enter the store because it was over-crowded "thrust their money through the windows." ¹⁶ On one occasion, a man who could not get near the counter because of the crowd allegedly held his roll of money above his head, telling the clerks not to forget they had promised to save him certain preordered materials. ¹⁷ Livingston and Kinkead allegedly did two or three thousand dollars worth of business per day until they sold out in 1858. ¹⁸

Even more amazing were the first-day profits of Gilbert & Gerrish, a later firm. They reportedly sold \$17,000 worth of merchandise in a single day. Brigham Young suggested that \$500,000 had been drained from the Saints into the hands of the Gentile merchants between 1849 and 1852. Therefore, it appears that the effects of the Gold Rush were both an advantage and a disadvantage--while it provided the Saints with desperately needed supplies, it also drained them of their

¹⁴J. H. Beadle, <u>Life in Utah</u>; or the Mysteries and Crimes of <u>Mormonism</u> (Philadelphia: National Publishing Co.), p. 122.

¹⁵Young, op. cit., XIII, 122.

¹⁶ Sarah Hollister Harris, <u>An Unwritten Chapter of Salt Lake</u> 1851-1901 (New York, 1901), p. 32, located in Church Historian's Office.

¹⁷James H. Martineau, "Pioneer Sketches: A Journey in 1854," The Contributor (1890), XI, 183, quoted in Arrington, op. cit., p. 82.

¹⁸Arrington, op. cit., p. 82.

¹⁹Beadle, op. cit., p. 199.

²⁰Young, op. cit., I, 52.

badly needed cash. The United States Treasury Department reported:

In 1849 Livingston and Kinkead brought a large assortment of goods to Salt Lake City, and on the first day after opening took in all the circulating medium in the city. This was mostly in gold coin. 21

The most critical disadvantage of the Gold Rush, however, was the significant influx of Gentile merchants who came to Salt Lake City because of the great profits in trading. This influx of merchants opened the door to a rather steady flow of Gentiles into Utah; the flow, in turn, proved to be an insurmountable obstacle to the Mormons' efforts for independence and seclusion.

Brigham Young listed twenty-two merchants and firms established by 1854, all of whom were prospering. 22 The Millennial Star listed two more, the combined capital of the twenty-four amounting to more than one million dollars. 23 Nevertheless, the community was hurting for merchandise. Apparently, the twenty-four merchants could supply only a trifle of the needed goods; for, when Solomon N. Carvalho visited the valley in 1853 with John Charles Fremont's exploring party, he reported that he was clad in tattered garments which he had worn for six months while journeying across the Rocky Mountains. He tried in every store in the city to buy a pair of black pants or a broadcloth coat, but none

²¹S. G. Brock, Report of the Treasury Department (1890), p. 860, cited by Arden Beal Olsen, "The History of Mormon Mercantile Cooperation in Utah," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California, 1935), p. 12, copy located in Brigham Young University library.

²²Knecht and Crawley, op. cit., p. 149.

^{23&}lt;u>Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star</u> (Liverpool), XVI, 733, 799, quoted by Andrew Love Neff in <u>History of Utah 1847 to 1869</u> (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1940), p. 337.

could furnish them.²⁴

Fortunately, time improved the situation, substantially. In 1864 the <u>Salt Lake Telegraph</u> described the mercantile business as being very healthy:

The changes in Main Street have been going on with great rapidity; every foot of ground seems to be claimed for commercial purposes. The sound of the chisel and hammer falls upon the ear from every direction. In a few weeks that street will be crowded with merchandise and will present an appearance of a metropolitan mart. 25

Twelve merchants and "a host of others" were reported to be waiting for substantial shipments which would very adequately supply the population. 26

The isolation of Salt Lake City made it difficult and frequently impossible for the Saints to obtain many of the necessities and, essentially, all of the luxuries available in the East. Thus the shortage of merchandise indicated by Carvalho prevailed for some time. Moreover, it was very difficult and dangerous to deliver supplies to the remote city. This news item is somewhat indicative of the danger involved: "... Jessing's train, in charge of W. Granger, arrived yesterday. He lost twenty-three mules and had one man wounded by the Indians."²⁷

After the Gold Rush subsided, many merchants who had done business with the gold miners turned to Salt Lake City to continue

²⁴Solomon Nunes Carvalho, <u>Incidents of Travel and Adventure in</u> the Far West (New York, 1857), p. 155.

 $^{^{25}}$ As cited in Watters, op. cit., p. 30.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷The Sa<u>lt Lake City Daily Telegraph</u>, August 21, 1864.

their trade. According to one observation, most of the Gentiles in Salt Lake City prior to 1867 were Jewish merchants. Among the earliest to arrive were Nicholas Siegfried Ransohoff, Samuel and Emanuel Kahn, the well-known Auerbach brothers, the Siegel brothers, the Cohn brothers, and the Watter brothers.

The emphasis of the Mormon Church on home manufacturing, their avoidance of merchandising as a business, and the isolation of Salt Lake City made the city a virtual merchants' paradise. These conditions account for the influx of Gentile traders which marked the beginning of the end of isolation for the Mormons. The Saints then had to deal with the inevitable opposition arising from Gentiles living in a community where they, the Saints, were trying to build the kingdom of God. Opposition was inevitable because the Gentiles maintained that Church leaders overstepped their authority by directing the community in secular affairs. This, the "supposed" violation of the sacred American tradition of church and state separation, the Gentiles could not tolerate.

An example of Gentile misinterpretation of the involvement of Mormon Church leaders in secular affairs is given in the case of Perry E. Brocchus who was sent to Salt Lake City in 1851 as a federally appointed judge. He functioned but a very short time before withdrawing from his assignment and returning East. Chief Justice Lemuel Brandebury

²⁸Stanley Ivins, Notebooks and Transcripts Manuscript Collection, IV, Notebook 16, p. 62, microfilm located in Utah State University library.

For short biographical sketches, see Leon L. Watters, <u>The Pioneer Jews of Utah</u> (New York: American Jewish Historical Society, 1952), pp. 16-17.

and Secretary of the Territory, Broughton Harris, also federal appointees accompanied Brocchus in his exodus. The reason for their leaving was, to say the least, incompatibility with the Saints. They informed Washington that the Mormon Church was:

the property, and even the lives of its members; usurping and exercising the functions of legislation and the judicial business of the Territory; organizing and commanding the military; disposing of the public lands, upon its own terms; coining money, stamped with "Holiness to the Lord," and forcing its circulation at a standard fifteen or twenty per centum above its real value; openly sanctioning and defending the practice of polygamy or plurality of wives; exacting the tenth part of everything from its members, under the name of tithing, and enormous taxes, from citizens, to members; penetrating and supervising the social and business circles; and inculcating, and requiring, as an article of religious faith, implicit obedience to the councils of "the Church," as paramount to all the obligations of morality, society, allegiance, and of law.30

Though exaggerated, this report was nevertheless indicative of the feelings of other anti-Mormons in Salt Lake City. Part of the misunderstanding by the Gentiles was due to their interpreting the attitude of the Mormons toward many federal officers to be their attitude toward the country as a whole. Mormons were "down" on some federal officers because, among other reasons, they had petitioned the President and Congress in 1840 for redress of property lost at the hands of anti-Mormon mobs in Missouri; but no redress was given. The Saints felt their denial for redress was due to the irresponsibility of federal officers in bringing about justice. Young therefore said, "I love the government and the Constitution of the United States, but I do not love the d---- rascals who administer the government." 31

³⁰Neff, op. cit., pp. 174-175.

³¹ History of Brigham Young, MS., September 8, 1851, pp. 61-64, cited by B. H. Roberts, <u>A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus</u>

This misunderstanding caused serious conflict between the Saints and Gentiles in Utah. Of course, the conflict, political in nature, stemmed from the ideas of Joseph Smith that the kingdom of God should be independent of all forces under heaven. This political conflict also laid the foundation for an economic conflict yet to erupt. Since the Gentile merchants were of the earliest and most significant forces to oppose the Mormon establishment in Salt Lake City, it was they against whom the Church erected their first official protective defense. The defense took the form of a boycott, enacted in 1866, against trading with anti-Mormon merchants. The cause and effects of this boycott are discussed in Chapter 3.

Christ of Latter-day Saints (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1965), p. 86.

Chapter 3

THE BOYCOTT OF 1866

Chapter 2 considered the early development of merchandising in Salt Lake City and explained why the city's isolation made it a merchants' paradise, attracting significant numbers of merchants. Evidence indicated that this influx of merchants marked the decline of Mormon isolation. Gentile charges alleging that Mormon Church leaders were running both the church and state increased conflict between the two groups.

This chapter will discuss five community problems, four of which were unrelated in and of themselves to merchandising but nevertheless, led to the boycott of 1866.

Gentile Merchants and Brigham Young Exchange Letters

In December of 1866, Gentile merchants representing twenty-three Salt Lake City firms sent an open letter to the leaders of the Church. The letter, published in the pro-Mormon Salt Lake Telegraph, proposed the following:

To the leaders of the Mormon Church, Gentlemen: -As you are instructing the people of Utah, through your Bishops and missionaries, not to trade or do any business with the Gentile merchants, thereby intimidating and coercing the community to purchase only of such merchants as belong to your faith and persuasion, in anticipation of such a crisis being successfully brought about by your teachings, the undersigned Gentile merchants of Great Salt Lake City respectfully desire to make you the following proposition, believing it to be your earnest desire for all to leave the country that do not belong to your faith and creed, namely: on the fulfillment of the conditions herein named,--first--the payment of our outstanding accounts owing us by members of your

church; secondly--all of our goods, merchandise, chattels, houses, improvements, etc., to be taken at a cash valuation, and we to make a deduction of twenty-five per cent from total amount. To the fulfillment of the above we hold ourselves ready at any time to enter into negotiations, and on final arrangements being made and terms of sale complied with we shall freely leave the territory. 1

The following day, Brigham Young answered the letter though his response was not printed in the Descret News until January 2, 1867. Young stated that Church leaders would not be responsible for collecting the merchants' outstanding debts nor buying out their discounted goods. Such action would allow them to "make more money than any merchants have ever done in this country." Brigham Young maintained this statement because the merchants allegedly made such high mark-ups on merchandise costs. The merchants were free to stay or leave as they pleased. Young claimed Church leaders neither had nor would use coercion in having the Saints cease their trading with any Gentile merchant even were it possible. Furthermore, no effort had been made to ostracise any person because of religious differences, for such efforts were antagonistic to the Mormon faith. Young alleged that those who had dealt fairly with the Saints had found friendship and acceptance in the community.

But Young went on to say:

There is a class, however, who are doing business in the territory, who for years have been the avowed enemies of this community. The disrupture and overthrow of the community have been the objects which they have pertinaciously sought to accomplish. They have, therefore, used every energy and all the means at their command to put into circulation the foulest slanders about the old citizens. As missionaries of evil, there have been no arts too base, no stratagems too vile for them to use to bring about their nefarious ends. While soliciting the patronage of the people, and deriving their support from them, they have, in the most shameless and abandoned manner, used the means thus obtained to destroy the very people whose favor they found it to their interest to court. They have done all in their power to encourage violation of law, to retard the administration of justice, to foster vice and vicious

 $^{^{1}}$ Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, December 20, 1866.

institutions, to oppose the unanimously expressed will of the people, to increase disorder, and to change our city from a condition of peace and quietude to lawlessness and anarchy. They have donated liberally to sustain a corrupt and venal press, which has given publicity to the most atrocious libels respecting the old citizens.

And have they not had their emissaries in Washington to misrepresent and vilify the gospel of this territory? Have they not kept liquor and surreptitiously sold it in violation of law, and endeavored to bias the minds of the judiciary to give decisions favorable to their own practices? Have they not entered into secret combinations to resist the laws and to thwart their healthy operation and refused to pay their taxes and to give the support to schools required by law?

What claims can such persons have upon the patronage of this community? And what community on the earth would be so besotted as to uphold and foster men whose aim is to destroy them? Have we not the right to trade at whatever store we please? Or does the Constitution of the United States bind us to enter the stores of our deadliest enemies and purchase of them? If so, we should like that provision pointed out to us. It is to these men whom I have described, and to these alone that I am opposed, and I am determined to use my influence to have the citizens here stop dealing with them and deal with honorable men.²

The motives of those who signed the open letter to the Church leaders have been variously interpreted, depending on one's point of view. The Gentiles held that the letter should be taken at face value, believing that sincere Gentiles wanted to end the long conflict with the Mormon Church and were thus willing to relinquish Salt Lake to its founders by proposing a realistic business offer. The Mormons thought the signers had ulterior motives of damaging the Church: If the merchants of twenty-three firms concertedly closed their businesses and left the territory, it would seem to be a verification of the false reports, previously sent to Washington, claiming that the Mormon Church would not allow Gentiles to live in the territory. Furthermore, the merchants would control the situation if Church leaders accepted the proposition; for, if the Church leaders did not agree to the valuation

²Deseret News, January 2, 1867.

the merchants affixed, the latter could proclaim loud and far the untrustworthy dealings of the Church. In light of this situation,

B. H. Roberts wrote that "the Gentile merchants were scarcely complimentary to the intelligence of Brigham Young." 3

The ills which caused the boycott had long been building up steam. Brigham Young's recounting of these ills, to reiterate, asserted that anti-Mormons had circulated the "foulest slanders" about the Saints, resorted to "vile" and "base" "stratagems" to "bring about their nefarious ends," used business profits gained from the Saints to destroy them, encouraged "violation of the law," fostered "vice and vicious institutions," and sustained "a corrupt and venal press."

Though Young's statement was very general, this writer proposes that there were essentially five specific causes of the boycott:

(1) the exorbitant prices which Gentile merchants allegedly charged the Saints, (2) the coming of Johnston's army to Utah in 1857, (3) the murders of Newton Brassfield and J. King Robinson, (4) land jumping, and (5) the publishing of the <u>Union Vedette</u>. The remainder of this chapter will discuss the developmental history of these specifics and how they worked together to bring about the boycott.

Exorbitant Prices

From the beginning, Mormon Church leaders recognized and accepted the right of Gentile merchants to operate in the valley. According to the Description and to public speeches, the Church

³B. H. Roberts, <u>A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints</u> (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1965), V, 514-515.

leaders were not opposed to the operation of Gentile businesses even though Church members complained that the prices charged were exorbitant. In fact, a <u>Deseret News</u> editorial mildly censured the Saints for finding fault with the prices of Gentile merchandise. The editorial said nothing about the merchants who were charging the alleged unfair prices.

Find fault with yourselves, if you must find fault, and not with them. They have come here, as all honorable men have a right . . . and it is not your prerogative to find fault with them

Don't blame the merchants for your foolery. They tell you what they will do and they are honorable men, compared with yourselves; for like the lawyer they tell you honestly what they came among you for, to do good and make money. . . . 4

And Brigham Young said, "I find no fault with the merchants, for they came here to gather gold by the hundred weight." 5

Livingston said that he charged the Mormons as much for his merchandise as his conscience would allow him, implying that his prices were high but could have been higher. But George A. Smith, first counselor to Brigham Young, said that Livingston's firm was "an honorable business house" and Brigham Young said of it:

. . . to their credit be it known that they never raised above their regular price on an article even when they had all there was in the market, never kept incorrect accounts, nor even failed to deal as fairly with a child or a person ignorant of value and price, as with the most knowing and influential, and it is no more than just that this conduct be remembered, and the people

⁴Deseret News, January 24, 1852.

⁵Young, op. cit., I, 52.

⁶Sarah Hollister Harris, <u>An Unwritten Chapter of Salt Lake</u> 1851-1901 (New York: Printed Privately, 1901), p. 33.

Young, op. cit., XIII, 122.

stand by those who have been tried, and found to deal fairly . . . 8

It seems that while Brigham Young found little fault with the merchants prices, he was concerned with unwise Saints who paid those prices. In 1852 he told the Saints assembled in conference that he knew they had paid \$300,000 into Gentile stores in the last half year. Further, he knew that gold and silver had been transported by the boxesfull from the valley to the East, and that "there is not a span of mules that could be found in this valley, able to draw the money, if it were all in silver, to the states, that this people have spent with these merchants within a few months past." Two years after the Descret News had mildly censured the Saints for complaining about the cost of Gentile merchandise, Brigham Young discouraged the Saints from buying from those who charged exorbitant prices. 10

Toward the end of the fifties, Church leaders themselves became alarmed with the prices of Gentile merchandise. Heber C. Kimball, counselor to Brigham Young, expressed his desire that the merchants increase their trade by bringing even as much as two thousand wagons full of merchandise into the valley. He believed this would flood the markets and force merchants to cut prices by two-thirds. Nevertheless, Brigham Young allowed Gentile merchants their complete rights, inherent within the free-enterprise system, to establish their businesses.

⁸Deseret News, September 28, 1854.

⁹Young, op. cit., I, 216.

¹⁰Deseret News, September 28, 1854.

¹¹Young, op. cit., VII, 233.

He seemed to have no resentment toward them until he felt they took advantage of the Mormon people. For example, Frederick H. Auerbach came to Salt Lake in 1864 to open a business. He discussed his plans with Brigham Young, expressing his desire to work with, rather than against, the Saints. Young reciprocated by assisting Auerbach in finding a suitable location for his business. They found a one-room building on Main Street occupied by a carpenter. Young asked the carpenter to move to the rear of the building since he could conduct his trade just as well there. Moreover, he had the carpenter make shelves for Auerbach's merchandise. ¹²

Church leaders resented Gentile merchants for two reasons: They felt the merchants were exploiting the Saints and causing very scarce, and therefore precious, cash to flow from Mormon to Gentile hands and subsequently out of the valley. Heber C. Kimball warned:

I will here give you merchants a little advice. Let our people have your goods at a reasonable price, and don't have a dozen different prices for the same article in your stores. If you will pursue this course, you will gain confidence and secure custom; but if you don't, you will lose it, for we shall turn merchants ourselves. 13

Kimball was perhaps the most outspoken against Gentile merchants.

Charles L. Walker reported that he heard him in a Sunday speech pronounce a curse upon Livingston and Kinkead for their plans to destroy the Saints. 14

When the Gentile merchants ignored the counsel of the Mormon Church leaders, the first organized attempt was made by the Saints

¹²Carter, op. cit., pp. 273-274.

¹³Young, op. cit., VII, 233.

¹⁴Ivins, op. cit., II, notebook 8, p. 74.

on July 11, 1860, to combat high prices and monopoly of Gentile trade. Twenty-two prominent Mormons, headed by William H. Hooper, met together and formulated plans to establish a Mormon business organization that would import merchandise and sell it at much lower prices than the Saints were heretofore able to obtain it. The Saints, themselves, could buy shares in the company, thus enabling the profits to be shared with the Mormon community. The group had considerable faith in the plan and presented it confidently to Brigham Young. However, he rejected it on the grounds that, among other reasons, it was not part of building the Kingdom. But as Church leaders became more and more concerned about prices which Gentile merchants were charging, Brigham Young instructed the Saints in October of 1865 to freight the commodities they needed from the states with their own teams. Where freighting was impractical on an individual basis due to capital shortage, he suggested that the Saints form partnerships, where possible, with other honest Church members for freighting purposes. 15 Furthermore, Young informed local Church leaders and influential members to see that honest Saints, who had the interests of the Kingdom at heart, establish themselves in merchandising in each community. He cared not how much these men made as long as they did not take advantage of the Saints and used their money wisely. 16 Brigham Young reiterated previous instructions given by the Church leaders to the effect that the Saints were to sustain themselves by furnishing their own needed supplies rather than continuing to depend upon the Gentiles. Particularly, they were to cease buying from

¹⁵Young, op. cit., XI, 139.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 140.

anti-Mormons altogether. His belief that God willed this type of independence served to emphatically reinforce this policy. "... never admit," he said, "of a store being started in your neighborhood again that you cannot control." How? "By never spending a dollar with any who will not aid in developing the country and in building it up." He held that the Mormon economy was suffering because most Gentile merchants lived in Utah only temporarily, having their permanent homes outside the territory. This arrangement drained capital from the LDS communities. The problem was that the Gentiles were not using the capital for community development, 18 but, in some cases, for the destruction of the Mormon Church. This problem will be discussed later.

Moreover, the Gentiles were counteracting the efforts of the Mormon Church to make Utah a state. Brigham Young claimed that these anti-Mormons would "bark, and yelp, and growl, and snarl" until pro-Mormon Gentiles dared not voice their support for Utah's statehood for fear of consequential wrath of other Gentiles. In fact, some Gentiles in Congress desired statehood for Utah but dared not disclose it, believing that such disclosure would bring political doom. "We have to preserve ourselves," Brigham Young declared, "for our enemies are determined to destroy us." The adopted method of preservation was simply for the Saints to do their own merchandising instead of pouring their money into the laps of the merchants who were their enemies. 19

That the Saints made efforts in the general direction ${\tt Brigham}$

¹⁷Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 139-140.

¹⁹Ibid.

Young had suggested is evident from an editorial of the <u>Union Vedette</u>, an anti-Mormon newspaper in Salt Lake City during that time. The paper reported that it had been informed that ward bishops had met for the purpose of, among other reasons, making "arrangements whereby trade could be concentrated and retained in the grasp of the Church leaders." The project, as the <u>Vedette</u> understood it, was "to purchase all the surplus provisions from the people as cheaply as possible and then to sell to outsiders on such terms as they may choose to dictate.²⁰

Alleged high prices were a principal contention between Mormons and Gentile merchants during the early fifties, and though there was talk of boycotting, Mormon-Gentile relations during this time were relatively calm. The conflict between Mormons and Gentiles gained momentum during the late fifties and continued to increase through the sixties. The previously specified causes of the conflict were, for the most part, quite unrelated to merchandising; nevertheless, they dwarfed the high-price issue as a cause of the 1866 boycott. The coming of Johnston's army to Utah was the first event to substantially strain Mormon-Gentile relations.

Johnston's Army

During the fifties, the Gentiles sent a number of reports to the federal government, claiming that the Mormon Church was tyrannical and corrupt. According to B. H. Roberts, former general authority and historian of the Mormon Church, two of these reports, one written by W. W. Drummond and the other by W. F. Magraw, culminated in the

²⁰The Daily Union Vedette, February 27, 1866, Editorial.

dispatching of Johnston's Army to Utah. 21 The respective background for these reports follows.

W. W. Drummond. Franklin Pierce appointed John F. Kinney as chief justice of Utah, with George P. Stiles and W. W. Drummond as associate justices. Mormons and Gentiles alike agreed that Drummond was a disgrace to his office. Some of the terms applied to him in a Millennial Star editorial were infamous scoundrel, "dastardly wretch," "beastly criminal," "horrible monster," "black-hearted judge," "poor wretch," "lying, adulterous, murderous fiend," and "loathsome specimen of humanity."²² Drummond deserted his financially needy wife and children in Illinois and picked up a prostitute in Washington, whom he introduced to the Saints as his wife. His deception was discovered, however, when Mormon correspondence with Drummond's real wife in Illinois verified his desertion. Thus the Saints learned that Drummond was living in adultery. They were incensed that he occasionally had his mistress sit with him on the legal bench. That Drummond rediculed Utah laws further incensed the Saints. In light of Drummond's history, the Saints were naturally even more irate when he condemned them for practicing polygamy.

In 1857 Drummond ostensibly left his residence in Utah valley to hold court in Carson valley. In reality he abandoned his post in Utah and went east. He mailed his resignation to Attorney-General

²¹Roberts, op. cit., IV, 215.

²²Norman F. Furniss, <u>The Mormon Conflict 1850-1859</u> (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 54 quoted from <u>The Millennial Star</u>, May 23, 1857.

Jeremiah S. Black, citing the following reasons for resigning:

- (1) The Mormons looked to Brigham Young for both their religious and political laws; therefore, congressional law was not binding upon them.
- (2) A secret organization existed among all male members of the Mormon Church for the express purpose of resisting laws of the United States and supporting only laws of the priesthood enacted by Brigham Young.
- (3) There were a number of men commissioned by the Church to take the lives and property of anyone questioning Church authority. (4)"... the federal officers of the territory were constantly insulted, harassed, and otherwise annoyed by the Mormons" without redress.
- (5) The Mormons daily attacked and slandered the federal government and its leaders, both living and dead. (6) The administration of the law in Utah favored Mormons over Gentiles; Captain John W. Gunnison and his party were murdered by Indians under Mormon direction; Mormons poisoned Judge Leoniadas Shaver, Drummond's predecessor; and Mormons murdered Almon W. Babbitt, secretary of the territory, under direction from Salt Lake City--he had not been killed by Indians as previously reported. ²³
- <u>W. M. F. Magraw</u>. W. M. F. Magraw and his partner J. M. Hockaday had contracted with the federal government to bring mail from the States to isolated Utah for \$50,000 a year. A <u>Deseret News</u> editorial indicated the Mormon attitude toward Hockaday and Magraw's mail service:

The miserable manner in which 50,000 isolated citizens of the United States are supplied with mail facilities is a disgrace to the government There is a gross injustice, miserable mismanagement, and the dead weight of foul corruption and fogyism

²³Roberts, op. cit., XXVI, 201-204.

somewhere, or such long standing and well known evils would be removed. 24

Almost a year after the publication of this editorial, the government still had not satisfied the Mormons by improving the mail service. Thus Mormon leaders organized the B. Y. Express and Carrying Company. Initially designed to carry passengers and mail between the western states and California, the company was later to be expanded according to customer demands. The federal government awarded the mail contract to the B. Y. Company for \$23,600 per year, only about half what Hockaday and Magraw received. Magraw reacted to his loss of contract by reporting to President James Buchanan that "There is left no vestige of law and order, no protection for life and property" in He claimed that the Mormon Church was exerting a more evil power of despotism than could be found in any other country and that the time was probably near when bloodshed, robbery and rapine would be practiced so indiscriminately that Utah would be reduced to the condition of a howling wilderness.²⁵ Referring to these two reports, B. H. Roberts says:

Roberts felt that these two communications were essentially responsible

²⁴Ibid., IV, 207-208.

No. 71, pp. 2-3, as cited in Roberts, op. cit., IV, 210-211.

²⁶Ibid.

for President James Buchanan's decision to send an army to Utah.

Ostensibly, then, Buchanan wanted to crush the "Mormon rebellion." 27

The reason for sending this expedition to Utah, however, was not so simple as merely crushing a rebellion. It appears that behind the scene, political competition enticed Buchanan to use the above reports as an excuse to send the army. Again, according to Roberts, even though the Mormon Church leaders urged the government to investigate the charges, Washington made no efforts to verify their accuracy. Probably Buchanan, himself, put very little stock in the reports²⁸ but sent the army anyway as a mere political gesture. It seemed necessary to show the nation that the Democratic party was unsympathetic to the Mormon cause, because the Republican party, created in 1856, had gained significant popularity with an anti-Mormon plank in its presidential platform of that year. The plank was to rid the nation of the twin relics of barbarism: polygamy and slavery. The Democrats had adopted squatter sovereignty--the doctrine that any state joining the Union could decide for itself whether to adopt slavery. The Republicans used the logic that if states could decide whether to condone slavery, then they could also decide whether to condone polygamy. logic was damaging to the Democrats because the Mormon Church, particularly with its doctrine of polygamy, was then highly unpopular in the nation. Therefore, Buchanan's action could be seen as a political maneuver designed to regain popularity--the crushing of the "Mormon rebellion" would show the nation that Democrats, too, were anti-Mormon.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 215-216.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 220-221.

The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed in February of 1848, gave the Mexican-owned land of Utah to the United States. In March of the following year, a convention was held to draft a constitution for the territory of Utah, and Brigham Young was elected governor.

According to Orson F. Whitney, historian and apostle of the Mormon Church, Young served well: trusted, loved, and obeyed by the Saints; not loved but accepted by the Gentiles. Prigham Young's acceptance is evidenced by the fact that many leading Gentiles united to petition the President of the United States for his reappointment as governor. The petition was reprinted in the Deseret News some time later, and the names of those who signed it included thirteen leading Salt Lake City merchants. The petition said that:

Brigham Young possesses the entire confidence of the people of this Territory, without distinction of party or sect--and from personal acquaintance and social intercourse we find him to be a firm supporter of the Constitution and laws of the United States and a tried pillar of Republican institution--and, having repeatedly listened to his remarks in private as well as in public assemblies, do know that he is the warm friend and able supporter of Constitutional liberty. 30

The petition also claimed that the above statement was true in spite of any rumors to the contrary which had been sent to the States that Young would be a better governor than "any other man" and that the "deepest feeling of sorrow and regret" would result if any other person were selected. 31

There was little conflict between Mormons and Gentiles before

²⁹Orson F. Whitney, <u>History of Utah</u> (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons Co., 1893), p. 535.

³⁰Deseret News, September 2, 1857.

³¹Ibid.

the late fifties; and, since Mormons were making the merchants wealthy by patronizing their businesses, the Mormons expected the merchants to reciprocate their good-will by correcting the slanderous reports which other Gentiles were sending to the nation. Neff suggests that "it was in recognition of this principle and obligation that merchants signed the petition to have Brigham Young reappointed to the governorship in 1854." 32

The merchants became upset, however, when the Brigham Young Express and Carrying Company was established. This company could transport merchandise from the states to Utah at a much lower cost to the Saints--so much lower that Brigham Young thought it might destroy the trade of the Gentile merchants. 33 The company was barely organized, however, before it collapsed--the government canceled the mail contract at the same time it sent Johnston's army to Utah. As previously discussed, both actions were due to the anti-Mormon reports sent to Washington. Again, the Mormons expected the Gentile merchants to come to their defense; instead, to the disappointment, expense, inconvenience, and agitation of the Saints, the merchants made no attempt to correct the false reports and discourage the coming of the army. Church leaders and some non-Mormons believed that the merchants remained silent because they saw an opportunity to fatten their wallets by supplying the army with its needed commodities. Many Church leaders felt the merchants had betrayed them by their silence. Elder Daniel Carn told the Saints in a sermon:

³²Neff, op. cit., pp. 347-348.

^{33&}lt;sub>Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star</sub> (Liverpool, England, March 1, 1857), 19, 362-363.

There are those who have been among us several years, but they have never proven themselves our friends; like blood-suckers, all they want is our money; they have never written a letter to the States to rebut a single falsehood or misrepresentation.³⁴

George A. Smith, an apostle, felt the same way; he reported to the Saints in their conference that:

The influence of the men we had enriched was turned against us, they (the merchants) believing they could make more money out of the Government, and get rich quicker through war, than they could by continuing their honest, legitimate business with the people here. 35

There was sympathetic feeling among non-Mormons as well; the Missouri Republican openly placed the blame by saying, "The merchants in Salt Lake have had a hand in it [the sending of the army]." The Millennial Star said that if anyone should fight the Mormons it should be the letter writers, politicians, speculators, priests, and editors who were the real cause of the Mormon-Gentile conflict. The same of the

The betrayal by the Gentiles came as no surprise to Brigham Young. Ordinarily he would have expected false reports to be corrected, that being the honest thing to do; but Brigham Young did not expect the Gentiles to do the honest thing. Six weeks before he heard about the army being sent to Utah, he told the Saints, in essence, that the Gentiles would have a mob destroy them if they had the chance:

Some merchants were as full of hell as an egg is full of meat, and all he wants is a chance to spew it out. They will meet

 $^{^{34}}$ As cited in Neff, op. cit., p. 348.

³⁵Young, op. cit., XIII, 122, reported by David W. Evans.

 $^{^{36}}$ As cited in Neff, op. cit., pp. 348-349.

³⁷ Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star (Liverpool, England), October 17, 1857.

you with bland expressions, with soft silky hands, and velvet lips, and will blarney around you; but let a mob come, and they are ready to point out their victims here and there, and be glad to see us destroyed.38

Historians have indicated that the Saints profited from the army's presence in the valley and also from its departure. Arrington, for example, reports that the army held occasional auctions which were a financial boon to the Saints. During one such auction 3,500 large freight wagons, worth \$150 to \$175 each, were sold for \$10 apiece. And, when the army was called from the territory in 1861 because of the Civil War, the Church purchased about one and one-half million dollar's worth of merchandise for a mere \$40,000.39 It seems reasonable that this windfall should have tempered the Saints' agitation about the cause and the effects of the coming of the army; but, according to George A. Smith, these advantages were considered only superficial. More significant, it was felt, was the fact that Johnston's army had really crippled the development of the Kingdom. As disadvantages brought by the army, Smith cited the increased number of mercantile establishments to supply the army's needs, "which have been nursed by us to so great an extent from that time to this [1868]" and the Saints' relaxation in their efforts to become self-sufficient through home manufacturing. The army was blamed for this relaxation because it provided the Saints with many of their needed commodities, but only for a short time. 40 The Church leaders thus felt anything but compensated for the stint of Johnston's army in Utah.

³⁸Young, op. cit., IV, 348.

³⁹Arrington, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

 $^{^{40}}$ Young, op. cit., XIII, 123, reported by David W. Evans.

In the view of Church leaders, then, the sending of Johnston's Army was substantial reason for the Saints to feel embittered toward the Gentile merchants.

Efforts to bring another army to Utah. If Church leaders blamed the Gentile merchants for allegedly conspiring to bring in Johnston's Army, they were even more distraught when the Gentiles sought to bring another army to Utah in the middle sixties. The reason the Gentiles gave at that time for requesting troops was that the Mormons threatened their lives and obliterated their law-given freedoms. On May 10, 1866, the Deseret News published an editorial expressing its utter disbelief that Gentiles had sent to the nation reports of "extraordinary excitement and terrible doing" committed by the Mormons in Salt Lake City. The News summarized the content of the reports, which they had received through newspaper exchanges, and responded to the reports as follows:

This whole city, it seems, has been in a state of the most intense excitement; all the "gentiles" have been notified to leave under the penalty of death--You "gentile" friends of ours down street have not heard of that before; and the whole place has been a perfect maelstrom of excited feelings, in which no person's life was safe. It cannot be that we have imitated Rip Van Winkle, and have been sleeping all through this terrible scene. . . . We never imagined there was such a volcano under our very noses, from which streams of the deadly lava of fanatic violence and wild passions were daily pouring. . . .41

The $\underline{\text{News}}$ held that the motives of those who sent the reports were to stir up the Saints to retaliation against the Gentiles so that "greedy speculators and their coadjutors" could obtain "fat contracts from Uncle Samuel. Four days earlier, George Q. Cannon publically exposed

⁴¹Deseret News, May 10, 1866.

⁴²Ibid.

the plot of those who were determined to do all possible "to stir up the power of the nation" against the Mormons so that a military force would be sent to Salt Lake to enforce the Gentiles' "obnoxious views." 43 The Telegraph wrote that Mormon enemies had denied making any effort to bring about a "collision" between the Mormons and the federal government for monetary gain. But to prove that the enemies had been lying, the paper quoted the testimony of Joseph H. Nevett, a former sutler of a Fort Douglas regiment, given before the Committee on Territories during June 1866. Nevett testified that "dissenting Mormons and Gentiles do desire other and additional protection" from the federal government. He recommended the establishment of a firm military government with both civil and military control, along with the "speedy trial of the Mormon leaders and others who were principal or accessory to the many murders and thefts" committed in Utah. He held that a few years of such control would bring a "loyal Utah." The Telegraph claimed to have had for a long time other evidence of Gentiles conspiring against the Mormon people. It then challenged those enemies to publically deny their strenuous efforts to have an army sent to Utah for the purpose of "filling their own pockets." 45

Anti-Mormons sent enough propaganda to Washington that the Committee on Territories actually resolved to investigate the Utah scene to determine whether it was appropriate to send more troops to Utah to handle any emergency that might arise. That the Gentiles were

 $^{^{43}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 232, reported by G. D. Watts.

⁴⁴ Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, January 1, 1867.

⁴⁵Ibid.

successful in having the federal government make this resolve indicates that they were significantly influencing the attitude of the nation toward the Mormon Church. George Q. Cannon reported that a new resident to Salt Lake told him that because of the false reports sent from Salt Lake City, he expected to find the Utah people "in a blaze of excitement," to the point that "men dare not go out of their houses." The stranger allegedly was led to believe that Gentiles were in danger of their lives. 46

As Church leaders believed the profit motive was behind the coming of Johnston's army, so they believed it was also behind the Gentiles' attempts to bring another army to Utah. Brigham Young publically declared that "the policy of the traders to whom I have referred, is to get all the people's money they possibly can" by sending an army to Utah. They did not want to "injure the people," but to get their "hands into the public pocket, and . . . [their] arms too up to the shoulders [in money]." One allegedly declared that he wanted to get "one hundred thousand dollars," from the army. 47 To set the record straight and eliminate the stimulus for sending another army, Brigham Young called on the Gentile merchants who expected the business and friendship of the Saints to "lift their voices against those vile wretches who are seeking to destroy an innocent and industrious people. We wish them to write, and send their testimony to those who will publish it to the world."48

 $^{^{46}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 231, reported by J. D. Watts

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 278-279.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 280.

The "Assassination" of Two Gentiles

Certainly the Gentiles did not admit profit as their motive for attempts to draw another army to Utah. Their stated motive was fear for their lives. Two Gentiles, O. Newton Brassfield and J. King Robinson, had been murdered during 1866; and, because of Mormon-Gentile conflict, the latter accused the former.

S. Newton Brassfield. S. Newton Brassfield came to Utah from Austin, Nevada, to establish a freighting business between Salt Lake City and Austin. He met Mrs. Mary Emma Hill, the plural wife of a Mormon missionary then serving in England, gained her confidence, and proposed marriage to her. Without attempting to divorce her legal husband, Mrs. Hill accepted Brassfield's proposal and married him on March 27, 1866, less than three months after he arrived in Salt Lake City. Many Mormons were outraged, believing Brassfield had taken advantage of and seduced a woman whose absent husband was unable to protect his relationship with his wife. They regarded this action as criminal. To further aggravate the situation, Brassfield attempted to gain possession of both Mr. Hill's children and property. Hill's family and friends interfered, so Brassfield threatened to destroy Hill's property. The police were informed and were able to prevent any destruction, but in the process Brassfield drew a pistol on the police. He was placed in jail overnight and subsequently charged with burglary, larceny, and assault with intent to kill. While awaiting trial, Brassfield was shot to death on the night of April 2, just as he was about to enter his hotel. Nearby police pursued and shot at the assassin, but he escaped without his identity being detected.

In general conference held after the murder, Brigham Young denied that he or the Church had anything to do with the killing, but he showed

no regrets that it had happened. He said that if a wife of his had been decoyed away from him during his absence, he would rejoice that his friends would guard the virtue of his household. Apparently, the Church leaders believed that the murder was caused by a private matter between Brassfield and friends of the Hill family, the Church not being involved. But the Gentiles claimed that the Church was responsible. The Descret News said "an attempt will likely be made to fasten guilt [of Brassfield's murder] on some place where it does not belong, 50 meaning the Mormon Church leaders. The News was correct: the Union Vedette declared:

It would be useless to deny the fact that in the opinion of the Gentile community of this city, the killing of Mr. Brassfield was a deliberately planned scheme, concocted and advised by men high in authority in the Mormon Church. It is a reminder of the days that were, and a foretaste of what will be again "when the troops are removed." 51

H. W. McCurdy, associate justice of the supreme court in Utah, the one who married Brassfield and Mrs. Hill, sent a dispatch to newspapers outside of Utah claiming that after he performed the marriage he was "denounced and threatened publicly" and that he felt "unsafe in person and property without protection!" McCurdy expressed his feelings of danger to give more weight to the Gentiles' efforts to have more troops sent to Salt Lake. Subsequent to McCurdy's report, orders, given to disband the California volunteers at Camp Douglas, were promptly postponed until regular army troops could replace the volunteers.

 $^{^{49}}$ Whitney, op. cit., p. 146.

 $^{^{50}}$ Quoted in Whitney, op. cit., p. 146.

⁵¹The Daily Union Vedette, April 10, 1866.

⁵²Deseret News, January 9, 1867.

So effective was the anti-Mormon propaganda implicating the Mormon Church in the Brassfield murder, as well as in three other murders which were alleged but never occurred, that General William T. Sherman sent a telegram to Brigham Young warning him that the country was "full of tried and experienced soldiers who would be pleased at a fair opportunity to avenge any wrongs you may commit against any of our citizens." Furthermore, he said, "These murderers must be punished, and if you people resort to measures of intimidation those must cease."

Brigham Young advised Sherman that his information was false and that the reports were spread by speculators "anxious to make it appear that American citizens' lives are in danger through religious fanaticism, hoping thereby to have troops sent here to make money out of contracts." He further assured Sherman that "Gentiles' lives are as safe here as 'Mormon,' and acts of violence occur more rarely in this city than any other of its size in any of the new states or territories." A good number of Gentiles had their names attached to the telegram, verifying the truthfulness of Brigham Young's statement. Names representing seven Gentile merchant establishments were also included.

Sherman's rejoinder said, "Your dispatch is received and I am much gratified at its substance and spirit." 53

<u>Dr. J. King Robinson</u>. Dr. Robinson came to Salt Lake in 1864 as the assistant surgeon at Camp Douglas. He was much more respected by the Mormons than was Brassfield, even though he was active in anti-Mormon circles. Two of his actions, in particular, offended the Church: First, he took possession (land jumped) of about eighty acres of land

⁵³Roberts, op. cit., V, 189-191.

which the city had used for many years for public swimming. He erected a small building on the property which designated ownership. The city destroyed the building and seized the property from Robinson, which action was sustained by John Titus, territorial chief Justice. Second, Robinson ran a bowling alley which sold liquor, contrary to a city ordinance. The community branded the establishment as a nuisance, and the police subsequently razed it. Robinson took the matter to court but was murdered before the case came to trial.

About midnight on October 22, 1866, a messenger went to Dr. Robinson's home to acquire his services, allegedly for someone who had broken his leg. Robinson had not gone far from home when he was attacked by a number of individuals who shot him three times and fled. Witnesses rushed to the scene of the crime and saw six or seven men fleeing, but none was recognized. Robinson died shortly thereafter without regaining consciousness.

T. B. H. Stenhouse, a very prominent Mormon who had been excommunicated from the Church, held that the Church was not to be blamed. He speculated that Robinson's attackers meant only to bully him but that perhaps Robinson recognized some of his enemies, who then resorted to murder to protect themselves from identification. ⁵⁴

Robinson's murder occurred at a bad time. Anti-Mormon sentiment was already high throughout the nation because of Brassfield's murder just months before. This second murder allowed the Gentiles to fan the flames of anti-Mormon sentiment by placing the responsibility of the murder on to the Mormon Church. Since Robinson was an anti-Mormon and had agitated the Mormon establishment by land jumping

⁵⁴Whitney, op. cit., p. 154.

and running a bowling alley, Gentiles deduced these actions as the natural motive for the murder even though Judge Titus, a Gentile, ruled the land-jumping case in favor of the Mormon establishment. Robinson, unlike Brassfield, was very prominent in the community and highly esteemed by the Gentiles. This fact intensified the seriousness of the predicament in which the murder placed the Mormons. Therefore, the Gentiles blamed the Church; and tension between the Mormons and Gentiles became intense. Stenhouse reported that:

After the assassination of Dr. Robinson, fears of violence were not unnatural, and many of them, who had never before carried arms, buckled on their revolvers. Highly respectable men in Salt Lake City forsook the sidewalks after dusk and as they repaired to their residences traversed the middle of the public street, carrying their revolvers in their hands. 55

But the Church was as equally offended as were the Gentiles over the slaying of Robinson. Immediately the community united in offering a reward of \$9,000 for the apprehension of the murderers. Brigham Young offered \$500--more than any other individual. The Descret News said that justice for the crime demanded the "expiation of blood" and that every effort should be made to apprehend the criminals. 56 After placing this murder on par with the Haun's Mill Massacre and the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, Young stated that he could hardly believe that "even savages would be capable of performing such inhuman acts." He instructed the Saints to "cease not your efforts until you find the murderers." The Mormon's share of the offered reward plus the

⁵⁵T. B. H. Stenhouse, <u>The Rocky Mountain Saints</u> (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1873), p. 625.

Desert News, October 31, 1866, quoted in Roberts, op. cit., V, 194.

 $^{^{57}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 281, reported by G. D. Watts.

vehement denunciation of the murder did nothing, of course, to weaken the belief of the Gentiles that the Church was responsible. The <u>Union Vedette</u> claimed that those who said anything against Brigham Young are tapped on the shoulder and warned that "the less they talk the longer they will live," and that "if they subscribe to a reward for the apprehension of a murderer, they will lose the trade of the people." Moreover, the <u>Vedette</u> claimed that the Church leaders went so far as to call for a list of the names of the merchants who supported a reward for the apprehension of the murderer. ⁵⁹

In a report from General Hazen to the Honorable John Bidwell of the House of Representatives in October 1866, Hazen stated:

The murder of Dr. Robinson occurred while I was in Salt Lake City, and that of Brassfield some time previous. There is no doubt of their murder from Mormon Church influences, although I do not believe by direct command.

This statement is quite ironical in light of Hazen's previous statement given in the same report, for he mentioned that his interview with Brigham Young was "pleasant, he [Brigham Young] talking freely upon all his plans," and that the Mormons were "probably the most universally industrious and law-abiding people on the continent, drunkenness and theft are very uncommon." These paradoxical statements did not seem to bother Hazen, for he recommended to the government that it take a course of action against the Church which was in serious violation of American constitutional law:

I have earnestly to recommend that a list be made of the Mormon leaders according to their importance, excepting Brigham Young,

⁵⁸The Daily <u>Union Vedette</u>, April 21, 1866.

⁵⁹Ibid.

and that the President of the United States require the commanding officer of Camp Douglas to arrest and send to the State prison at Jefferson City, Missouri, beginning at the head of the list, man for man hereafter killed as these men (Brassfield and Robinson) were, to be held until the real perpetrators of the deed, with evidence for their conviction, be given up. I believe Young, for the present, necessary for us there.60

Because of the murder of Dr. Robinson, the image of the Mormon Church, which was already negative in the eyes of the nation, continued to get worse. Statements attacking the character of the Mormons spread nationally. A Mr. Stover, who had authored a sensational account of Brassfield's assassination which implicated the Mormons, testified before the Congressional Committee, in July of 1866, that "the Mormons, as a whole, are an ignorant, illiterate and superstitious people." He therefore declared that military protection had to be given to many Mormon dissenters desiring to leave Utah or they would be liable to assassination by the Mormon Church. The Reverand Norman McLeod added his testimony to that of Stover by saying that the Mormon system,

... justifies deception, theft, robbery, when Gentiles are the victims. It fosters hatred towards all governments and all religions outside of Utah and of the Mormon religion. It devotes its enemies and opposers to perdition.

Later in his testimony, McLeod added:

At present, the lives of law abiding citizens are threatened even by Brigham's police. The sanctity of our place of worship is invaded on the peaceful Sabbath by armed assassins—the life of the speaker who, in chaste and fitting terms, opposes polygamy, is menaced. 61

The <u>Desert News</u> wrote that the motives of Stover, McLeod, and other anti-Mormons who had for some time been spreading this information

 $^{^{60}}$ As quoted in Whitney, op. cit., II, 142-143.

⁶¹Deseret N<u>ews</u>, January 9, 1967.

were:

. . . to get troops here and make money out of Uncle Sam; to drive the people of this Territory from their homes and enjoy the fruits of their toil and labors; and prejudice the entire nation, if possible, that their own misdeeds and cowardly falsifications might not be too closely inquired into.

And for this reason, the editorial concluded, the Church advocated the boycott against those merchants who actively supported these evil schemes. 62

Land Jumping

On September 26, 1866, the <u>Union Vedette</u> lashed out at the Mormons with an editorial which said in part:

Last winter it was claimed by witnesses before the House Committee on Territories that the laws of the United States were openly defied in Utah--a fact which we have ever maintained, although it has been vehemently denied by a sycophantic and subsidized Polygamous press. . . .

The cause of the <u>Vedette's</u> outburst occurred two nights previously, on September 24. The paper reported that on that day between eleven and twelve o'clock, "one of the most high handed outrages that ever disgraced the bloody and turbulent record of Utah was perpetrated on the banks of the Jordan River." For, according to their own testimonies, J. C. Emmerson, John C. Deaver, and Frederick B. Schlosmiller preempted government land which no one had previously occupied nor improved. The three proceeded to build homes and otherwise improve the land when a Mormon polygamist came forth and claimed the land was his. They agreed to leave if the polygamist could produce proof of ownership. They thought the matter was amicably settled but were awakened that

^{62&}lt;sub>Ibid.</sub>

night by the thrust of pistols into their faces. The house was filled and surrounded by about forty men, disguised and armed, who forced the preempters to go to the Jordan River. The mob attempted to tie Deaver and Emmerson together and throw them into the river, but Deaver escaped and swam to the other side. The mob shot at him a number of times, wounding him in the ankle. They tied Emmerson, threw him into the river five or six times, and pulled him out by an attached rope. In an attempt to escape, Schlosmiller jumped in the river. However, he returned when so ordered, after two shots were fired at him. The mob returned the prisoners to the latters' house and destroyed it plus the remainder of their property. In addition, they reportedly informed their prisoners that if they were ever caught on the Salt Lake side of the Jordan, they would be dead men. ⁶³

Albert Brown--who with J. M. Williamson, preempted land near that of Emmerson, Deaver, and Schlosmiller--testified in an open letter to Brigham Young, printed in the same issue of the <u>Vedette</u>, that the mob committed the same violence to them that same night. He claimed the mob was going to drown him and Williamson but set them free after they promised to leave Salt Lake within forty-eight hours and never return. Brown then said to Brigham Young:

. . . as you have publicly announced the policy of violence inaugurated on my person . . . and, as the agent employed on that occasion stated that they were "obeying orders," if I am assassinated as by them threatened, my blood will be upon your hands--such is my conviction and such I am persuaded will be the verdict of public opinion. If attacked openly, which I doubt, I shall defend myself to the best of my ability, be the consequences what they may.64

⁶³ The Daily Union Vedette, September 26, 1866.

⁶⁴Ibid.

The above news story caused such a sensation among the Gentiles in Salt Lake City that all of the issues of the <u>Vedette</u> were sold, though an extra large edition had been printed. The paper promised to repeat the news story in its weekly publication so that all demands to obtain copies could be met. 65

The conflict at the Jordan River over what the Mormons referred to as land jumping is but one of a number of cases which occurred during 1866. Therefore, Robinson's attempt to claim the eighty acres of city-owned land was by no means an isolated incident.

The roots of the whole land jumping problem stemmed from a decade earlier when the Utah Expedition interrupted the federal government's project of surveying in Utah. Surveying did not commence again until 1867; and, according to Land Commissioner Joseph Wilson, in 1868 the federal government had not yet disposed of lands in Utah inasmuch as land districts had not yet been created. Hot until 1869, when the Federal land office was opened in Utah, was it possible to homestead a piece of land under Federal law. Hot Therefore, some Gentiles questioned whether or not the Mormons had legally binding ownership of some of their lands. To determine whether their own claims would hold legally, they land-jumped private grounds by erecting fences and other structures to designate their ownership.

The Gentiles claimed that their reason for land jumping was

⁶⁵Ibid., September 29, 1866.

⁶⁶Neff, op. cit., p. 681.

⁶⁷Carter, op. cit., III, 313.

because the Church had promiscuously and greedily grabbed more land than it could use. Moreover, they felt that the Church grabbed the choicest land, leaving the poorer quality for them. The <u>Vedette</u> held that claimed land duly improved gave legitimate ownership. It condemned anyone who jumped such land but argued that much of the land the Church claimed laid idle. Idle land deprived others from putting it to good use. Thus, the <u>Vedette</u> quoted Brigham Young as saying, "I have lots, and plenty of them but not more than I want, and if any man jumps any of them I will send him to hell, so help me God." P. Edward Connor, commanding officer of Camp Douglas, testified before the Committee on Territories that the Church disposed of public lands by granting large tracts of both the most and best timber and grazing lands to the Mormons, alone, in order to exclude Gentiles from occupying them. With the lands occupied, the Church, he claimed, then taxed the government, private parties, and actual settlers for land usage. ⁶⁹

The Mormons naturally disagreed with the Gentiles regarding land jumping, as they did with many other issues. They felt they were the victims of Gentile oppression. When the <u>Deseret News</u> responded to the Jordan River incident, it, in no way, gave the story of what happened. Rather, it explained why the Mormons were so distraught by land jumpers: they felt they were trying to destroy the Mormon establishment. Essentially the <u>News</u> took the position that the Mormons came to a barren waste and made it productive. On Mormon-constructed roads, Gentiles

⁶⁸The Daily Union Vedette, August 7, 1866.

⁶⁹U.S., Congress, House, The Condition of Utah, H.R. 96, 39th Cong., 1st sess., July 23, 1866 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1866), p. 13.

came to Salt Lake City and tried to drive from the lands the very people who were feeding and clothing them. The paper continued:

They seek to jump on to land in or contiguous to this principle city . . . land that has been claimed and owned by citizens, but they would seize if they could, with the double view of obtaining valuable property and stirring up the citizens to resent the robbery. . . . Yet the public squares, reserved for such purposes here, were striven to be jumped on to until the municipal authorities condescendingly fenced them in. Not a place of resort; not even a race track or a parade ground, though claimed by private citizens years ago, would be safe from these miserable harpies.

In the only direct reference to the Jordan incident, the <u>News</u> claimed that the land which was jumped had been claimed years prior to the incident and that all statutory provisions regarding the claim were complied with. The incident was "one of the most flagrant acts, of attempted plunder, and deep laid conspiracies against the peace and prosperity of a community, that has ever been attempted in the nation. . . ." Particularly was this true in light of the fact that the land was "twice fenced in and the last time the fence was taken forcible possession of—or stolen, to use a plainer phrase—by government officials and burned to make fires." Furthermore, the land lay uncultivated until the costly system of irrigation could be established. Finally, the <u>News</u> expressed its feeling of righteous indignation against land jumpers:

The local laws which govern land-claims here are according to the best legal authorities. The organizing of mining districts and the laws which govern them, are <code>[sic]</code> the result of custom and not based upon legal authority. We have ever respected these custom-appointed laws; have viewed districts being organized in the Territory . . . and mining claims parceled out to different parties with all the quietness and good feeling imaginable. Yet these very same individuals, would trample our local legislation under foot, rob us of our property, jump on to the claims held by the original settlers and pioneers, and drive us from the

possessions we have wrested from the wilderness by unparrallelled industry and toil--if they could. Please make contrast.70

Of course the <u>Vedette</u> could not allow the response of the <u>News</u> to pass by without comment. Its viewpoint was that there was no question that the Mormons were fully entitled to the land they improved—but they could not hold on to land they were not improving or possessing. Furthermore, when the Mormons came to Utah, they occupied and improved only small portions of the land upon which they made more than substantial investment returns. To greedily hold on to land they never really owned, used, or needed, and to drive out Gentiles who did morally own it was absurd. 71

The Mormons had claimed all along that they did not try in any way to prevent the Gentiles from settling undeveloped land. For example, the News said: "If they [the Gentiles] simply desired land to homestead, why not take up the unbroken soil," of which there was an abundance in the city. Parigham Young made it quite clear that the Gentiles could build and live where they pleased as long as they left Mormon property alone. But the Gentiles were to understand—and this was the essence of the Mormons' complaint—that if they "undertake to drive a stake in my garden with an intention to jump my claim there will be a fight before you get it; if you come within an enclosuer of mine with any such intent, I will send you home, God being my

⁷⁰ Deseret News, September 29, 1866.

⁷¹The Daily Union Vedette, October 1, 1866.

⁷² Desert News, September 29, 1866.

helper."73

The <u>Vedette</u> was outraged over Mormon statements about land jumping. Young's statement, "I have lots and plenty of them, but not more than I want, and if any man jumps any of them I will send him to hell, so help me God," gave the paper an opportunity to pin the blame of Brassfield's murder on Young and proclaim that if anyone else was killed for claiming government property, no one would question who was to blame. 74

In a speech given some time later Brigham Young stated that the objective of Gentiles in land jumping was to destroy the Mormon establishment. He also held Gentile merchants responsible for participating in land jumping. These facts are evident from his December 23 speech in which he proclaimed the boycott. Just what part the merchants played in land jumping is not clear from sources examined by the writer. For example, Roberts merely declares, without documenting his information, that they encouraged land jumping. 75

Connecting Gentile merchants and Gentile businessmen with land jumping, Young stated that they were picking the pockets of the Saints, then using the money for the latter's destruction. Given their own way, the businessmen would allegedly confiscate the property of the Saints, prevent them from owning any land, steal their wives and children (an allusion to Brassfield), and defile their beds. If the Saints should defend themselves against these abuses, "lying dispatches . . .

 $^{^{73}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 260, reported by G. D. Watts.

⁷⁴ The Daily Union Vedette, August 7, 1866.

⁷⁵Roberts, op. cit., V, 209.

[would be] sent to the General Government to get an army sent" to protect the Gentiles. Young implied that the businessmen did not need protection but had no right to jump Mormon claims. However, since those men were "seeking with all their might to bring about . . . destruction [of the Saints]," Young instructed the Saints to

... withdraw your support. If he is a lawyer, let him alone. If he is a merchant, pass by his store or place of business; serve the mechanic the same; and let every enemy of this people become satisfied that they cannot look to us for support while they are seeking with all their might to bring about our destruction. 76

When Young said that Robinson's murder was "too horrible for me to think about," the Vedette accused him of being a plain liar.

In the same speech Young also stated that he prayed he would "never be brought into circumstances to be obliged to shed human blood." Though he had never been in that position, he warned the Gentiles:

If I should find a dog in my buttery, or in my bedroom as some have, I fear they should have their last howl If they jump my claims here, I shall be very apt to give them a preemption right that will last them to the last resurrection. I hope no man will venture so far as to tempt me to do such a thing.77

To this statement, the <u>Vedette</u> replied: "If we should add that Brigham Young in this sermon justified and threatened assassination, it would be boldly and unblushingly characterized as 'slander.'" In reference to the hypothetical person whom Young threatened, the paper continued:

And when some bright morning sun should have looked down on the mangled corpse, how bitter would have been the denunciation

 $^{^{76}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 276-277, reported by G. D. Watts.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 281.

of the (Mormon Church) organs, if somebody should have the temerity to point out such teachings as the foregoing, as having a near connection with assassination and murder.⁷⁸

The Union Vedette

The <u>Vedette's</u> attitude toward the Church will become even more apparent in this section. The historical development of that newspaper will be discussed as well as how its attitude helped to effect the boycott of 1866.

In October of 1862 the federal government sent about 700 soldiers to Salt Lake City, under the direction of P. Edward Connor, to allegedly protect the telegraph lines and mail routes from the Indians. Since the Church had clearly expressed to Washington its willingness to assume this responsibility, however, Church leaders believed the mission of the troops was to keep surveillance on the Saints. These troops, known as the California volunteers, settled on the east bench of Salt Lake City where they established Camp Douglas.

During the army's first year in the valley, some of the soldiers staked a mining claim in Bingham Canyon. This claim, called The Jordan, was one of the first ever made in Utah. To publicize mining news, and to encourage interested parties to "seek, prospect and possess the wonderful riches of her [the nation's] widespread domain," the California volunteers established a printing office at Camp Douglas and printed Utah's first daily newspaper, the <u>Union Vedette</u>. The first issue of the paper came off the press a year after the arrival of the volunteers, on November 20, 1863. It contained an article by Connor reporting that

⁷⁸ The Daily Union Vedette, June 8, 1867.

rich veins of gold, silver, copper, and other minerals abounded in the territory. He invited miners, soldiers, and all others who were interested to accept the challenge of mining. The underlying motive of Connor's invitation, however, was to flood the territory with Gentiles. The flood, he maintained, would weaken the tremendous power of the Mormon Church. Evidence of Connor's motive is found in his letter to the State Department:

large Gentile and loyal population sufficient by peaceful means and through the ballot-box to overwhelm the Mormons by mere force of numbers, and thus wrest from the Church--disloyal and traitorous to the core--the absolute and tyrannical control of temporal and civil affairs, or at least a population numerous enough to put a check on the Mormon authorities, and give countenance to those who are striving to loosen the bonds with which they have been so long oppressed. With this view, I have bent every energy and means of which I was possessed, both personal and official, towards the discovery and development of the mining resources of the Territory. 79

In addition to advertising the opportunities of mining, which Connor significantly exaggerated, the <u>Vedette</u> claimed its purpose was to supply the needs of the California volunteers and the Gentile community as a whole with a much needed medium for "communicating its thoughts, correcting mis-apprehension or rebutting misrepresentation." The paper claimed its purpose was not to make war with the Saints nor intrude upon their everyday lives. They allegedly commenced their enterprise

. . . in the best of feeling, trusting and believing that our language will not be distorted into aught that savors of threat or unkindness, but as the friendly voice of those who seek the good and the prosperity of every man, woman and child in Utah,

 $^{^{79}}$ Whitney, op. cit., II, 110.

who have not voluntarily placed themselves beyond the pale of charity and friendship. 80

Nor did the $\underline{\text{Vedette}}$ claim its purpose was to make money. Though the editors hoped to meet expenses, they promised to publish regardless. Subscriptions were fifty cents per month, and advertising space was thirty dollars per column. 81

The <u>Vedette</u> had a rather difficult time in its beginning.

Frequent explanations were given by the editor as to why certain issues were not printed: Expected paper shipments were not received, the editors could not be excused from troop inspections, and the demands of community service would not allow them the necessary time. Eventually the paper had to discontinue its weekly and print only its daily because of a limited paper supply. The editor scolded those who cancelled their subscriptions. He also informed them that the paper would continue to grow in spite of their cancellations and that the purpose of the paper was not for profit. 82

Little local news was published to begin with. The paper blamed the lack of news on the stagnant community of Mormons. "For six days of the week the place looks like Sunday anywhere else," the paper complained; "and if we except the stream of people tending towards the Tabernacle and homeward twice a day on Sunday, one might imagine the

⁸⁰J. Cecil Alter, <u>Early Utah Journalism</u> (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Historical Society, 1938), p. 361, as quoted in <u>Vedette</u>, November 20, 1863.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²The Daily Union Vedette, June 11, 1864.

population dead or the city abandoned!"⁸³ This statement--sarcastic though apparently not unfriendly--opened the door, slowly at first, to bitter editorials filled with anti-Mormon sentiment. This sentiment was to characterize the <u>Vedette</u> for the remainder of its life.

Surprisingly, anti-Mormon articles did not appear before this statement was made, for the name of the paper itself implied that it was anti-Mormon. According to the editors in their August 7, 1865 issue, the term "vedette" meant "a sentinel on horseback; a dragoon or horseman stationed on the outpost of an army to watch an enemy and give notice of danger."⁸⁴

The lid of Pandora's box was opened wide when, on December 21, 1864, the editor of the <u>Vedette</u> changed hands. Henceforth the paper was adamantly anti-Mormon. The following day the <u>Vedette</u> acknowledged its true mission—to combat "heresiers which oppress the people of Utah, and to be the chronicler of the times in which we live." In the August 12, 1865 issue, the publishers bragged that the <u>Vedette</u> was a thorn in the side of Mormonism and an enemy of polygamy. The paper claimed that it could not exist were the federal troops withdrawn from the territory, for so effective were its "broadsides upon the tabernacle" that the Church would certainly destroy the paper. In the February 22, 1866 issue, the editor stated: "The <u>Vedette</u> is the Wooden Horse entered into the very Troy of Polygamy," operating for the overthrow of the Mormon Church. Again, the anti-Mormon sentiment

⁸³ Ibid., April 4, 1864.

⁸⁴Alter, op. cit., p. 362.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 367.

of the editors is expressed:

The Vedette takes to task the "One Man Power policy" of Brigham Young. . . . It is so patently pernicious to the interests of the government, the great West, and to all "gentile" enterprise in Utah. . . . To route this rotten clique of Mormon monopolists who are fattening on the industry of the Gentiles without giving them equivalents even advantages for equivalence in this free territory of ours has been the effort and the objective of this journal for some years past. And to turn the attention of the authorities to this section, so much choked and controlled by those saintly church cormorants has been our highest hope and noblest ambition—knowing as we do, that it is suicidal to the interests and the glory of the great Nation to have those selfish swindles, Church corruptions and Council persecutions pass unnoticed—aye and unpunished—by those parties perpetuating them from time to time. 86

Though the Vedette claimed no motive for profit but rather a desire only to meet expenses, for a time it had the outward appearance of a prospering newspaper. In the first issue of the paper there were only two small ads in its three pages, both pertaining to Camp Douglas. The next weekly issue contained a full-column advertisement by three Salt Lake City merchants, among whom were the Walker Brothers, prominent Mormons at that time. The following week, the number of advertisements doubled; but the number of pages in the paper remained the same. With each weekly issue, additional merchants bought advertising space until in November 1864, after one year of publication, twelve out of the twenty columns were devoted strictly to advertising. The following January, the paper increased the number of its ads but decreased the size of the paper. Three quarters of the paper, and sometimes more, was purely advertising. At least one subscriber complained of this imbalance, requesting more reading material. To this complaint, the Vedette answered: "The advertising patronage of any journal constitutes

The Daily Union Vedette, February 22, 1866.

its back bone and vitality, and our friend should be gratified with us that we are so ably upheld." The editors generously thanked "the loyal elements of Utah" who had so liberally supported the paper from its beginning. They promised to enlarge the <u>Vedette</u> very soon; this would enable them to "present a daily newspaper worthy of liberal and generous support, even exceeding that heretofore granted us by an enlightened public." Although the <u>Vedette</u> was enlarged, however, it never increased the amount of news. As late as the following November, three-fourths of the paper was filled with advertisements. Although their advertisements were essentially local in nature and reading material was scarce, the Vedette claimed a large circulation:

The <u>Vedette</u> is the pioneer daily newspaper of Utah. Its immense circulation in every mining camp and city of Montana and Idaho . . . makes it the most advantageous medium for advertising in these four central territories." 88

In December of 1865, when the <u>Vedette</u> moved from Camp Douglas into the city to expand its facilities, it had to miss two issues. The paper printed press comments from Nevada and Idaho, expressing their wishes for continued and increased success. It claimed to have received other similar statements but would only print the two "lest the reader might accuse it of becoming vain."

If their claims of "immense circulation" and the reception of moral support from other newspapers were valid, rather than a publicity trick printed to attract subscribers, then the <u>Vedette</u> had to be a

⁸⁷ Ibid., February 27, 1866.

⁸⁸Ibid., September 29, 1866.

⁸⁹Ibid., December 13, 1865.

damning influence on the Mormon Church. Its editorials were all basically anti-Mormon, containing much material which, from the editors' viewpoint, exposed polygamy as a practice instituted to satisfy the lusts of evil men. This damning publicity from the newspaper's editorials and the inability of subscribers to learn the Mormon side of the issues angered Church leaders.

The <u>Vedette</u> also sent telegraphic dispatches from the territory which were even more damning than its editorials. The <u>Deseret News</u> quoted a dispatch as it was discovered in the News of the World:

"RELIABLE INFORMATION?" The Mormons have resolved to abandon the plan of emigration, and to right for predominance. An affray has occurred in which eight "Gentiles" were killed. Placards have been posted everywhere about Utah warning enemies of Mormonism to depart.

The Deseret News responded by referring to this quote as:

... a fair specimen of the "reliable" items of "information" sent by mail and telegraph from Utah by our enemies. The unblushing barefacedness and audacity of the falsehoods published and circulated concerning Utah and the "Mormons" are so numerous and so protean in shape that it would be an endless task to attempt rebutting them, were we so disposed.

To the press we would say, and we desire they should take note of it, we do not reply to the scurrilous and false statements made about the citizens of Utah, and palmed upon the people outside of this Territory as reliable, by our open and avowed enemies, because we could not do so without entering an arena too filthy to step into. It would be a thankless and a profitless task to hunt up falsehoods and their authors for the purpose of replying to them. 90

The <u>Vedette</u> claimed that its move into the heart of town "proved an eye-sore to the law-breaking lion of the Lord and all his loud, lesser satellites." It further claimed that Church leaders tried to embarrass the editors as much as possible by forcing them out of their

 $^{^{90}}$ Deseret News, December 5, 1865.

new office and threatening the office owner with a law suit for renting to them. 91 The truthfulness of this accusation cannot be determined by the trustworthiness of the <u>Vedette</u>. The paper had a difficult time reporting the news without exaggerating. For example, when Brigham Young referred to the <u>Vedette</u> as a "corrupt and venal press," it countered by saying that if the paper had erred at all,"

. . . it has not been on the side of severity. There is not a respectable newspaper in the United States that has been as mild, careful, and considerate in its comments on the head of the Mormon Church as has the Vedette.92

In light of the attitude of Church leaders toward the <u>Vedette</u>, the above statement would be absurd to them. According to George A. Smith, the newspaper's "scandelous sheets" had been sent, as far as possible, to all parts of the world, "filled with lies, defamation and abuse, and everything that would tend to arouse the indignation of the Christian world against us, and to get up an excuse for our annihilation."

The <u>Vedette</u> played a very significant role in effecting the boycott because it was sustained by merchants who were in turn sustained by the patronage of the Saints. ⁹⁴ Church leaders believed that were it not for the extensive advertising space purchased by Gentile merchants, the paper could never have survived to spread its anti-Mormon propaganda. In his reply to the merchants' open letter Brigham Young

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²The Daily Union Vedette, December 24, 1866.

 $^{^{93}}$ Young, op. cit., XIII, 123, reported by David W. Evans.

^{94&}lt;sub>Ibid</sub>.

stated that Gentile businessmen had "donated liberally to sustain a corrupt and venal press which has given publicity to the most atrocious libels respecting the old citizens." Therefore, Church leaders, Brigham Young particularly, used their energies to have the Saints boycott anti-Mormon merchants and trade with honorable citizens.

The $\underline{\text{Vedette}}$ responded to the boycott as though it were the first to give the revelation that it was a principal cause: "The $\underline{\text{Vedette}}$ is a thorn in the side of the Prophet, and his proscription of the Gentile merchants is doubtless due to their support of that journal." 95

Brigham Young's speech of December 23 wherein he introduced the boycott was seemingly dramatic and effective. Young's first words were quite solomn, conveying the feeling that his message was of great import and necessitated the complete support of the Saints: "I will try to speak to the people. I will need silence in the house, and the close attention of my hearers." Then, to prepare the Saints to accept his message of boycotting the Church's enemies, he said, "As to the ordinances of the Gospel we are united, we are one; but I will inquire are we one in all temporal matters?" He then encouraged the Saints to unite even as the Father and Son were united in all things. ⁹⁶ After thus setting the climate, Young gave a more lengthy and vehement exhortation than had ever before been given on the boycott, at least as far as the records indicate. He went so far as to say that those who would not boycott would by and by leave the Church and go to destruction. ⁹⁷

⁹⁵The Daily Union Vedette, January 8, 1867.

 $^{^{96}\}mbox{Young, op. cit., XI, 273, reported by G. D. Watts.}$

^{97&}lt;sub>Ibid</sub>.

Young was determined to make the boycott succeed: "I mean to hold this subject of not supporting our enemies, before the people, until I get the Saints to build up the kingdom of God unitedly, and let our open and secret enemies alone." 98

Young had been unhappily surprised at some of the merchants who signed the open letter, for he believed that the signers proclaimed to the world their "open opposition to the people called Latter-day Saints." He therefore answered the question he posed to the Saints: "Shall we foster such a band of men? No." 99

Reaction to the Boycott

As emphatic as the Church's encouragement seemed to be in having the Saints cease their trade with anti-Mormon merchants, its instructions appear to be only encouragement and nothing more. In fact, the writer has discovered no evidence to indicate that Church leaders ever named or condemned particular anti-Mormon firms; such judgments were left to the personal discretion of each Saint. No doubt, however, there was a general concensus throughout the community as to who the hard-core of anti-Mormon merchants were; certainly one obvious way of finding out was to read the <u>Union Vedette</u>. Its reading would show what merchants were buying advertising space and in effect supporting the paper in its fight against the Church. Again, the final determination of who was or who was not an enemy was left to each Saint.

From its inception, the boycott had been directed strictly

^{98&}lt;sub>Ibid</sub>.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 276.

against anti-Mormon firms. Nevertheless, the merchants' open letter made it clear that the merchants apparently felt that the boycott included all Gentiles and that the Saints were forced to comply. Brigham Young in his speeches and the <u>Deseret News</u> in its editorials plainly clarified the issue. Young said, "Let our enemies alone. 'What, all the outsiders?' Not by any means. I trade with outsiders all the time. . . . My counsel to the Latter-day Saints is to let all merchants alone who seek to do evil to this people." 100

To confirm that the boycott was not levied against merchants who were friendly toward the Church and that Mormons and Gentile merchants could cooperate in business, the <u>News</u> quoted an advertisement by Gentile merchants Rose and Barrett: "We are greatful [sic] for the kindness with which we have been received here; we heartily thank the people of this community for their very liberal patronage." 101

C. Prag was one merchant who had apparently misunderstood the limitation of the boycott. After learning that it was levied only against enemies of the Church, he asked that his name be removed from the letter. He also wrote the Telegraph saying that he had "no ill-will or ill-feeling whatever against either the prominent men of this community, or the people in general. . . . " But if he or his firm "were in any way obnoxious to the community," then he would sacrifice his merchandise to the Mormons rather than remain where he was not wanted. "But being assured by high authority," he said, "that no ill feeling exists against me I cheerfully do herewith withdraw my name

¹⁰⁰ Desert News, January 2, 1867.

 $^{^{101}}$ Ibid.

from said, card." Prag also made it clear that his feelings toward the community were entirely his own and in no way represented any other signer or signers of the letter. 102

Regardless of the Church's stated position, enemies of the Church misrepresented it by declaring that (1) the boycott included all Gentile merchants and that (2) it was forced on the Saints by stringent means. The testimony of Norman McLeod and editorials of the <u>Union Vedette</u>, which follow respectively, are evidence of the tone of this misrepresentation.

In 1866 a committee of the U. S. Senate convened to discuss conditions in Utah and whether the Territory should be granted state-hood. During the hearings, Mr. Rice asked McLeod, the chaplain at Camp Douglas and an overt anti-Mormon, how the Mormon Church felt about its members having social and business intercourse with Gentiles.

McLeod replied: "All social and business intercourse between Mormons and Gentiles is discountenanced by the leaders and frequently denounced; the merchants, lawyers, and Gentiles generally receiving large measures of abuse!" He further testified that sermons from the tabernacle contained the most vile and vulgar abuses of the Gentiles. 103

On January 11, 1867, immediately following the Church's proclamation that only the anti-Mormons would be boycotted, the <u>Vedette</u> complained that Brigham Young's speech of December 23 was:

¹⁰² Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, January 3, 1867.

^{103&}lt;sub>U.S.</sub>, Congress, House, <u>The Condition of Utah</u>, H.R. 96, 39th Cong., 1st sess., July 23, 1866 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1866), pp. 15-16.

. . . an order to the Mormons not to trade with the Gentile merchants in their midst. . . . Should the Mormons persevere in the resolution not to trade with those whom their leaders denounce as the enemies of the Church, the Gentile traders in Salt Lake will lose heavily. But there is no remedy for it. . . . The people dare not disobey the orders of Brigham Young, and of course no law can be enacted to protect the Gentiles against such an arbitrary use of his authority; but the Church leaders have never acted with less discretion than in this matter. 104

One of T. B. H. Stenhouse's noted writings was the <u>Rocky</u>

<u>Mountain Saints</u>, an anti-Mormon book published in 1873. In this work,

Stenhouse substantiates the previous testimonies and reveals an alleged method of enforcing the boycott:

. . . preceding the assassination of Dr. Robinson a large portion of the Tabernacle sermons were devoted to "freezing out" the Gentiles, and surveillance was offensively placed upon their stores, in order to discover who among the Saints would persist in trading with them. The police in sauntering to and fro could see the offenders and report them, and with these official eyes upon them, it took courage in the people to deal with a Gentile, Jew, or Apostate--especially with the latter. 105

In Brigham Young's reply to the merchants' open letter, he explicitly denied using force to prevent the Saints from trading with anybody. His denial was substantiated by Hubert Howe Bancroft, a non-Mormon historian who wrote a history of Utah and the Mormons. He claimed to present Mormon and Gentile claims objectively, without discussing their validity. Bancroft stated that those who traded with Gentiles were "considered weak in the faith"; but nevertheless, when Gentile merchants offered better bargains than did Mormon merchants, the Mormons succumbed to the temptation and traded with the Gentiles "without the severe censure on the part of the Church, which has often

¹⁰⁴The Da<u>ily Union Vedette</u>, January 11, 1867.

^{105&}lt;sub>T</sub>. B. H. Stenhouse, <u>The Rocky Mountain Saints</u> (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1873), p. 623.

been alleged." Bancroft did agree with Stenhouse that Mormons discriminated against Gentile merchants: "... as late as 1860 [the Gentiles] were subject to a running fire of ridicule and condemnation directed against them from the tabernacle." He held that they were condemned for two reasons: Mormons disliked "the presence of gentiles in whatever capacity," and the Gentiles "absorbed the small amount of capital that the brethren [church leaders] possessed." 106

As one might imagine, Gentiles reacted negatively to the boycott. For example, Stenhouse wrote that "Brigham felt master of the situation.

. . . the merchants had to 'bide their time' and await the coming change that was anticipated from the completion of the Pacific Rail-road." 107

The <u>Vedette</u> reacted much more bitterly and inconsistently. Sometimes it scoffed, confident that the boycott would never be effective; other times it wrung its hands and complained that the boycott was a diabolical scheme devised to ruin the merchants. For example, in 1866, after Church leaders had started to encourage the boycott, the paper scoffed at their efforts: "Mormons like everyone else will make their purchases where they can trade to the best advantage." But after the boycott received the special attention given it in December of 1866, the <u>Vedette</u> changed its tune and complained that the boycott "created a lively sensation among the

History Company, 1890), pp. 651-652.

¹⁰⁷Stenuouse, op. cit., pp. 385-386.

¹⁰⁸ The Daily Union Vedette, September 7, 1866.

Gentile traders' and that there was no remedy which would prevent the merchants from losing heavily. 109

The <u>Vedette</u> further criticizing Young's assertion that the merchants' proposition would make them rich, asked, "How can merchants get richer than any in the country by selling their goods at 75% of their fair cash valuation?" Also mocking his statement that no coercion had been nor would be used to enforce the boycott, the <u>Vedette</u> said that Young's statement was a mere "quibble on words which will deceive no one. Brigham and his bishops don't call it intimidation or coercion, but with them it goes by the milder name of 'counsel.'" 110

On the other hand, the <u>Deseret News</u> stated that Young's reply was very wise and objective, "straightforward and manly." Continuing, it said, "We believe it is deemed wise policy everywhere that men should not sustain any enemy, nor strengthen him in making his enmity effective. Why this policy should not be practiced in Utah we cannot see." 111

The correspondence between the merchants and Brigham Young brought additional unfavorable publicity from outside Utah. The <u>News</u> called attention to the <u>Plattsmouth Democrat</u> in Nebraska, saying that the <u>Democrat</u> had published the entire correspondence, allowing its readers to decide the merits of the case. But then the <u>News</u> concluded by saying:

The great majority of the other papers noticing the correspondence evince such a spirit of contemptible bigotry and one sidedness in the grabled and untruthful versions that we feel

¹⁰⁹Ibid., January 11, 1867.

¹¹⁰ The Daily Union Vedette, December 24, 1866.

¹¹¹¹ Desert News, January 2, 1867.

humbled to think that men so destitute of honor and principle as those controlling such newspapers, should be considered members of the American Press. . . . 112

Just how loyal the Saints were in obeying their Church leaders or how much the anti-Mormon merchants actually suffered is not clear. As with any Church law or policy, some boycotted and others did not. In the general conference of the Church in April 1867, Daniel H. Wells, counselor to Brigham Young, expressed his pleasure that the Saints had participated so unitedly in the boycott. However, Brigham Young, in the same conference, chastized the elders of the Church who prayed for unity but traded with the enemies. Two months earlier he took to task those who felt it was none of his business where they bought their merchandise. Brigham Young told them that "It is just as much my business, Latter-day Saints, to dictate in these [temporal] things as it is in regard to the sacrament we are partaking of here to-day. 114

In summary, the letter exchange between the Gentile merchants and Brigham Young had two apparent effects: (1) it caused intense feelings on both sides to find expression and (2) it polarized the Mormons and Gentile merchants more than ever before by stimulating Church leaders to emphatically enforce the boycott.

The ultimate success and effects of the boycott will be treated in the following chapter.

¹¹²Ibid., January 26, 1867.

¹¹³Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, April 7, 1867.

 $^{^{114}}$ Young, op. cit., XI, 298, reported by David W. Evans.

Chapter 4

THE BOYCOTT OF 1868

In Chapter 3 it was determined that the boycott of 1866 was levied only against anti-Mormon merchants. In fact, Brigham Young wanted it expressly understood that the hand of business fellowship would continue to be extended to friendly Gentile merchants. in Chapter 3 also indicated that the LDS Church used no coercion to Both of these prevent the Saints from trading with Gentile merchants. policies were changed, however, in a general conference held October 6-8, 1868. The conference expanded the boycott to include all Gentile merchants whether or not they were friends of the Church. would not sustain the boycott were to be disfellowshipped or excommunicated. On October 7, Apostle George Q. Cannon asked the Saints in conference if they were going to continue to subject themselves to those merchants who were continually trying to destroy the Church. The congregation responded with cries of "No, No." Cannon then replied:

Well, then if you will not bow to it, stop your trading with men of this class and sustain your friends; sustain those who want to build up the kingdom of God, who are one with us. If this fight must come and we have to cut off all from the church who will not reform in this respect, I would rather have it done now than wait until, environed by enemies, we are thrust out of our possessions at the point of the bayonet. . . .

The congregation replied, "Amen."

 $^{^{1}}$ Young, op. cit., XII, 294-295, reported by David W. Evans.

The following day, Brigham Young reminded the congregation that Church leaders had continually encouraged the Saints to send to the East for needed merchandise instead of having Gentiles do it for them. He said that "every man and woman who will not obey this counsel shall be severed from the Church." Upon request, all in attendance raised their right hands signifying that they would sustain this counsel. 2

Brigham Young perhaps gave the most decisive statement made by a Church leader about the Saints boycotting all Gentile merchants: "I want to tell my brethren, my friends and my enemies, that we are going to draw the reins so tight as not to let a Latter-day Saint trade with an outsider." Later that month the School of Prophets, whose purpose was partly to put Church economic policies into community action, adopted the policy that "those who dealt with outsiders should be cut off from the Church."

Apostle Cannon justified the expansion of the boycott on the oversimplification that the Church really had no true friends among the Gentiles; those who posed as friends did so with the ulterior motive of exploiting the material wealth of the Saints. As far as he was concerned, whenever the Saints were "down and out," they were completely ignored; but whenever they accumulated a little substance,

²Ibid., p. 301.

³Ibid., p. 286.

⁴Leonard J. Arrington, "The Transcontinental Railroad and Mormon Economic Policy," Pacific Historical Review, 20, 2 (May, 1951), 147-48.

⁵Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, November 28, 1868, as cited in Arrington, <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>, p. 296.

There was a class, who like vultures scenting the carrion from afar, came here and to hear them talk one would have thought that the "Mormons" had thousands of friends. Why, they always sympathized with and pitied us! they $[\underline{sic}]$ always felt kindly towards us and thought, we were a very much abused people.

Later in his speech Cannon admitted that some Gentile merchants were "very fine men;" nonetheless they were to be boycotted. "I would as soon deal with them [the decent Gentiles] in the eastern States as with anybody else," Cannon stated, "but it is because they are in Salt Lake City that I am opposed to them." To those who could not see any difference between trading with Gentiles in Salt Lake City and in the East, Cannon responded, in essence, that in Salt Lake City the Gentile merchants ban together for political power which they use for their personal interests at the expense of the Church. In the East, however, there is no reason for Gentile unity because of the diversity of people within the community. Cannon compared the power of the Gentile merchants in Salt Lake City to the power of the wooden horse given to Troy as a present which destroyed that city. 7

Brigham Young, like Cannon, was suspicious of the friendship of Gentile merchants on the scriptural grounds that "he who is not for us is against us." Orson Pratt, an influential apostle, declared that he did not care how much Gentile merchants professed honesty, he would not trade a dime with them unless they repented and were baptized. Pratt further stated he would "rather go and kill wolves in the

 $^{^6}$ Young, op. cit., XII, 295, reported by David W. Evans.

⁷Ibid., p. 296.

⁸Ibid., p. 315.

⁹Ibid., p. 305.

forest . . . and wear wolfskin pantaloons, and wolfskin coats and vests . . . than spend one dime with one outsider in the Territory of Utah. (The congregation said 'amen')."¹⁰

One reason Pratt gave for justifying the boycott was the McGrorty case. McGrorty was a merchant of whom the Deseret News said:

The miserable creature is beneath the contempt of every respectable person We have never alluded to him or written his name without being ashamed and disgusted. We viewed him while here as a contemptible lick-spittle. . . .

The News held McGrorty in contempt because he attended Mormon Church meetings and repeated loud professions of "friendliness and sympathy."

While he thought he had any prospect of making money out of the Mormons, "he was most friendly. . . . But when he found he was becoming known [as a hyprocrite] . . . then the mask was thrown aside, and he appeared in his true colors."

Without mentioning names, Pratt said that McGrorty ran for delegate to Congress and received 105 votes out of 15,000; the balance were cast for his opponent, William H. Hooper.

McGrorty "contested his [Hooper's] seat, and fought him month after month in the Halls of Congress, being sustained while doing so, by those [merchants] who profess such friendship towards us." Pratt said McGrorty's whole objective was to "deprive the 'Mormons' of citizenship and the privilege of taking up the land."

That Pratt "seldom took radical views on such subjects" indicates the intensity of the conflict.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 307.

¹¹<u>Deseret News</u>, May 27, 1867.

 $^{^{12}}$ Young, op. cit., XII, 306-307, reported by David W. Evans.

¹³Roberts, op. cit., V, 223.

In the early fifties the attitudes of Brigham Young, George A. Smith, and the <u>Descret News</u> were moderate toward Gentile merchants. However, with the boycott of 1868 and the resultant mushrooming of the Mormon-Gentile conflict, Young and Smith soon changed their attitude. This change is evident from their October conference addresses. Both expressed negative feelings as they looked in retrospect at their experiences with the early merchants. Young now echoed in conference the same complaint about the merchants as the Saints made in 1852, for which they had been mildly scolded:

[Livingston and Kinkead] to my certain knowledge, commenced by selling the goods they brought at from two to five hundred per cent above cost. There were a few articles, with the real value of which everybody was acquainted, that they did not put quite so high; but just as they came to a piece of goods, the value of which everybody did not understand, the people might look out for the five hundred per cent. They continued their operations here until they made hundreds of thousands of dollars.

In Young's next statement, his resentment toward Livingston and Kinkead is more explicit:

There being a press of people in the store, I passed behind one of the counters. I saw several brass kettles under it, full of gold pieces. . . . One of the men shouted, "bring another brass kettle." They didso, and set it down and the gold was thrown into it, "chink," "chink," "chink," until, in a short time it was filled.14

A few days before ZCMI was established, George A. Smith, who had just been sustained as first counselor to Brigham Young, expressed his regret to the Saints that they had not initiated cooperative merchandising much earlier; great amounts of money would then have been saved. He recounted the \$10,000 Livingston and Kinkead had received their first day of business and the hugh profits in gold they had taken from the

¹⁴Young, op. cit., XII, 372-373.

valley when they left Utah in 1858. Then he said:

. . . I have often reflected upon the bad policy that we, as servants of God, adopted at that time in sustaining strangers. If the ten thousand dollars which were paid into the house the first day, had been handled by some of our experienced merchants in a co-operative institution, it would have been just as easy to have furnished our own merchandize [sic] as to have bought their's [sic].

He further said that as a result of this policy large sums of money would have remained in Salt Lake City for building up the country. 15 Obviously, then, in the midst of their turmoil with Gentile merchants, Church leaders regretted having allowed the merchants to monopolize Salt Lake City trade.

Causes of the Boycott

Since Brigham Young stated rather positively that the 1866 boycott was against enemies only and that no coercion would be used to enforce the boycott, the question is raised: Why did he reverse this policy in 1868?

The essential reason for the reversal was that the railroad, then under construction, was almost ready to connect isolated Utah with the rest of the nation. The end of isolationism severely threatened the Mormon establishment.

The other reason for the reversal, as indicated by Church leaders, was the continued Mormon-Gentile strife focused around the publication of the <u>Salt Lake Daily Reporter</u>, an anti-Mormon newspaper published in Salt Lake City.

 $^{^{15}}$ Young, op. cit., XIII, 122, reported by David W. Evans.

The Railroad

With the enforcement of the boycott of 1866, Gentile merchants were immediately affected. Arden B. Olsen reports that all Gentile stores were hurt by this boycott. Two firms had to close out immediately: the first, Firman and Numson of Nephi; the second, J. H. McGrath's branch store of American Fork. Gentile merchants located in Utah communities other than Salt Lake City were naturally hurt most, since they did not have the Gentile population upon which to rely for business. ¹⁶

Though the <u>Union Vedette</u> had said that Mormons are like every-body else and will trade where they can get the best bargains--implying that the Gentile merchants did not have to worry too much about losing business--the paper changed its tune in February 1867. At that time the boycott had been in effect about two months, and Gentile businesses were hurting. The Vedette reported:

. . . for some months past, the "times" have been unprecedentedly dull. In fact, in mercantile parlance, the "bottom has verily fallen out" of Salt Lake trade. Never has there been such a dearth of money, or so little business transacted.

As far as the <u>Vedette</u> was concerned, the solution to this state of affairs was the coming of the railroad. The paper stated, "Our people [the Gentiles] are all interested in it most deeply. To the commercial man it gives assurance of better times in the near future." The paper sarcastically suggested that even to the Mormon, "wrapped up as he is in his faith and his predilection for isolation," the railroad should be

¹⁶Arden Beal Olsen, "The History of Mormon Mercantile Cooperation in Utah," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1935), p. 27, copy located at Brigham Young Univ. Library.

a welcome asset. Mormons should welcome the railroad, in the viewpoint of the <u>Vedette</u>, because it will "break in on the monotony of his everyday life and . . . on some of the peculiar practices of his creed"; it will bring "temporal prosperity, open markets for his grain and other produce, scatter money among the people, and advance the temporal (even if in his view it may not the spiritual), welfare of the community." The <u>Vedette</u> anxiously awaited the railroad, for it would "bear on its iron horse enlightenment, commerce, contact with the world, and by peaceful means, some day if not soon, overcome the errors of Mormonism." 17

Gentiles in general believed that the railroad would be the downfall of Mormonism--it would bring to Utah sufficient numbers of outsiders to effectively dilute the power of the Church and its institutions. Arrington quotes one publication as saying, "When the United States goes to Utah [via the railroad], Mormonism will disappear like a puddle with Niagra Falls turned into it." 18

The anti-Mormon press in Salt Lake City held similar but much more bitter views. It proclaimed:

... the orthodox churches of the land, whose members number millions, will throw themselves against the spurious monster of Utah with all their force. This force only awaits the opportunity that the railroad will give it. 19

Church leaders were very concerned about the consequences of

¹⁷The Daily Union Vedette, February 27, 1867.

¹⁸Arrington, <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>, p. 255.

Young, op. cit., XII, 293, reported by David W. Evans.

the railroad coming to Utah. One reason was their fear that the Mormon community would be weakened by the influx of Gentiles; another that easily obtained, cheap imports would further drain badly needed capital into the hands of Gentiles who would then use that capital against the Church. Furthermore, the availability of cheap imports threatened to "disemploy a considerable number of Mormons working in local industries." Disemployment would also destroy home manufacturing, strongly encouraged by Church leaders because it allowed the Saints a degree of self-sufficiency. ²⁰

In light of these threats, the coming of the railroad was the major cause of the boycott of 1868. In the October conference, George Q. Cannon said,

We are told--openly and without disguise, that when the railroad is completed there will be such a flood of so-called "civilization" brought in here that every vestige [sic] of us, our church and institutions shall be completely obliterated."

Cannon viewed it a "folly, nay insanity" for the Saints to "sit still, fold . . . [their] arms supinely and await the crash without making a single effort to ward it off." The Church by no means passively awaited the negative effects of the railroad. Earnestly it initiated the boycott and founded ZCMI for protection.

The Salt Lake Daily Reporter

The <u>Union Vedette</u>, in spite of its large number of paid advertisements, met with financial difficulty and eventually disaster. The editors were changed in August 1867. The new editor openly admitted

²⁰Arrington, <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>, pp. 240-241.

 $^{^{21}}$ Young, op. cit., XII, 290-291, reported by David W. Evans.

that the paper had been condemned more than commended because of the "wishy-washy, back-boneless Gentiles, and those reeking with hypocrisy as well as the advocates and defenders of polygamy, [who] can see everything to blame and nothing to praise in its columns." On September 18 of the following month, the paper discontinued. 23

On May 11, 1868, a new paper, the <u>Salt Lake Daily Reporter</u>, commenced publication. Though the editor, S. S. Saul, explained that the <u>Reporter</u> was unrelated to the <u>Vedette</u>, the former used the facilities of the latter. Moreover, Saul expressed his hope that the <u>Reporter</u> would fill the void created by the loss of the <u>Vedette</u>. In lieu of this statement plus the fact that the <u>Reporter</u> assumed the anti-Mormon posture of the <u>Vedette</u>, the <u>Reporter</u> was considered the <u>Vedette's</u> successor.

That the <u>Reporter</u> was a cause, even though a secondary one, of the boycott of 1868 is evident from the October conference talks of George Q. Cannon and Orson Pratt. Pratt spoke of the <u>Vedette</u> and <u>Reporter</u> as if they were the same paper. He called the paper "scandalous" and somewhat chastized the Saints for supporting the Gentile merchants who in turn supported the paper. Pratt expressed his feeling that the paper could not have continued "belching forth falsehoods of the blackest dye" against the Saints and Brigham Young had not the merchants supported it. He said that the paper's purpose was to "arouse the feelings of the enemies to the Saints throughout the States" so that an army would be sent to Salt Lake "that they [the merchants] may

The Daily Union Vedette, August 16, 1867, as quoted in Alter, op. cit., \overline{p} . 374.

²³Alter, op. cit., p. 374.

make money out of it."²⁴ The secondary causes of the boycott of 1868 paralleled those of the boycott of 1866.

Cannon frequently condemned the <u>Reporter</u>. Shocked to think that in Zion where the Saints were fully established there was a "power growing up in . . . [their] midst that threatens [them] with utter destruction." Cannon said that this power, the <u>Reporter</u>, was more abominable than the <u>Nauvoo Expositor</u> which the Saints destroyed because of its lies. The time had come, Cannon declared in essence, when something must be done about the paper, which has heretofore been ignored by the Church and allowed to survive. Cannon then quoted extracts from the <u>Reporter</u> which severely slandered the Saints. As evidence that Mormons were patient, forebearing, and law abiding, Cannon called attention to the fact that the editor had not been hanged: "In any other community, he would have been strung up to a telegraph pole," and the "office would have been 'gutted' within five days." Cannon never suggested what had to be done to silence the <u>Reporter</u> other than for Mormons to cease trading with the Gentile merchants.

Reaction of the Salt Lake Daily Reporter. In its beginning, the Reporter did not appear anti-Mormon in nature. Unlike the Vedette, it editorialized a great deal about non-controversial subjects. In fact, sometimes the Reporter appeared friendly toward Mormonism. When Heber C. Kimball died, for example, the paper praised him as a man of high character:

²⁴Young, op. cit., XII, 307, reported by David W. Evans.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 292-294.

However, a few anti-Mormon articles appeared after the above editorial. Nevertheless, it was not until the initiation of the 1868 boycott in the October conference that the Reporter became overtly hostile toward Mormonism. The paper reacted quite emotionally in response to the conference speeches. It garbled and corrupted reports of some speeches so much so that the misrepresentations were apparently intentional. For example: An editorial in response to George Q. Cannon's speech was headed with the question: "ARE WE TO HAVE A REIGN OF TERROR IN UTAH? IS THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH TO BE DENIED AND A FREE PRESS DEMOLISHED." The editorial stated that Cannon's speech was "bathed in blood," and "aroused the passions of the people to the boiling point," for he spoke of the fate of the Reporter were it located in any other community. The Reporter implied that Cannon was attempting to arouse the emotions of the Saints to violence against the paper. It concluded: "Out upon you [church leaders] and your threats of assassination and violence. Your props must indeed be very far gone when you have to resort to such means to save yourself."27

Several days later, the <u>Reporter</u> stated that, "for some undefined reason the Mormon leaders developed at this conference a plan of warfare against the Gentile in this Territory. . . . " The paper interpreted that the plan, the reason for which had been very well defined, was

²⁶Salt Lake Daily Reporter, June 22, 1868.

²⁷Ibid., October 6, 1868.

devised to "starve out" the Gentiles by complete "non-intercourse."

The paper then quoted an alleged, but fabricated, conference "proclamation" which said that "henceforth and forever in Zion it shall be unlawful for a saint to . . . purchase any article" from a "loathsome Gentile." While the essence of this statement was correct, the "proclamation" allegedly went on to say that Mormons could not sell to Gentiles no matter what price the latter offered. Moreover, Mormons were not to sell, "give, grant or present, even in the name of charity anything that a saint may possess, not excepting an article of food, to a Gentile, tho' he be sorely pressed by hunger, for they are vipers in the midst of the faithful." 28

Before the preceding statement had been made, however, Brigham Young made it quite clear in conference that while the Saints would not buy from Gentiles, the latter were more than welcome to buy goods and services from the Saints:

Are we going to cut off all communication and deal with outsiders? No. If they want a house built we will build it for them if they will pay us the money. If they want our grain, they are welcome to it, if they will pay us the money for it. We will furnish . . . [the soldiers at Camp Douglas] all the hay, flour, oats, and barley and everything that they want.²⁹

It is interesting to note that after its fabrication of the so-called Mormon "proclamation" the <u>Reporter</u> later stated that "there is no man who entertains a more tolerant feeling to all sincere and honest Mormons than we do." 30

²⁸Ibid., October 9, 1868.

²⁹Young, op. cit., XII, 286, reported by David W. Evans.

³⁰ Salt Lake Daily Reporter, October 25, 1868.

Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution

Since Gentile merchants had had a monopoly on trade in Utah and Mormons had not as yet had a real chance to enter that field of business, the boycott created a problem for the Mormons: Where and from whom were they going to buy their merchandise? Church leaders could never have successfully initiated the boycott without having first laid the groundwork for the solution to the problem. The solution came in the form of what is believed to be the first department stores established in America, Zion's Co-Operative Mercantile Institution. Church leaders instructed Mormon merchants to invest their independent businesses into the cooperative association for which they would receive the equivalent value of stock. ZCMI, the parent wholesale store in Salt Lake City, imported goods from the states via the railroad. Branch co-ops, in turn, purchased the merchandise to be sold in their locality from ZCMI. As the counterpart to the boycott, Church leaders required the Saints to buy from ZCMI branches. In addition to making the boycott effective this action would help to build the economy within the Mormon establishment. To differentiate Mormon co-operative stores from Gentile stores, a picture of an "all-seeing eye" was placed over the doors of Mormon stores, accompanied by a sign stating, "Holiness to the Lord." Thus Mormons were not left to guess in which stores they could legitimately shop. A Mr. Trumbo, a Gentile merchant, thought he would take advantage of ZCMI by placing the above-mentioned sign over the door of his own store. Offended Mormons destroyed the sign. 31

As a last resort, the Church did, on a few occasions at least,

³¹ Watters, op. cit., p. 58.

disfellowship those who would not comply with the boycott and trade exclusively with ZCMI. Sabitts F. and Angeline Hyde testified that Bishop W. S. Warren said that "a man who wouldn't buy goods where they were cheapest was a fool," that parts of the co-operative system were to "build up men such as B. Young, D. H. Wells and W. H. Hooper," and that "poor brethren must either starve or apostatize!" Apparently Bishop Warren was not actually responsible for the charge because the record states that Brigham Young asked him to reveal the individual who was responsible for that statement. Warren declined on grounds of not wanting to betray a friend. It was therefore moved by President Young and seconded by George A. Smith that Warren be suspended from the priesthood. Apparently Warren was bishop of Parowan, for Daniel H. Wells asked him to inform the School of the Prophets of those who traded with the Walker Brothers' in that town. Warren also declined this request; but, on his return to Parowan, he had Brother Barton, who was guilty of both trading with Walker's and responsible for the above statements, write the school explaining the situation. Barton apologized to the school for innocently buying goods from Walkers, explaining that after the purchase Warren informed him that he should refrain from further trading with them. Barton also apologized for making "any unbecoming expressions" about the co-operative system and asked to be forgiven. 32 What action was taken is not stated.

Effects of the Boycott

An anti-Mormon writer, J. H. Beadle, reports that after the

³²Iving, op. cit., 2, Notebook 7, pp. 42-43.

enforcement of the boycott, "greater bitterness" developed between the Mormons and Gentiles than already existed. "... both parties contented themselves with a little quiet cursing." He said that the parties seldom met because of social ostracism; but when they did, they either "sat in sullen silence, or their conversation was a mixture of the 'rile' and Knagg." 33

Beadle further reports from his research that there were approximately 800 Gentiles in Salt Lake City during the winter of 1868-69, but because of the boycott many soon departed. He estimated that less than 300 remained by June 1, 1869. He addle mentions only two Gentile firms, Gilbert & Sons and Ransohoff & Co., who left Salt Lake. Certainly there must have been others, for a number established their businesses in Corinne where they expected the Gentile capitol of Utah to be established when the railroad was completed, but research does not specify any other merchants. Beadle described the state of affairs in which the Corinne merchants found themselves.

It was amusing and provoking to take a walk along Main Street [Corinne] that winter and see the melancholy Jews standing in the doors of their stores looking in vain for customers. For six months the ten Gentile firms did not sell one-twentieth the usual amount of goods; their disgust was beyond expression, and their curses against Brigham not loud, but deep. 35

In light of the conditions which Beadle described, it is no wonder that many Gentiles heavily attacked the Mormon merchandising cooperation. Tullidge reports that for years "the most base and

³³Beadle, op. cit., p. 507.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 305-306.

As quoted in Bernice Gibbs Anderson, "The Gentile City of Corinne," <u>Utah State Historical Quarterly</u>, 9 (1941), 144.

unscrupulous methods have been adopted" to destroy ZCMI. The hostility and bitterness of the press toward that institution has been unparalleled in the history of mercantile enterprises. Nevertheless, as a monument to its credit, ZCMI has had "no note go to protest; no firm, by dealing with it, has ever lost a dollar; its business transactions have been satisfactory to its creditors," and its "payment of dividends to its stockholders has been very high." ³⁶

T. B. H. Stenhouse, former editor of the pro-Mormon <u>Salt Lake</u>

<u>Telegraph</u>, apostatized from the Mormon Church partly because of its economic policies. He wrote that though larger mercantile firms were able to survive the boycott, the smaller ones were forced out of business and lost nearly everything. 37

Brigham Young said that the effects of the boycott were "apparent to the passer-by, to the transient person and to the world." Just what these effects were, he did not say, but one might infer that the Gentile merchants had been substantially held in check. Young's feeling was that had the boycott not been effected, the Saints "would have seen perhaps, one hundred merchants in this city now more than last year. They would have brought their clerks and friends and a great number who would have operated against us." 39

The Utah Reporter, a continuation of the Salt Lake Daily Reporter

³⁶ Edward W. Tullidge, <u>Tullige's Quarterly Magazine</u>, Vol. 1 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Published by Author, 1881), p. 390.

³⁷Stenhouse, op. cit., p. 626.

³⁸Quoted in Neff, op. cit., p. 831.

³⁹Ibid.

which had been moved to Corinne, stated that Salt Lake looked dull and dreary. Business was virtually dead "with no chance for revival," and that "many contemplate closing up and storing their goods for the winter." 40

While many writers concur that the boycott was a serious detriment, often fatal to the Gentile merchants, they do not specify what or how many merchants were actually forced to close their businesses. They do reveal, however, that of the large, prominent merchants, several claimed huge declines in profits. William S. Godbe, a prominent Mormon excommunicated for proclaiming economic policies antagonistic to the Church, claimed that he was forced to close his drugstore business because of competition caused by the boycott and the negative feelings of the Saints toward him. He said that a year or two later, when he should have been worth at least \$100,000, he was that much in debt. 41

Walker Brothers, former Latter-day Saints who had been excommunicated from the Church, and Auerbach Brothers, Gentile merchants, claimed a great loss of trade. Stenhouse states that though they and Kahn sustained huge business losses, they were nevertheless able to continue business. One Gentile merchant, David Day, in a letter to the board of directors of ZCMI, claimed that "when the parent store [ZCMI] started we were able to sell \$10,000 a month; now we scarcely sell \$10 a day."

^{40&}lt;u>Utah Reporter</u>, October 27, 1869.

⁴¹R. N. Baskin, <u>Reminiscences of Early Utah</u>, Photo reprint of 1914 edition (Salt Lake City, Utah: Modern Microfilm Co.), pp. 80-81.

⁴² ZCMI's First Record Book, Minute Book A, p. 56, as quoted in Arden Bolsen, "Merchandising Struggles in Early Utah," Brand Book, Harold H. Dunham (ed.), (Denver: University of Denver Press, 1950), p. 290.

the boycott relate the information obtained from Walker's statement that the sales of Walker Brothers decreased from \$50,000 a month to \$4,000 a month and that Auerbachs sales similarly decreased. There is some question, however, as to just how much Gentile merchants actually lost, for Arrington found that the tax lists of that period do not support Walker's claim of financial loss. Rather, they report that during March and April of 1869, when ZCMI had just commenced business, their sales nearly doubled those for the same period of the previous year. Arrington suggests the reason for the increased profits was that Walkers absorbed the business of those merchants who discontinued their trade. All Walker's case is indicative of the reports of other merchants, the losses incurred from the boycott are substantially exaggerated. Nevertheless, evidence has been given indicating the boycott did take its toll from the Gentile merchants.

The effects of the boycott were of limited duration, however.

The following year, Saints who came to Salt Lake City for conference jammed the Gentile stores so heavily that clerks had difficulty serving them. He condition is reminiscent of Livingston and Kinkead's trade when they first opened their store in 1849. "The store was densely packed with would-be buyers, all anxious to get near the counter." He counter.

Neff maintains that enthusiasm for mercantile co-operation among Saints heavily declined because the principle was founded on the

⁴³Arrington, <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>, p. 307.

⁴⁴Stenhouse, op. cit., p. 644.

⁴⁵ James H. Martineau, "Pioneer Sketches: A Journey in 1854," The Contributor, XI (1940), 183, as quoted in Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, p. 82.

expectation that the Saints should and would be loyal to the Church-sponsored program. But the economic practicality of buying where the best bargains were found took precedence over loyalty to the Church. 46 Competition forced Gentile merchants to lower their prices to the point that many Saints felt they could obtain better bargains from them than from ZCMI. Brigham Young responded by saying:

Among this people called Latter-day Saints, when the devil has got the crowns, sovereigns, guineas and the twenty dollar pieces, it has been all right; but let the Lord get a sixpence and there is an eternal grunt about it. 47

The influx of Gentiles brought by the railroad revived Gentiles trade to the point that one would hardly guess that they had been boycotted. In 1878 President John Taylor said that the Saints had made an "awful bungling" at co-operation as they had done "with a great many other things"; and, though the principle was correct, "Saints were beginning to pull off in their own interests." Finally in 1882 the First Presidency, consisting of John Taylor, George Q. Cannon, and Joseph F. Smith, issued an epistle to the Saints ending the Church's mercantile monopoly and allowing the Saints to enter into private businesses. This freedom allowed the Saints to trade with merchants, even Gentiles, unaffiliated with ZCMI. The boycott, essentially ignored during most of the 1870s, was virtually dead after the epistle of 1882.

⁴⁶Neff, op. cit., pp. 832-833.

 $^{^{47}}$ Young, op. cit., XII, 373, reported by David W. Evans.

⁴⁸Young, op. cit., XX, 58, reported by George F. Gibbs.

⁴⁹Olsen, op. cit., p. 117.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Persecutors had forced the Latter-day Saints to leave their homes in New York, Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. Opposition to the Mormon concept of the kingdom of God and Mormon efforts to build the same appears to be the essential cause for the persecution. The Saints migrated to Utah in 1847 to remove themselves from their persecutors and to isolate themselves in a locality where they could peacefully build their Kingdom. Isolation was short-lived, however. In 1849 thousands of emigrants passed through Salt Lake City on their way to the gold mines of California. Some immediately settled in the city; others returned to settle at the end of the Gold Rush. Of the latter, most were merchants who had the idea of making financial profits in a city that, because of its geographical isolation, was a merchants' paradise. Because of this ideal situation, the body of Gentile merchants swelled rapidly.

Conflict between Mormons and Gentiles commenced almost immediately. Once again the Gentiles did not like the way the Mormons were attempting to build their Kingdom. A major objection was that they felt the Mormons united Church and state under the tyranny of Brigham Young. This political conflict helped lay the foundation for a mercantile conflict yet to erupt.

The mercantile conflict took the form of the Saints boycotting

anti-Mormon merchants in 1866, expanding the boycott in 1868 to include all Gentile merchants whether or not they were anti-Mormon, and establishing ZCMI as an institution with which they were all expected to trade exclusively. There is certainly no one reason for the boycott of 1866, though it is clear that the essential reason for the boycott of 1868 was the coming of the railroad. The 1866 boycott was caused by a number of reasons most of which were interrelated. It is difficult to determine which, if any, reason was primary. It is even more difficult, however, to determine all of the causes for the 1866 boycott. This study has attempted to explain the major causes.

The 1866 boycott was enacted as a defense measure against some Gentile merchants whom Mormons thought were agitating the political conflict. Specifically, the major causes of this boycott are as follows:

The Gentile merchants priced their commodities as they pleased since they monopolized trade from 1849 to about 1867. In general, their prices were geared to fleece the Saints, so they felt, particularly when a scarce item was in demand. Church leaders warned the merchants to be more considerate of the Saints or they would take up merchandising themselves. Gentiles ignored the warnings, so Brigham Young counseled the Saints to freight their own merchandise from the States rather than to depend on the Gentiles for that service; to establish faithful Mormon merchants in the various communities which they patronized; and to cease buying from Gentiles who sought the destruction of the Church.

A number of Gentiles who opposed the Mormons' concept of the Kingdom aired their feelings in Washington. They accused Church leaders of running a vicious, tyrannical theocracy, which included murder as a method of forcing obedience. The report of W. W. Drummond

and W. M. F. Magraw to the effect that the Mormons were in a state of rebellion against the United States resulted in the Utah Expedition. Because the Saints had patronized Gentile merchants to the point where many had become wealthy, Church leaders felt the merchants should reciprocate by correcting the false reports sent to Washington about the Mormons. Correcting the reports, they believed, would eliminate any reason for Washington to send an army; but to the vexation of Church leaders, nothing was done to correct the reports. An even greater thorn in the side of Church leaders was their belief that Gentile merchants actually wanted the army to come in order to increase Salt Lake City trade.

S. Newton Brassfield and J. King Robinson, anti-Mormon Gentiles, were both killed by unknown assailants on April 2, 1866, and October 22, 1866, respectively. Those responsible were never discovered; but, to fan the flames of anti-Mormon sentiment already running high in the nation, the Gentiles dogmatically accused Brigham Young of directing the "assassinations." Gentiles used the assassination stories to give substance to their claims that the Mormon Church was satanically corrupt. Gentiles sent reports to Washington to the effect that they feared for their own lives because the Mormons hated them so intensely, and they requested that the federal government send another army to Salt Lake City to protect their lives and property. The Saints viewed this request as another means for Gentile merchants to destroy the Church and at the same time "make money out of Uncle Sam."

Because of conflict over land titles, some Gentiles attempted to "jump" Mormon claims. Among the land jumpers was King Robinson. Since land jumping had heated the emotions of both Mormon and Gentile and Robinson was killed shortly after his land jumping episode, the Gentiles felt the Mormons, and ultimately Brigham Young, were surely to blame—the motive was obvious. Exactly what part the Gentile merchants played in land jumping is not clear; but that Church leaders blamed them for it and therefore boycotted them is clear. Evidently the merchants were encouraging and supporting land jumping if not actually participating in it themselves.

No cause of the 1866 boycott appears to be more influential than the publication of the Union <u>Vedette</u>, a very outspoken anti-Mormon newspaper published by the California volunteers at Camp Douglas but supported by the advertising space purchased by Gentile merchants. Through the <u>Vedette</u>, the Gentiles voiced their anti-Mormon sentiments, so vicious from the Mormon viewpoint. Church leaders held that the paper never could have survived had the Gentile merchants not supported it.

Therefore, because of the conflict resulting from the above circumstances, Church leaders levied a boycott against anti-Mormon merchants in December 1866.

In October 1868, Church leaders expanded the boycott to include all Gentile merchants rather than only those who were anti-Mormon. The principal reason for the expansion was the coming of the railroad which would bring a significant influx of Gentiles. The Saints believed this influx would increase the already severe agitation and thwart the growth and success of the Church. A secondary reason for the expansion of the boycott was the publication of the Salt Lake Daily Reporter which, in a sense, was the successor to the Vedette. The contribution of the Reporter in effecting the boycott of 1868 was essentially the same as the contribution of the Vedette in effecting the boycott of 1866--Gentile

merchants were supporting an adamantly anti-Mormon newspaper.

The two boycotts were effective, but only for a while. The Saints obediently passed by the stores of the Gentile merchants and traded with ZCMI. However, after competition of ZCMI forced the prices of Gentile merchandise to drop and after the Saints patriotic support of the boycott subsided, the Mormons soon traded where they could bargain best. Frequently this was in Gentile stores.

In 1882 the First Presidency issued an epistle to the Church members, discontinuing the Church's monopoly on mercantile trading. This epistle officially ended the boycott which, for all intents and purposes, was already dead. The Saints eventually made no distinction between Mormon and Gentile merchants, and the mercantile conflict has long since dissolved. Essentially, the political conflict dissolved as well, and relative peace was established between the two groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Harris, Sarah Hollister. An Unwritten Chapter of Salt Lake 1851-1901. New York: Printed Privately, 1901.
- Ivins, Stanley. Notebook and Transcript Manuscript Collection, microfilm, Utah State University Library.
- Knecht, William L. and Peter L. Crawley (compliers). <u>History of Brigham Young 1847-1867</u>. Berkeley, California: Mass Cal Associates, 1964.
- Parowan Historical Record of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, September 14, 1866. Located in Church Historian's Office.
- Smith, Joseph. <u>History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day</u>
 Saints. Ed. by B. H. Roberts (2d ed. rev.), Salt Lake City, Utah:
 Deseret Book Co., 1959-60.
- U.S. Congress. House. <u>The Condition of Utah</u>. H.R. 96, 39th Cong., 1st sess., July 23, 1866. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1866).
- Young, Brigham. <u>Journal of Discourses</u>. Liverpool, England, 1954. 27 Vols.

B. NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Bernice Gibbs. "The Gentile City of Corinne." <u>Utah State</u> <u>Historical Quarterly</u>, 9, 1941.
- Arrington, Leonard J. "The Transcontinental Railroad and Mormon Economic Policy," <u>Pacific Historical Review</u>, 20, 2 (May, 1951), 143-157.
- Carter, Kate B. (compiler). <u>Heart Throbs of the West</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, vols. 4, 4, 1943.
- Hansen, Klaus F. "The Metamorphasis of the Kingdom of God." <u>Dialogue:</u> A Journal of Mormon Thought, I, 3 (Winter, 1966), 69.
- Latter-day Saints Millennial Star, (Liverpool, England), 1852.

- Olsen, Arden B. "Merchandising Struggles in Early Utah." <u>Brand Book</u>. Harold H. Dunham (editor), University of Denver Press, 1950.
- Salt Lake Daily Reporter, May 1868-January, 1869.
- Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, 1964-1868.
- The Daily Union Vedette (Salt Lake City, Utah), 1963-1868.
- The Deseret News (Salt Lake City, Utah), 1852-1879.
- Tullidge, Edward W. <u>Tullidge's Quarterly Magazine</u>, Vol. 1. Salt Lake City, Utah: Published by Author, 1881.

C. GENERAL WORKS

- Alter, J. Cecil. <u>Early Utah Journalism</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Historical Society, 1938.
- Andrus, Hyrum L. <u>Joseph Smith and World Government</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1962.
- Arrington, Leonard J. <u>Great Basin Kingdom</u>. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. <u>History of Utah</u>. San Francisco: The History Company, Publishers, 1890.
- Baskin, R. N. Reminiscences of Early Utah. Photo reprint of 1914 ed. Salt Lake City, Utah: Modern Microfilm Co.
- Beadle, J. H. <u>Life in Utah: The Mysteries and Crimes of Mormonism</u>. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: National Publishing Co.
- Dwyer, Joseph Robert. The Gentile Come to Utah: A Study in Religious and Social Conflict. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1941.
- Furniss, Norman F. The Mormon Conflict 1850-1859. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Kauffman, Ruth and Regenald Wright. The Latter Day Saints, A Study of the Mormons in the Light of Economic Conditions. London: Williams and Norgate, 1912.
- Linn, William Alexander. The Story of the Mormons (From the Date of Their Origin to the Year 1901). London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1923.
- Neff, Andrew Love. <u>History of Utah 1847 to 1869</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1940.

- Olsen, Arden Beal. "The History of Mormon Mercantile Cooperation in Utah." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1935.
- Roberts, B. H. A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1965.
- Stenhouse, T. B. H. <u>The Rocky Mountain Saints</u>. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1873.
- Toponce, Alexander. Reminiscences of Alexander Toponce, Pioneer 1839-1923. Ogden, Utah: Published by Mrs. Katie Toponce, 1923.
- Tullidge, Edward W. <u>History of Salt Lake City</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: Star Printing Company, 1886.
- Tullidge, Edward W. <u>Life of Brigham Young: or, Utah and Her Founders.</u>
 New York, 1876.
- Watters, Leon L. The Pioneer Jews of Utah. New York: American Jewish Historical Society, 1952.
- Whitney, Orson F. <u>History of Utah</u>. Salt Lake City, Utah: George Q. Cannon and Sons Co., 1893.

CAUSES OF THE MORMON BOYCOTT AGAINST GENTILE MERCHANTS IN 1866 AND 1868

Peter Neil Garff

Department of Church History and Doctrine

MA Degree, May 1971

ABSTRACT

In the 1850s and 1860s Gentiles monopolized the mercantile profession in Salt Lake valley. Conflict arose between the Mormons and anti-Mormon merchants for essentially five reasons: Mormon Church leaders believed merchants charged exorbitant prices, encouraged the coming of Johnston's army, falsely accused them for the "assassination" of two Salt Lake City Gentiles, supported Gentiles who were "jumping" Mormon land claims, and supported an adamantly anti-Mormon newspaper. Church leaders maintained that the motive behind these actions was essentially the destruction of their church; therefore, they levied a boycott against the anti-Mormon merchants in 1866.

Because Church leaders felt the coming of the railroad would bring more Gentiles to Utah to fight against the Saints and because the merchants persisted in supporting an anti-Mormon press, Church leaders expanded the boycott in 1868 to include all Gentile merchants.

The boycott was effective until Mormon patriotic support for the boycott wained and Gentile prices dropped. The boycott was officially lifted in 1882.

COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

ussell R. Rich, Committee Chairman

Howard H. Barron, Committee Member)

(LaMar C. Berrett, Department Chairman)