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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This research focuses on the Indian slave trade between the Mormon settlers and the Native Americans in the Great Basin region. Prior to 1847, when the Mormons began colonizing the Great Basin, the slave trade was an essential element of native Indian life. Systematically, stronger Indian tribes captured prisoners from weaker Indian tribes before selling them as slaves to either the Mexicans or to other Indians. Mormons, therefore, confronted the Indian slave trade soon after their arrival because local Indians expected them to participate in the slave trade. Mormons disliked the slave trade but realized Indian-Mormon relations revolved around their participation. To justify their participation in the slave trade, both secularly and spiritually, and to essentially legalize the slave trade between Indians and Mexicans, Mormons developed a program in which they would purchase slaves, adopt them into their families, and assimilate them into their culture.

The primary advocate of this adoption program was Brigham Young: Mormon prophet, Utah Territorial Governor, and Superintendent of Indian Affairs. Young zealously provided both secular and religious justifications, which he linked to expected results, for Mormon participation in the
Indian slave trade. With Young's approval, the Utah territorial legislature passed a law which legalized the Mormon adoption policy. This research explores Young's reasons for supporting the adoption policy as well as his expected results from Mormon participation. Further, this research compares Young's expectations with the actual results.

The Indian slave trade, as a fact in western United States' history, has been well documented. Eighteenth and nineteenth century Great Basin and Southwest explorers recorded in diaries, memorates, and official government documents, their perceptions about the slave trade. Later, Mormon settlers recorded their observations of the slave trade through similar materials.

In 1929, historian William J. Snow wrote an article about the Indian slave trade in the Great Basin area in which he summarized these earlier accounts. In his article, Snow presents primary historical accounts and data about the slave trade such as the accounts by explorer Daniel W. Jones, and the territorial law passed in 1852 that sanctioned Mormon participation in the slave trade.

Juanita Brooks, a noted Mormon historian, wrote the next significant work on the Mormon-Indian slave trade.  

---

1 Daniel W. Jones, Forty Years Among the Indians. Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1890. This book is an often quoted primary source that explains Mormon-Indian relations and the issue of the slave trade. Brooks, Snow, and Creer, use Jones as a primary source for a reliable commentary on the slave trade.
In her article, published in 1944, Brooks argues that the Mormons had an economic and a philosophical basis for entering the Indian slave trade. Brooks also presents some material that revealed important social challenges faced by the Indians who were bought and adopted by Mormons—especially pertaining to race and intermarriage. Brooks feels that adopted Indians faced these challenges because the dominant white culture was unable to accept the adopted Indians as equals. Additionally, Brooks notes that some adopted Indians were treated more equally than others. From her sample of thirty-two adopted Indians, she concludes that female Indians were more apt to intermarry with whites, while Indian men usually married Indians or didn't marry at all.

In 1945, A. Arline Malouf also wrote an article on the Indian slave trade. Malouf's article was basically a re-examination of the Indian slave trade through sources already quoted by Snow and Brooks. Malouf's contribution to this subject is found in his concluding paragraph wherein he suggests that "The most striking result of Spanish slavery was the development of bands of raiders which preyed upon the weaker bands in their vicinity." Because these Indian slave traders, or bands of raiders, threatened Mormon colonization efforts, Malouf asserts, the Mormons used a combination of religious ideology and military superiority
to ultimately destroy the slave trade in the Inter-mountain West.⁵

Another historian, Leland Hargrave Creer, reviews the subject of the Indian slave trade in a short chapter of his book about the exploration of Utah.⁶ Creer's chapter II is one of the better explanations of the Spanish/Mexican-Indian slave trade in the Great Basin. In his chapter, Creer reviews the documentation of the Indian slave trade during the period 1776-1856 and includes an explanation of Mormon policy concerning the slave trade. He also cites the entire Utah Territorial Act that legalized the slave trade between the Indians and Mexicans while it sanctioned the slave trade between Indians and Mormons.

In 1964, Roldo V. Dutson wrote a Master's thesis about racial attitudes among members of the Mormon faith.⁷ Dutson's thesis contains an important chapter entitled, "Slavery Among the Indians of the Utah Territory" in which he reviews the Indian slave question. Dutson uses this chapter to conclude that Mormons, from 1847 to 1865, accepted slavery among Negroes but rejected slavery among Indians. In support of his claim, Dutson cites Mormon theological statements during the period 1847 to 1964.

Some important historical sources about the Indian slave trade are the four series of compilations published by the Daughters of Utah Pioneers.⁸ The Daughters of Utah Pioneers compile personal historical accounts of events in
Utah's history. Within these four series of accounts, some volumes contain information about Indian slaves that were bought and then adopted by Mormons. These accounts are scattered throughout the volumes that comprise some ten thousand pages. Some accounts are full of information about the adopted Indians, while others only mention a name or an incident concerning an adopted Indian. However, these accounts are the only known accounts of adopted Indians.

This research uses prior academic studies and historical accounts to explain the important historical precedents that led President Brigham Young and the Utah Territorial Legislature to sanction the purchase of Indian slaves among the Mormons. It also seeks to investigate the Mormon justifications, as enunciated by Young, for persuading the predominantly Mormon territorial legislature to enact the 1852 territorial law that legally established Indian slavery in Utah Territory. Young's statements are the primary source of the Mormon's justifications because Young was not only President of the Mormon Church, but was also Utah Territory's Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in 1852.

One of Young's primary reasons for Mormon interaction in the Indian slave trade was the incorporation of the newly purchased slaves into the framework of the Mormon family. Young reasoned that Indian slaves, who otherwise would have ended up as servants of other Indians or of Mexicans, would
be better off as members of a Mormon family. Further, Young expected the adopted Indians to become assimilated into the Mormon culture. By assimilation, Young meant that adopted Indians would become a member of the Mormon Church and thereupon receive all Mormon ordinances necessary to become saved or exalted in the Mormon sense. Additionally, Young expected the adopted Indians to become fully "civilized" or Anglo-Americanized. Therefore, the adopted Indians would be legally, socially, religiously, and culturally accepted as members of the community. Or in other words, become as any other person in the Mormon community.

The definition of assimilation is not always clear in social science because each discipline defines it differently. This study will define assimilation in a traditional manner. The word assimilate comes from the latin word assimulare, which means to make similar, or the process wherein one group becomes similar to another. Robert Park, one of the first scholars to define assimilation, states that:

Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life.

Milton M. Gordon adds to Park's definition as he basically defines assimilation as a change of cultural patterns to

---

2The definitions of essential terms is found in Appendix I.
those of the host or dominant society, though he divides his
definition into several categories. Some scholars, such
as Greeley, Kallen, and Feagin, have added specialized
definitions to the literature and a current trend among
some area studies' scholars is to almost reject the Park and
Gordon definitions because of an establishment and an
ethnocentric bias; however, this study follows the original
definitions set forth by Park and Gordon because the Mormon
adoption program was an attempt to absorb the Indians into
the Mormon culture.

This study will focus on the Mormon attempt to
assimilate the adopted Indians into their culture.
Brooks, in 1944, concluded that adopted Indians were unable
to become fully assimilated into the Mormon culture. She
bases her assumption upon scattered accounts of marriage
among the adopted Indians. Brooks also mentions some
assumed social challenges faced by the adopted Indians,
challenges she linked to the difficulties of cultural
assimilation. Since Brooks's article in 1944, no
significant work dealing specifically with the Mormon-Indian
slave trade and the associated effects upon the adopted
Indians has been published. Therefore, Brooks's assumptions
and conclusions have neither been confirmed nor challenged.

This thesis is based upon the work begun by Brooks.
Brooks suggested some inconsistencies between Mormon
expectations and actual results of the adoption policy. To
confirm the inconsistencies mentioned by Brooks, as well as to confirm other inconsistencies not mentioned by Brooks, this thesis draws from other historical accounts that mention adopted Indians. Many of these accounts are drawn from the volumes of memorates published by the Daughters of Utah Pioneers, while other accounts are drawn from additional historical sources.

Using these accounts, this research shows that adopted Indians faced many challenges related to their status as a racial minority. At the present time, scattered accounts describe some of these challenges, but no comprehensive work has been compiled to adequately describe and explain what these challenges were, and to what extent the challenges affected the lives of the adopted Indians. This research shows that these challenges, necessitated by the meshing of two cultures, resulted from a long established Indian culture becoming subservient to a new and dominating Mormon culture.

The information found in the Daughters of Utah Pioneer accounts, coupled with the Brooks accounts and other scattered accounts, helps describe the Indian's degree of cultural assimilation in the Mormon culture. This research then verifies the degree of adopted Indian assimilation described by historians, who are generally Anglo-Americans, by analyzing ordinance records kept by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. These records, used primarily
for genealogical data and Mormon temple work, contain accurate records of baptisms, marriages, endowments, and sealings. Also, these religious ordinances figure importantly in the Mormon belief of personal exaltation or salvation. Because these Mormon ordinances are requirements in Mormon belief for personal salvation, they are an accurate mirror of the adopted Indians' degree of assimilation into the Mormon culture in-as-much as the adopted Indians either participated or did not participate in these religious ordinances. Thus, this research presents an overall description of adopted Indian assimilation but focuses on the adopted Indians' religious assimilation in particular.

Limitations and Delimitations

The primary limitation for this research is the availability of information on the Indian Slaves who were sold to Mormons. Unfortunately, the Censuses of 1850, 1860, and 1870, taken in Utah do not in most cases specify, though there is a area for specification, the race of the inhabitants. Therefore, an accurate estimate is not available for the number of adopted Indians. However, in varied historical accounts, Indian children are mentioned, and it is from these accounts that the initial information was collected. These accounts are mainly in the compiled literature of the Daughters of Utah Pioneers' series.
These accounts also vary in the amount of information they contain. Some only mention names, while others document further data such as marriages, deaths, and personal characteristics. Still, this wide spectra of information contains enough fundamental aspects to conduct a reliable and informative study.

This sample of adopted Indians, collected from the Daughters of Utah Pioneer accounts and other sources, is necessarily skewed toward those who lived past early childhood and toward those who were exceptional in some way because the sample is taken from historical sources. However, the sample is still useful in determining the extent of assimilation, specifically religious assimilation, into the Mormon culture because it consists of the most prominent adopted Indians. If the most prominent adopted Indians were not fully assimilated into the Mormon religious culture, as shown through Mormon ordinance records, it can be assumed that the less prominent adopted Indians were also not fully assimilated into the Mormon religious culture.

What percentage of the total population of adopted Indians the sample represents is not statistically known. However, the best estimate of the total Indian population in the Great Basin during the decades 1850-1870, is twelve thousand. Again, what percentage of the twelve thousand Indians were children, and what percentage of those children were sold into slavery is not known; but, assuming that the
adopted Indian population was five hundred or less, the sample of eighty-eight adopted Indians is a very good sample.

Another limitation is the extent of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' records of these Indian children. The data presented comes from the TIB, IGI, and Ancestral File, and though theoretically complete, clerical errors could have been made by individuals who compiled the records. Thus, in order to eliminate as much error as possible, this research uses all three record indexes for its data.

This research focuses on three periods: 1) Before Mormon colonization, 1776-1847, 2) The period of the Mormon-Indian Slave Trading, 1847-1865, 3) Post-1865 as far as it is relevant to the lives of the Indians involved in the slave trade, particularly the lives of those Indians included in this research. This research can be classified as Historical Narration.

At the present time no other historical cases, in which a culture bought slaves for the express purpose of adopting them and teaching them a prescribed religion, have been academically presented. The Mormon experience with the Indians of the Great Basin seems to be a unique occurrence in history and thus, this research cannot be guided by a prior academic theory.
In general, this research provides a comprehensive explanation of the Mormon adoption program along with a description of the effects of the program on the Indians involved. Specifically, this research describes the degree of adopted Indian religious assimilation into the Mormon religion by showing that the Mormon adoption program was initiated by the Mormon leader Brigham Young, who proposed a rationale for Mormon involvement in the Indian slave trade that was necessarily linked to expected results; however, actual results were substantially different from Young's expected effects. This conclusion is reached through an analysis a sample group of adopted Indians and their associated participation in Mormon religious ordinances.
Endnotes for Chapter 1.


4. Ibid., 390.

5. Ibid.


CHAPTER 2

PRE-MORMON HISTORY OF INDIAN SLAVERY IN UTAH

In 1776, the government of New Spain sent an expedition to find a new northern route to connect Santa Fe to Monterey in California. The government sent this expedition, led by two Franciscan friars named Silvestre Velez de Escalante and Francisco Antanacio Dominguez, into the Great Basin as a response to rival European, colonization north of New Spain. Therefore, the Dominguez-Escalante expedition became the first recorded white men to enter what is now Utah and to interact with the Utah Indians. Thomas J. Farnham reports that the expedition, after encountering some early winter storms, returned to Santa Fe. The Dominguez-Escalante expedition did not find a new route to Monterey, but they returned with important information about the Great Basin and its inhabitants.

After the Dominguez-Escalante expedition, Leland Creer records, the Spanish officials did not seek to establish missions among the Great Basin Indians because of complicated European problems and the difficulty of heading off threats to major Spanish settlements by Russians, English, French, and later Americans. Each of these nations was constantly encroaching upon the Spanish Empire in North
America. However, although the Spanish government did not send settlers to the Great Basin after 1776, Spanish traders began to filter into the area. According to Creer, these Spanish traders "... were not concerned primarily with the fur trade but with the inhumane traffic in Indian children for which they exchanged fire arms, intoxicating liquors, and California horses."

An assumption made by many historians is that traders pressed into the Great Basin to trade with the Indians after 1776. An important letter dated 1 September 1805, from Joaquin de Real Alencaster, Governor of Mexico, to the Commandant General, refers to trading activities of Manuel Mestos. According to Creer, "These communications suggest more or less continual intercourse between the Spaniards of New Mexico and Yutaahs of the Utah Lake Region."

Further, an account taken from a document filed with the Alcalde of the Villa de Santa Cruz de la Canada contains information about two traders, Mauricio Arze and Lagos Garcia, who traded for Indian slaves with local Indians during an expedition to Utah Lake in 1813. Joseph J. Hill states,

The Company remained at the lake of the Timpanogos three days carrying on a little trade ... When all were assembled a council was held, but, if we rely upon the statement of the Spanish affidavits, the Indians would trade nothing but Indian slaves, as the Spaniards had done on other occasions. The Spanish rebuffed and the Indians started killing their horses.
Farther south, the Spaniards again confronted Indians who wanted to sell them slaves. Hill records:

The Commandant, having been informed of the extremity of the resentment of the Indians, called the men together and gave them permission to purchase the slaves. As a result twelve slaves were bought by the Spaniards."

The slave trade did have some opposition from officials in Mexico City. In 1812, Spanish authorities passed a law prohibiting slavery, but the law was largely ignored in Santa Fe and Spanish lands north of Santa Fe."

Thus historians, such as William J. Snow in his article "The Spanish Slave Trade," generally conclude, "It would seem from facts to be presented that almost continuously from Escalante's expedition on until after the Mormons came, wandering Spaniards entered these valleys not only for furs, but to traffic in Indian Slaves."" Milton R. Hunter also states that:

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

Gregory C. Crampton states that the Mexican people continued to participate in the Indian slave trade after their independence from Spain in 1821. Uncle Dick Wooton, an old frontiersman of the early nineteenth century, also states,

It was no uncommon thing in those days [1830s] to see parties of Mexicans in that country [Great Basin]
buying children and while we were trapping there(,) we sent a lot of peltries to Taos by a party of those same slave traders."13

And Daniel Jones in his book *Forty Years Among the Indians* writes, "The Mexicans were as fully established and systematic in this trade as even were the slavers of the seas, and to them it was a very lucrative business."14

The old Spanish Trail, which crossed the southern part of Utah, was a favorite route of the Spanish and Mexican slave traders. Creer mentions that the slave "trade was confined mainly to the Indians of the Southern part of the state."15 Jones, speaking of the year 1851, writes that "The slave trade gave rise to the civil wars between the native tribes of the country from Salt Lake down to the tribes of Southern Utah"16 And, Snow declares that the Ute tribes from Northern Utah, commonly preyed on the Piute and Goshute tribes of Southern Utah; it was very convenient for the Ute Indians to capture the Piute Indians and trade them for goods with traders traveling along the Spanish Trail.17

Farnham, who visited the Great Basin in 1839, describes the trade among the Piutes:

These poor creatures are hunted in the spring of the year, when weak and helpless, by a certain class of men, and when taken, are fattened, carried to Santa'Pe and sold as slaves during their minority. A likely girl in her teens brings often times 60 or 80 pounds. The males are valued less."18
Therefore, the slave trade was very profitable for the traders. Another account, by Jones, confirms this assumption:

All children bought on the return trip would be taken back to New Mexico and then sold, boys fetching on an average of $100, girls from $150 to $200. The girls were in demand to bring up for house servants, having the reputation of making better servants than others.  

Not only did the local Indian tribes and slave hunters capture and sell these Piute people but even American beaver hunters and Piutes themselves participated in the slave trade. A Dr. Lyman, who traveled of the Old Spanish Trail in 1841, observes,

The New Mexicans capture the Piutes for slaves; the neighboring Indians do the same, and even the bold and unusually high handed old beaver hunter sometimes descends from his legitimate behavior among the mountains streams for this mean traffic.

Finally, the Piutes themselves sold their own children. Jones states, "Many of the lower classes, inhabiting the Southern Deserts, would sell their own children for a horse and kill and eat the horse." Captain James H. Simpson confirms Jones' statement and affirms that the Indians in the southern part of Utah territory bartered their children to one another; the Utes in particular bought slaves and sold them to other southern tribes or to the Mexicans.

Therefore, in 1847, when the Mormons entered the Great Salt Lake Valley, the slave trade had become a lucrative occupation for many Mexicans, some American traders, and of course many Utah Indians. However, of these three groups,
the slave trade was most important to the Utah Indians because it had become an essential element of their culture or, in other words, their economic way of life revolved around the slave trade.
Endnotes for Chapter II.
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CHAPTER 3

EARLY MORMON INTERACTION IN THE UTAH INDIAN SLAVE TRADE

When the first group of Mormons entered the Great Salt Lake Valley, they were but the first wave of a vast group of immigrants that would come to the Great Basin. The reasons for this vast immigration were numerous; however, the principle reason involved religious belief. The Mormons were basically a religious denomination fleeing from repeated persecution in New York, Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. What they sought was an isolated area where they might worship as they pleased. Utah, at that time, contained few white men, and the Mormons firmly believed it was their final destination, their Zion.

Because of religious beliefs, Mormons brought to the Great Basin a particular interest in the Indians. According to Mormon scripture, The Book of Mormon, which they held as scripture similar to the Bible, the American Indians were a remnant of a people who came to the Americas from Palestine six hundred years before Christ. The Mormons believed this Israelite group built a substantial civilization, but because of disobedience God cursed their posterity with a dark skin. Since the American Indian was of the blood of Israel, Mormons saw them as brothers because they believed they were also of
the blood of Israel. This concept was freely taught by Joseph Smith, the Mormon founder, and his successor, Brigham Young.

Evidently this concept did, at times, break through the conceptual level to actual practice. A non-Mormon, Richard F. Burton in his book The City of the Saints, notes that "the Mormons treat their step brethren [Indians] far more humanely than other western men; they feed, clothe, and lodge them, and attach them by good works to their interests."3

Juanita Brooks suggests that another important factor in Mormon-Indian relations was a Book of Mormon promise that these Indians, upon conversion, would become a "white and delightsome people." The concept of the Indians as a fallen people was not new. O'Neil and Layton note that the most articulate expression of this idea occurred in seventeenth-century New England where the Indians and the wilderness were viewed as manifestations of the devil.5 The authors conclude:

But whereas the Puritans of that time and place approached the challenge of redemption with trepidation, the Mormons, their intellectual heirs, approached it with verve and optimism.6

Mormons, therefore, felt that it was their religious duty to help fulfill this promise. Brooks says, "that promise, often repeated, became a sort of axiom with the Mormons, though they seemed to have been in doubt as to the way the transformation was to come about."7

Mormons were also aware of their secluded and isolated position--far from help in case of Indian Wars. Thus, early
in their interactions with Indians, Brigham Young set the policy of either being friendly or neutral with the Indians. John R. Young comments that Brigham Young set the standard of Mormon-Indian relations when Brigham said, "But even aside from Christian duty, I am satisfied it will be cheaper to feed them, than to fight them." And Brooks states: "From the time they entered the Salt Lake Valley, the Mormons were intimately responsive to, and keenly aware of the problem of getting along with the Indian."

When the Mormons began their colonization of the Great Basin in 1847, there were approximately twelve thousand Indians scattered throughout the Great Basin. Two principle tribes inhabited the Great Basin: Shoshoni and Ute. The Shoshoni consisted of the Northwestern Shoshoni of northern Utah, the Bannock of southern Idaho, the Western Shoshoni of northern Nevada, the Northern Paiute of western Nevada, and the Eastern Shoshoni of western Wyoming. The Utes consisted of the Tumpanawach (Timpanogas) Utes of central Utah, the Unitah Utes of northeastern Utah, the Pahvant Utes of south-central Utah, the Goshiutes of western Utah and eastern Nevada, and the Southern Paiutes of southern Utah and southern Nevada. According to Eckman, the Salt Lake Valley was a largely uninhabited "buffer zone" between the Ute and Shoshoni tribes and partly because of that, neither tribe officially exhibited resistance to Mormon settlement in the region.
However, even though Indians presented little resistance to the Mormons, most Mormons came to the Great Basin unprepared for the Indian's habit of selling Indian slaves to white men. Peter Gottfredson, quoting from the journal of Solomon Kimball, relates one of the Mormon's first encounters with this custom:

During the winter of 1847-48 some Indian children were brought to the old Salt Lake Fort to be sold. At first two were offered but the settlers peremptorily refused to buy them. The Indian in charge said that the children had been captured in war and would be killed at sunset if the white men didn't buy them. Thereupon they purchased one of them and the one not sold was shot. Later, several Indians came in with two more using the same threat, they were bought and brought up at the expense of the settlers.13

Gottfredson also records another early Mormon encounter with the Indian slave trade:

Soon after the Mormons arrived in the valley a number of Indians were encamped at the Hot Springs, north of Salt Lake City. A little girl whom they had stolen from another tribe was offered for a rifle. The colonists at first refused to buy, whereupon the Indians began to torture her, declaring that they would kill her unless the rifle was forthcoming. In the face of this cruelty and threat, one of the men parted with his only gun.14

Solomon F. Kimball says of these first encounters that: "The red men were not long in learning that the Saints were a tender-hearted people, and could not witness such scenes without sympathizing to the uttermost with those who were being tortured."15 Elder John R. Young writes that:

Soon after we moved on to our city lot in the fall of 1847, a band of Indians camped near us. Early one morning we were excited at hearing their shrill, blood curdling war whoop, mingled with occasionally sharp cries.
of pain... It was Wanship's band. Some of his braves had just returned from the war path. In a fight with "Little Wolf's" band, they lost two men, but had succeeded in taking two girls prisoners. One of these they had killed and were torturing the other. To save her life Charley Decker bought her and took her to our house to be washed and clothed.15

So, the Indian slaves were often tortured before the Mormons stepped in and bought them. John Young describes the situation of the child just mentioned:

She was the saddest looking piece of humanity I have ever seen. They had shingled her head with butcher knives and fire brands. All the fleshy parts of her body, legs and arms had been hacked with knives, then fire brands had been stuck into the wounds. She was gaunt with hunger and smeared from head to foot with blood and ashes.17

Consequently Mormons, soon after their arrival, participated in the local slave trade primarily for two reasons. First, because of their isolated position as a small Anglo-American group amidst a larger group of Native Americans who, at times, demanded they participate in the slave trade, the Mormons sensed that Mormon-Indian relations depended upon their participation. Second, because of their supposed religious duty—as dictated by their leaders, their scriptures, and their desire to eliminate suffering among the Indians—Mormons felt inclined to aid the Indian slaves. Juanita Brooks, in her article "Indian Relations on the Mormon Frontier," states of this time period: "Early pioneer relations with the Indian soon began to revolve upon the necessity of Mormons purchasing slaves."18

As the Mormons pushed their settlements south of Salt Lake, their leaders, especially Brigham Young, recognized the
need to use diplomacy and tact with the Indians. The Mormons also knew that part of their policy of diplomacy and tact entailed buying slaves. George A. Smith in his journal of the Iron County Mission relates an incident of an Indian trading a boy in retribution for killing one of the settler's oxen. Smith also says, "Br. [Brother] Barnard presented me with a child, a Pihede girl about four years old, he purchased it off Walker [a local Indian chief] for an ox," and "Brother Baker was accompanied by his son 12 years old. He had also two Indian children which he had purchased of Walker." Smith's accounts are characteristic of many incidents involving the Indian slave trade on the Mormon frontier.

Slave trading was the chief occupation of one of the most colorful Indian chiefs of the Mormon colonial period--Chief Walker or Walkara. Because Walker was a dominant Ute Indian chief, Brigham Young and other Mormons negotiated for land and peace on Walker's terms. Walker regularly captured and sold slaves, usually gaining tremendously from exploiting the Piute and Goshute peoples; consequently, the slave trade was very important to him and his people. Because the slave trade was important to Walker, the slave trade was important to Mormons. Daniel Jones says, "They [Walker and his band] were in the habit of raiding on the Piute and low tribes, taking their children prisoners and selling them." In addition, Jones states, "Walker and his band raided on the weak tribes, taking their children prisoners and selling them to the Mexicans."
Naturally, Walker wanted to continue his profitable occupation of capturing and selling Indian slaves. So, Brigham Young and the Mormons necessarily dealt with the slave trade because they dealt with Walker.

But for the Indians who were slaves, the experience was less than desirable. William R. Palmer, a historian who interviewed many Indian slaves living as free people with Mormon families in 1929, stresses the difficult circumstances of slave life. Two accounts recorded by Palmer deal with Mary Shem and Jinnie. These two Indian women were captured during Indian raids, one by Walker and the other by the Navajo, and were forced into servitude. However, both managed to escape, but only after intense trials and near impossible journeys through barren country.²³ It is evident from these accounts that lives were irreversibly altered. Palmer includes this account as an example of the sometimes tragic results:

At times when Walker had made his selection of children the mothers fought frantically to save them. One of the tragedies of the Virgin River is centered in such an occasion. The mother had seized her child that had already been traded to the Navajos and had fled into the hills. She was chased around for several days by Walker's warriors and the purchasers and was finally trapped on Thompson's point near Virgin City, a high promontory that jutted out into the river. As the Indians rushed upon her she threw her child off the cliff down into the swollen river and killed it.²⁴

However, female slaves among the Navajos fared much better than their male counterparts. Female slaves seldom worked harder than other women of the tribe and most of them
married before the age of twenty. There was no tribal prejudice against such unions, and the social status of a slave woman so wedded became the same as that of any other married woman in the tribe.25

But the male slaves were not afforded such status. According to Palmer,

They were always slaves and had to suffer every indignity that their masters cared to inflict. Many were emasculated that they might be left in safety among the women of the tribe while the warriors were away on their fighting or hunting expeditions. Some had their tongues cut out to prevent them from talking if they escaped. Others had their ears cut off to mark their servile status.26

So, male slaves among the Navajos were destined to a life of drudgery and servitude, unless they escaped.

Mormons looked upon the slave trade as a repugnant and devilish practice. However, they were forced to buy the Indian slaves because they wanted to preserve peace between themselves and the local Indians; and, they were unable to stand by as slavers tortured and maimed Indian slaves, their "Israelite" brethren, in their presence. The result was an unsteady peace between Mormons and Indians and a growing problem among Mormons because they detested buying Indian slaves.
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CHAPTER 4

MORMON LEGISLATION AND THE INDIAN SLAVE TRADE

Walker and the Mormons enjoyed a favorable relationship during the first few years of their interaction. After receiving assistance through the difficult winter of 1849-50, Walker, his brother Arapeen, and an older chief, Sowiette, reciprocated by being baptized into the Mormon Church on 13 March 1850. This action was followed by the same three receiving the ordination of Elder in the Mormon Church on 9 June 1850. However, the relationship between the Indians and the Mormons soon crumbled as Brigham Young adopted measures to undermine the Indian slave trade.

When Utah became a territory in 1850, Brigham Young became both Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs. On 13 May 1851, Young advised the Mormon people,

... To buy up Lamanite (Indian) children as fast as they could, and educate them and teach them the gospel, so that many generations would not pass away ere they should become a white and delightsome people ... The Lord could not have devised a better plan than to have put us where we were in order to accomplish that thing. I knew the Indians would dwindle away but let a remnant of the seed of Joseph be saved.

Brigham Young basically advised the Mormon people to purchase slaves in order to "redeem" them. Young, like many Anglo-American religious leaders of the period, wanted to
"convert" the Indians to a "civilization" and a "religion" that he deemed as naturally superior. Young saw the slave trade as a godsend to help his people accomplish their goals.

Later, in 1851, Young and the Mormons encountered a group of Mexican slave traders. This group, described as a group of "Spaniards," consisted of twenty-eight persons who left New Mexico in September of 1851 for the express purpose of trading for slaves. Before they left, Pedro Leon obtained a slaving license from the Governor and Superintendent of Indian affairs in New Mexico, James S. Calhoun. The license was dated 14 August 1851. Another license in the possession of the party, dated 30 July 1851, authorized its holder, whose name was not given, to proceed to the Salt Lake country in the territory of Utah for the purpose of trading with Utah Indians. The party sent six or seven men to see Governor Young in order to show him their license; and if it was not good in Utah, then to get another one. Whitney records that Young was not in Salt Lake but was in "San Pete Valley [sic]." Whitney states:

Here they exhibited to the Governor their license, and informed him they wished to sell their horses and mules to the Utah Indians, and buy Indian children to be taken to New Mexico. Governor Young then informed them that their license did not authorize them to trade with the Indians in Utah. They then sought one from him, but he refused it, for the reason that they wanted to buy Indian children for slaves."

In another account, Daniel Jones states that the meeting between Young and the slavers was in Provo and that
Young had a "law" read to them. Jones also says that Young told him that the laws of the United States, which then extended over Utah territory, "prohibited this business, and that it would be his duty to put a stop to the same." What law Jones refers to is not stated, but Jones implies that the treaty of Guadalupe de Hidalgo has changed the former conditions under which slave trading had been practiced. Frederick Gowens suggests that Jones referred not to the 1852 slave act but to another not mentioned.

Perhaps the law mentioned by Jones is the same law or laws mentioned in the Deseret News editorial of November 15, 1851.

Some of the traders returned to New Mexico, but because Pedro Leon and others remained and attempted to trade for Indian slaves, Editor Richards of the Deseret News wrote an editorial that appeared in the Deseret News on November 15, 1851, that made a firm case against the New Mexican government, particularly James S. Calhoun, the governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs, for the issuance of the slaving license to Pedro Leon and associates. Richards states:

... He has transcended the limits and authority of his office, he has violated his oath, trampled upon the Constitution and laws of the United States, and set at defiance every righteous principle that binds together the states and territories of our Union. ... Again, the purchase and removal of Indian children from Utah Territory to any other state or territory, or the removal of Indian children from Utah Territory to any other state or territory by any such means or process, as appears to have been contemplated by said me, is
kidnapping in the eyes of the U.S. laws, an ought to be treated so in any United States Court.\textsuperscript{10}

Richards further expresses a view that the slave traders were acting contrary to the law when they supplied Navajo Indians with arms and ammunition. If such individuals engaged in these activities, Richards stressed, such individuals were guilty of treason against the United States. The editor then takes a positive stance toward those Mexicans, Spaniards, and others who traded coffee, sugar, and other goods. However, Richards attacks those who traded for slaves:

And we further counsel that no person whatsoever be guilty of trafficking in human blood, or of selling Indians or Indian children to be transported out of the Territory or from one part of the territory to another.\textsuperscript{11}

L.R. Bailey attributes a similar message, like Richards', to Brigham Young on the same date.\textsuperscript{12}

The editorial, or Brigham Young's statement, had little effect on eight slave traders who had promised to leave but did not. One member of the group asserted that he would do just as he pleased, and to back up his boast declared he had a band of four hundred Mexicans on the Sevier River awaiting his command. When told that he was breaking the law he remarked, "Catching is before hanging."\textsuperscript{13}

Thereafter, officials arrested Pedro Leon and his associates. Later, during the winter of 1851-2, a Manti, Utah, Justice of the Peace tried them for slave trading. Subsequently, their case went before Judge Zerubbabel Snow
in the First District Court. Judge Snow decided against the eight defendants because they violated the law; their punishment, however, was light. The judge sent the defendants back to New Mexico and ordered them to release the Indian slaves in their possession—a squaw and eight children.\textsuperscript{14}

Snow's ruling basically stopped the Mexicans from overt trading with the Utah Indians. Jones records, "I never heard of any successful attempts to buy children afterwards by the Mexicans. If done at all it was done secretly."\textsuperscript{15} It is probable that the Indians and Mexicans continued to trade slaves after Snow's ruling, but only sparingly because of possible punishment by Utah courts. But that slave trading continued is evident from Simpson's statement in 1859 that the Utes in particular bought and sold slaves to the Mexicans and other southern tribes.\textsuperscript{16}

Following the 1852 cases of Pedro Leon and associates, the Utah Territorial Legislature [with Young's approval] passed an act which made the sale of Indians to Mexicans illegal but allowed the Mormons to buy Indian slaves. The reasons for the act, as stated in the preamble, was manifold. First, the legislature was explicit in its assertion of self-government. The government of New Mexico, mentioned as a culprit because it overstepped its authority in the Pedro Leon case, had ignored the fact that Utah was an autonomous territory. By stating this fact, the
legislature was both proclaiming its own authority and demanding that the New Mexico officials understood that they had no authority in Utah territory.

Another important aspect in the preamble was the assertion that both territories resided in what would otherwise be Indian land. In fact, the preamble implied that the land was still Indian by right.

Next, the preamble described the history and the depredations of the Indian slave trade. The preamble depicted the treatment of the slaves as lamentable and stressed the destructive influence of the slave trade on civilization.

Therefore, the preamble noted three reasons for its enactment. First, Utah territory was located in the mist of Indian lands and Indian tribes, which in turn necessitated the interaction of whites and Indians. Second, the whites had a perceived parental duty toward the Indian slaves based upon common principles of humanity. And third, a combination of the prior reasons "forced" the people of the territory, and therefore Congress, to remedy the problem for a mutually beneficial result.

The act itself provided that whenever any white person secured a child, he should go before the Selectman or Probate Judge of the county and make out an indenture which provided that the apprenticeship should not exceed twenty years if the white person was deemed suitable by the Probate
Judge of Selectman. The act also stated that the master must send his ward to school at least three months each year between the ages of seven and sixteen, and that the apprentice should be clothed in a comfortable and becoming manner, according to his master's condition in life.'

In light of today's liberties, most people feel human slavery is immoral. Some may feel that Young was immoral in urging his people to purchase slaves and that no Christian church should have ever officially participated in such a practice. However, before judging Young and the Mormons by today's standards, it is important to look at the justifications set forth by Young based upon the circumstances.

The Mormon Church believed, as set forth by a passage in its scriptures, The Doctrine and Covenants, that the Constitution of the United States was divinely inspired.17 Their twelfth Article of Faith states: "We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law."18 At that time, the Constitution and the laws of the United States upheld the institution of slavery. After Utah became a territory of the United States, Mormons became subscribers to the Constitution and the laws of the United States and their legislatures passed laws based on the Constitution and

1"A Preamble and An Act for the Further Relief of Indian Slaves and Prisoners and An Act for the Relief of Indian Slaves and Prisoners" is cited in full in Appendix II.
United States' law. This adherence to the Constitution and to law was evident in the preamble of the act concerning the relief of Indian slaves.

Further, in an interview reported by Horace Greeley of the New York Tribune, on 13 July 1859, Greeley asked Young about the L.D.S. Church's position on slavery. Young responded:

We consider it of divine institution, and not to be abolished until the curse pronounced on Ham shall have been removed from his descendants . . . slavery is a curse to its masters . . . I could not afford to own them . . . I can do better than subject myself to an obligation to feed and clothe their families, to provide and care for them in sickness and health. Utah is not adapted to slave labor.19

Young, of course was referring to the issue of Negro slavery, not Indian slavery; however, he supported the principle of slavery because the Constitution upheld it. From Greeley's report it can be inferred that Young did not personally approve of slavery in his household or in the territory because of its expense and his view that slavery was a curse for both the slaves and their owners. Later, during the Civil War, Utah as a Union territory, with Young's approval, abolished slavery with the rest of the Union states and its territories.

However, Young in supporting the buying of Indian slaves, had other intentions than following an established precedent. In his message to the Utah Territorial Legislature in support of "An Act for the Further Relief of
Indian Slaves and Prisoners," on 10 January 1852, Young states,

It is unnecessary perhaps for me to indicate the true policy for Utah in regard to Slavery . . . [When] human flesh [is] to be dealt as property, [it] is not consistent or compatible with the true principles of government. My own feelings are, that no property can or should be recognized as existing in slaves, either Indian or African.

Again, it is clear that Young personally did not approve of slavery. Later in his address, he clarified his reasons for recommending the 1852 Slave Act,

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

Young continues:

Many a life by this means is saved; many a child redeemed from the thralldom of savage barbarity and placed upon an equal footing with the more favored points of the human race. So shall the benevolence of the human heart be called into action to promote the improvement of the down trodden race . . ., so shall the condition of the poor, forlorn, destitute, ignorant savage, or African, as the case may be, becomes ameliorated, and a foundation laid for their advancement in the
scale of useful, exalting existence . . . ; thus, will a people be redeemed from servile bondage.²

Brigham Young also wanted to help the Indians to become self-sufficient. Floyd A. O'Neil and Stanford J. Layton in their article "Of Pride and Politics--Brigham Young as Indian Superintendent," state:

Young placed considerable emphasis on practical education--especially in the domestic and agricultural arts as important facets of redemption. From this emerged the wide spread policy of adopting Indian children into their homes and of experimenting with Indian farms.²⁰

O'Neil and Layton conclude that Young and the Mormons tied the idea of redemption to factors that militated against success. First, the Mormons wanted to press forward with their colonization process. Second, there was an inevitable gulf between the rhetoric of leadership and the natural inclination of Mormonism's rank and file; not all Mormons believed that Indians could be redeemed or that effort ought to be expended in that direction. Third, the Mormon culture was clearly superior to the Native American culture; therefore, redemption meant Anglo-Americanization.²¹

O'Neil and Layton's conclusion is based upon Brigham Young's policies as Indian Superintendent. Still, the authors address some of Young's intentions in dealing with the Indians in general and their ideas serve as a broad

² It is important to cite a great deal from Brigham Young to understand his justifications.
backdrop for Young's intentions in supporting Indian slavery among the Mormons.

Therefore, Young's intentions for supporting Indian slavery among the Mormons can be summarized by the following points: (1) Because of the present condition of Indian slave trading in Utah, it was in the best interests of the Indians being sold to have Mormon masters rather than Mexican masters; (2) Under United States' law slavery was legal; (3) With Mormon masters, the Indians would be freer; they would have a better opportunity to become civilized (Young and the Mormons made the same mistake shared by most European peoples that the Indian was inferior in culture; therefore, they needed to adopt their culture or Mormon culture); (4) Mormon goals of further colonization would be enhanced; and, (5) Indian slavery would promote the Mormon religious goal of converting the Indians to Mormonism.

The Territorial Legislature approved the Slave Act on 31 January 1852; Congress's approval followed on 7 March 1852.

The territorial act was devastating to many Indians, such as Walker, who previously had benefitted from involvement in the slave trade. On losing the lucrative slave trade with the Mexicans, the Indian slave traders were filled with resentment. From an account Jones related of Walker's brother Arapeen, it is clear that the Slave Act was effective in its purpose to stop the Mexican slave trade,
but that it also inaugurated a new wave of hostilities toward the Mormons:

Next year when they came up and camped on the Provo Bench, they had some children for sale. They offered them to the Mormons who declined buying. Arapine became enraged, saying the Mormons had stopped the Mexicans from buying these children; they had no right to do so, unless they bought them themselves. Several of us were present when he took one of these children by the heels and dashed its brains out on the hard ground, after which he threw the body towards us, telling us we had no hearts, or we would have bought it and saved its life. This was a strange argument, but it was the argument of an enraged savage.22

Also, according to Whitney, the original ruling against Pedro Leon and the slave traders was thought to be a warning to the Mexican slave traders. However, some of the slave-traders felt revengeful, and "went to work stirring up the savages against the Utah settlers."23 This continued problem pressed Young to issue a proclamation that dealt with the Mexican and Indians.

Young directed his proclamation toward certain Mexicans who were supplying Indians with guns and ammunition--actions that were contrary to Territorial and United States law. In his proclamation, Young ordered a small militia, consisting of thirty men, to "arrest and keep in close custody every strolling Mexican party, and those associating with them, and other suspicious persons or parties that they may encounter."24 Additionally, Young warned the settlers in
the territory to remain in a constant state of preparedness.

Thus, the Indians who relied on the slave trade for their livelihood began to turn hostile toward the Mormons, especially toward those Mormons who refused to buy their captives. As in other instances in Indian history, the Utah Indians had become too dependent upon the outside culture for a great amount of their subsistence. Walker and his band could no longer live their customary lifestyles due to the dramatic decrease of the slave trade with the Mexicans and the now sporadic slave trade with the Mormons. The restriction of the slave trade also contributed to the beginning of the Walker War in July, 1853. Howard Christy concludes that the restriction of slave trade, added to other Indian grievances against the Mormons, resulted in the Walker War. Another source, Kate Carter, also links the slave trade to the Walker War:

For some time before the Walker Indian War broke out, Walker and his chieftains were surly and angry because of the position taken by the pioneers in regard to slavery, and waited for some pretext to attack the settlers. Oft times the Mexicans would supply the Indians with firearms and ammunition in exchange for the women and children, and these weapons were used against the pioneers in the Walker war.

Therefore, Indian-Mormon relations soured because the slave act failed to satisfy many Indians. Instead of easing

---

3Young's full proclamation of 23 April 1853, can be found in Appendix III.
tensions between Mormons and Indians, the act became a springboard for conflict.
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CHAPTER 5

THE MORMON ADOPTION PROGRAM

However, not all Mormons refused to buy Indian slaves. In fact, many Mormons followed the advice of Brigham Young—they bought Indian slaves and adopted them. Aware of the harsh treatment meted out to many of the Indians captured and sold, some Mormons felt by purchasing them, they were liberating the Indians from an otherwise tragic life. The manuscript journals of Isaac C. Haight tell "how an Indian captive was put to death to appease an angry God who was afflicting the children of a tribe with measles." Carvolho, in his writings about Fremont's last expedition, records another example of cruelty to Indian captives:

When I returned [to Walker's camp] I saw a crowd around the governor's [Brigham Young] wagon. I approached and found that his excellency had just concluded the purchase from the Utahs of two children, about two or three years of age. They were prisoners and infants of the Snake Indians, with whom the Utahs were at war. When the Governor saw these deplorable objects, they were on the open, digging with their little fingers for grassnuts, or any roots to afford sustenance. They were almost living skeletons. They were usually treated in this way—that is, literally starved to death by their captors. Governor Young intended to have them sent to Salt Lake City, and have them cared for and educated like his own children. I never saw a more piteous sight than those two naked infants in bitter cold weather on the open snow, reduced by starvation to the verge of the grave—no, not the grave; for if they had
died they would have been thrown on the common for the wolves to devour. 2

Not only did many Mormons want to eradicate the human suffering among the Indian-slaves, but they also felt a keen sense of religious duty. Mormon leaders connected the Indian adoption program to Christian duty in many of their sermons. For example, in an on 13 July 1855, Elder E. T. Benson stresses that Christ wanted the people to be one in mind and purpose because he felt:

It is our duty, brethren and sisters, to work and bring these natives [Indians] to an understanding of the principles of civilization, to teach them to till the earth, and earn their bread by the sweat of their brows, and if they are needy and ask us, we should feed them, and at all times be an example to them. We have not been as faithful as we ought to have been in many of these things. 3

However, in the same speech, Benson enumerates another Mormon justification for buying and adopting Indian children, that of redemption for a fallen race. Or in other words to Anglo-Americanize them in a Mormon fashion. Benson states:

I have a little Indian boy and girl, and certainly it is repugnant to my feelings to have to put up with their dirty practices, but I have passed a great many of these things by; and this I have done because I knew what our duties were. In a short season we shall be rewarded for all that we do to civilize this lost and fallen race. The little boy will soon be quite bright, his mind is becoming clear and perceptive, and if he sees a horse, a man, or any other object, he will always remember them. True, he yet has some of his Indian traits, and I presume it will be some time before they are all erased from his memory. 4
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Therefore, some Mormons made it a point to secure all the Indians they could in order to fulfill their supposed religious duty as well as to "civilize" or assimilate the adopted Indians into the Anglo-American culture.

As already noted, Brigham Young, and therefore the Mormon leadership, had a unique vision concerning adopted Indian children and their future. Brooks records an account of John Beal, who on 1 February 1859, adopted an Indian boy, Samuel. Beal attempted to implement Young's vision,

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

Another noteworthy example of a pioneer who implemented Young's policy is Jacob Hamblin, a prominent Mormon pioneer in southern Utah. Many accounts state that Hamblin adopted a number of Indian children and raised them as his own. George Armstrong, an Indian agent, states in a letter to Brigham Young: "Mr. Hamblin, who resides at Fort Clara, has four apparent Pied children." Armstrong further explained that the children were learning home skills and that they all spoke English fluently.
Mormons also bought and adopted Indians for practical reasons. Indian slaves, after they were adopted, helped Mormons to convert the desert land of Utah to productive farms and ranches, as well as to help Mormon mothers raise children. Indians could be very helpful to the Mormons, and local Indians regularly assisted them with their work. Joel H. Johnson writes:

I employ several Piede Indians to assist in tending the herd and doing chores about the house which I find as faithful to their trust as any white man... When employed and fed by the Whites they are a great help to the farmers, for many of them will do as much work as most any white man in a day... They are a great benefit to me in herding, clearing land, putting in and securing crops, etc.\(^9\)

Because of the economic benefit, it became a great benefit for any aspiring farmer or rancher to buy and adopt an Indian slave. Also, an Indian slave could be helpful in the home. Samuel Knight and his wife adopted Jane Knight because "Sister Knight's health was very poor, and she had quite a family. They took the little Indian girl so that she could help her with the work and to care for the children."\(^9\)

That adopted Indians were valuable assistants for the Mormons is verified by the following notice in the September 18, 1852, issue of the Deseret News:

Ran Away. From this subscriber, an Indian boy about twelve years old; speaks a little English. Anyone giving information where said boy may be found, or returning him to me, shall be liberally rewarded. Christopher Merkley, 19th Ward.\(^10\)
Evidence from the Indian Slave Act also supports the conclusion that Mormons benefitted when they bought and adopted an Indian slave. Section One of the Indian Slave Act states: "it shall be his or their duty [the purchaser] to bind out the same, by indenture for the term of not exceeding twenty years, at the discretion of the judge or select men."

A complete list of all of the Indian slaves adopted by the Mormons does not exist. However, there are some accounts of these adopted Indians and their lives. This research compiles and documents eighty-two Indians who were taken into the homes of Mormon families through the slave trade. Most initial accounts are from historical sources, sources that mention the adopted Indians because of some type of prominence. Since most accounts are memorates, these adopted Indians either lived to maturity, or were remembered for some act. Some accounts are filled with detail, while others briefly mention a name or child. These accounts reveal some basic characteristics of Indian children adopted by Mormons, characteristics that describe some aspects of their lives.

Brooks reports that "A surprising number of Indian children in white hands died in childhood or early adolescence; they seemed to have had little resistance to white man's diseases, especially measles." This research does not confirm Brooks's assumption that many of the Indian
children died from disease and illness at a young age, neither does it disprove her assumption. However, it does show that many adopted Indians grew to adulthood. That some adopted Indians died in childhood is clear, however. Sylvia Cox, adopted by Elviria M. Cox, died at a young age during an epidemic from measles, and Micky Snow, adopted daughter of Erastus and Artemisia Snow, died of lung fever.\(^\text{13}\) Brooks also notes that T.D. Brown, who secured five Indian children, saw three of them die before the end of a year.\(^\text{14}\) Therefore, a total of five adopted Indians, from a sample group of sixty-six adopted Indians with known ages of death, died from disease and illness in childhood or early adolescence. That only 7.5 percent of the sample group died from disease or illness in childhood or early adolescence shows that further research is necessary to either confirm or disprove Brooks's claim.

Some adopted Indians died at a young age from accidents. Ellen Hamblin died after stepping on a jagged chaparral stick which had been used to kill a tarantula and soldiers shot Lemuel Hunsaker during an Indian conflict because they thought the boy was stealing one of their horses.\(^\text{15}\) Also, Indians murdered one adopted child at a young age.\(^\text{16}\)

These causes of death, from the sample of known deaths, added to the other premature deaths among the adopted Indians, brings the overall percentage of adopted Indians,
who died at a young age to 12 percent, a percent that is not a high percentage. However, a high percentage of this sample lived to adulthood. Fifty-eight adopted Indians or 88 percent lived to adulthood.1

Of these adopted Indians who reached adulthood, eleven are known to have died before the age of thirty. Ammon Draper died after falling off a horse; Rhoda Barker from tuberculosis; Sally Henrie Curtis during childbirth; and Mary Mountain from consumption.17 Albert Hamblin, Omar Badge Heywood, Zadie Hunter, Lorim Spilsbury, Lehi West, Lamoni Judd, and Matilda Judd, all died from unspecified illness or unknown causes.18

Some of the Indians documented died in middle age. Of this sample five died between ages thirty-five. Indian Dick Nebeker, was murdered at age forty-nine; Cora Keate Hartman died during an operation for a tumorous growth; Minnie Burgess Hartman [who had three prior children] died in childbirth at age thirty-one; and Alma Shock Brown and his wife, Betsy Peacock Brown, died from an unspecified illness: Alma at age forty-seven and Betsy around the same age.19

Other adopted Indians lived full lives. Research shows that sixteen Indians lived to old age or over fifty years. One of the better documented cases was Rose Daniels, who

1A complete list of adopted Indians in this research’s sample can be found in Appendix IV.
lived to be one-hundred and three. Stolen from her own people by the Navajo, Rose remained a slave until Aaron Daniels bought her. Later, Rose married Daniels and bore four children. As an adopted member of the Ute tribe, Rose received land on the reservation. During her years on the reservation, she was known to be a "country doctor" and, at the age of ninety, she helped develop a rugged type of lima bean that could be successfully grown in the short dry seasons of Utah, Wyoming, and South Dakota.

Another adopted Indian who lived to an old age of seventy-five was David Lemmon. According to Brooks, Lemmon was known for his healing powers:

When there was sickness and he was called in to administer, the patient always seemed to recover. At last his white neighbors come to have such faith in him that he was always sent for in trouble; in fact, he often went a whole day's journey to bless the sick.

Historical accounts of adopted Indian deaths vary in detail and length, some historians recording a death as a casual aside while others prefacing the death with a description of the Indian's life. In the 1929 April edition of Utah Historical Quarterly, William Palmer records little about a respected young Indian, Omar Badge Heywood, except his death:

Omar was a splendid character, much beloved, an Elder in the Mormon faith, and his death was mourned by the entire community. He died about the age of twenty years and was the fourth person buried in the Harmony cemetery.
But other accounts, such as Cora Hunter Harris's, first describes the adopted Indian's life and then ends the account in a sentimental way:

Never very robust Zadie grew weaker and weaker as the years went by and at the age of twenty-six she passed away. Her burial clothes were richly trimmed with lace and ribbons as she had so wanted them to be. Zadie was always mourned by her foster mother who affectionately remembered her to her grandchildren.23

Possibly the most bizarre account of a death of an adopted child concerns an Indian girl in Monticello, Utah. One cold, stormy morning in late winter Wilmer Bronson found a little half frozen and nearly starved girl who apparently had been left to die. Since there were no Indian camps nearby, Bronson took the four-year-old girl to Monticello and the Edward Hyde home. The Indian girl remained with the Hydes for several weeks before the Hydes learned why the child was left to die. According to Old Wash, a petty chief of the nearby Indians, the child's mother had been bewitched and, by custom, killed. The Indians believed the child had inherited her mother's spirit and had purposely abandoned her to die. Wash explained that the tribe would not be at peace until the child died and advised the Hydes to turn the child over to the Indians. Horrified by this demand, the Hydes refused to relinquish the child. However, a few months later, while the child stayed with a Sister Baker, the Indians forcibly took the Indian child. Later, Wash told the Hydes about the girl's tragic death. After
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abducting the child from Sister Baker, the Indians threw her over a high cliff and "each man sent a deadly shot into the little body as it hurtled out through space, before falling to its final destruction."

Other noted causes of death among adopted Indians who reached adulthood ranged from illnesses, such as Lucy Meeks, who died from consumption, Julie Markham Perry who died of malaria fever, and a girl adopted by Sister McClellan who died of pneumonia, to adopted Indians who died from unspecified illnesses--Jane Knight and Christian Nielson.

Research also reveals other characteristics of the adopted Indians's lives, including how Mormons bought or found them, the primary regions of the state where this trade occurred, and some tribes from which they originated.

As previously mentioned, the slave trade was a profitable business for the slave traders. The Mormons bartered for the Indians with money, stock, textiles, and grain. However, since money was in short supply, Mormons usually traded for Indian slaves using common barter goods such as flour, wheat, blankets, sheep, cattle, and horses. William Draper acquired Ammon Draper for a beef, Perregrine and David Sessions offered an old grandmother a pony, saddle, blanket, and a little flour, for Jim (the Indian) Sessions, and Joseph Black traded a sack of flour for Mary Thompson.
Often, as already mentioned in this study, the Indian children were taken in warfare and then sold to the Mormons. Another example was Rhoda Barker's experience:

During the fifties, some of the Ute Indians, who lived in and around Ogden part of each year, went to battle against another tribe. In the skirmish a Pahute Indian squaw and her nine-month-old papoose (Rhoda Barker) were taken prisoners. The squaw made her escape and joined her own people, but the papoose was purchased from the Indians by Ann Blythe Barker . . . the wife of David Moore--for a pair of blankets and some flour.28

Still, some Mormons bought Indian children with money. James T. Brown bought Alma Shock Brown for $25.00 and Melancthon W. and Margaret J. McIntire Burgess bought Minnie Burgess Hartman for $50.00.29

Indians also gave the Mormons Indian children. Zenos W. Hill said that, "As a papoose of seven months he was given by his parents to Mrs. Hill, who took the Indian boy."30 Harriet Hamilton's parents also gave her to her foster parents:

In 1848, a band of Piute Indians came to Manti from the southern part of the state. They were very poor and hungry. An Indian couple of the tribe came to the home of Brother Hamilton. They had a little girl papoose, one month old. They gave her to the Hamilton's because they were kind to the Indians.31

A few Mormons found their adopted children. Elnathan Eldredge found Mary Mountain alone after an Indian skirmish and took her home; and, as already mentioned, Wilmer Bronson found a girl and took her to the Hyde home.32 Callie O. Morley writes of Sally Henrie and how she was found:
Mary and Myra Elizabeth Henrie, young daughters of Daniel and Amanda Henrie, were gleaning wheat in the field near Manti when they were startled to hear the sound of a baby's cry near them. They followed the sound to an irrigation ditch along whose banks thick clover was growing. There in the ditch lay a newborn Ute Indian baby girl on the damp sand. . . . The Henrie family decided to rear the little girl as their own and they named her Sally.33

The primary areas of the slave trade between the Mormons and the slave traders seemed to be either the Manti-Ephraim area or the St. George-Parowan area. Although not all of the accounts mention a specific area, sixty-seven do. Information from the accounts show eleven adopted Indians lived in the Manti-Ephraim area, ten adopted Indians lived in the Parowan area, and thirty-two adopted Indians lived in the St. George area. Other Indian adoption areas include: Brigham City, Ogden, Farmington, Salt Lake City, Grantsville, Heber City, Spanish Fork, Price, Fillmore, Cedar City, Monticello, all in Utah, and Oakley, in Idaho. From this data it is clear that the primary concentrations of adopted Indians were either in the Manti-Ephraim area or the St. George-Parowan area, but also that the Mormons adopted Indians throughout Utah.

Few of the accounts specifically mention an original tribal affiliation. Of the few that do, seven of twelve were Piute. Other adopted Indians came from the Navajo, Shoshone, and Ute tribes. This data does not differ from previous conclusions by such historians as Snow, Farnham, and Jones.34
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Once adopted, the Indians faced the challenges of coping with a different culture as a distinct minority. Research shows that some Indians assimilated themselves into the dominant white culture better than others. However, all faced challenges.

One challenge adopted Indians faced was their status in their adopted families. Were they just "indentured servants" or were they equal members of their adopted families? Many adopted Indians probably felt like servants rather than members of a family. To cope with this challenge some Indians simply left their adopted homes, returning to their own people or moving to a different location. Nellie Judd, after she was a young woman,

... carefully took her clean clothes from the washing on the line, rolled them into a tight bundle and placed them in the window ... the next morning she was gone, apparently with a and of her own people who were passing through.  

Moroni Forsythe and Samuel Arthur both left their adopted homes as young men at nineteen and seventeen respectively, greatly disturbing their adopted parents.  

Adopted Indians also faced challenges surrounding inter-racial marriages. Due to prevailing circumstances, some young adult adopted Indians faced racial prejudice when inter-racial marriage was an issue. Most adopted Indians wanted to marry whites, but many whites were not ready for their children to marry an Indian. One account of the prejudice adopted Indians faced is that of Jim Sessions. Jim
seemed to be culturally accepted; he frequently went hunting with Wilford Woodruff, President of the Mormon Church. Jim's talents were many: he was an avid sportsman as well as an excellent carpenter; yet, he was unable to marry a white girl. "Several girls felt that they would like Jim for a husband, but parents intervened. Jim took it all in good part expressing himself as being as good as they were but it didn't matter."37 Later in his life, Jim married a white woman, but the example still implies that some adopted Indians faced racial prejudice when inter-racial marriage was an issue.

Other examples of adopted Indians who might have had difficulty marrying because of racial prejudice were Ann Hamilton Brooks and Mary Thompson. It is not known exactly why these two women did not marry, for they seemed to be well-known in their circles of influence and, on the surface, culturally accepted. Of Ann, Brooks states, "(she) speaks with a cultured accent and is a delightful person to know. She spends a great deal of her time in the Mormon temple and has done some work there for her own people."38 Of Mary, Jennie T. Johnson and Ethel Thompson Lewis write, "Mary was a born aristocrat, it is a fair conclusion that her mother was a wife of a chief . . . Her life was one of service and devotion to those who had befriended her."39 Still, these Indian women never married.
Perhaps the primary reason Indians like Ann and Mary did not marry was the fact they were Indians. Not all Mormons accepted the adopted Indians as equals. Some adopted Indians had the opportunity to marry but their white parents either dissuaded them or their suitors. For example, an Indian girl, daughter of Sister McClellan, "had a chance to marry a white man as his fourth wife, but the parents thought she could do better." And Tony Tillohash, after graduating from Carlisle, "went to the Heaton [his adopted home] home hoping to marry one of the girls for whom he had had a great affection all his life. Not only the girl but the parents discouraged his suit, advising him to marry among his own people." An excellent illustration of being caught between the two worlds of the white and Indian was Mary Mountain's experience: "Indian braves came courting Mary Mountain but she would have nothing to do with them. She preferred her white environment and home. Then the white men came courting, but Father Eldredge advised them against taking an Indian maiden for a wife." To get around the "two worlds" some adopted Indian women had children without the benefit of marriage. Susie Pulsipher had three children, Harvey, Renie, and Nina, but never married. Soon after the birth of her second child, Susie was called before the local Church authorities to answer for her "sins":
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"I have a right to children," she told them courageously. "No white man will marry me. I cannot live with the Indians. But I can have children, and I will support the children that I have. I will ask no one else to support them. I have them because I want them. God meant that a woman should have children."

After Susie's defense the locals seemed to accept Susie, but another adopted Indian, Lucy Meeks, did not fare as well as Susie. After giving birth to an illegitimate daughter, and after the supposed white father committed suicide, she faced disgrace and a public confession. Lucy became ill and died a short time thereafter.

Men especially had a difficult time finding suitable partners for marriage. Many never married. Brooks lists the following examples of men who did not marry: "Angus M. Cannon adopted a boy Alma; Amos G. Thornton also had one whom he called Alma: George Wood raised one Leo; John Haws of Glendale one, Frank; Moroni Spilsbury of Toquerville, one, Lorren." Brooks continues, "None of these ever married though all lived to maturity and the two latter to old age. All were known as expert cattlemen and horsemen, all mixed with the white freely, but none could secure a white wife or would accept an Indian girl."

However, some of the Indian children who grew to maturity did intermarry with whites. Brooks comments on one Indian girl named Janet, a girl brought up by Prime Coleman who later married James Clark, "The couple had seven children—the descendants are now quite numerous, and move on an equality with their neighbors."
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intermarriage compiled by Brooks include Minnie Burgess, who married Albert Hartman, their union producing four children; Janet, who married a polygamist, Dudley Leavitt, having eleven children; Rhoda Carpenter, who married a Spanish War veteran and had six children, and Cora Keate, who married Albert Hartman after Minnie's death.48

One of the most controversial inter-racial marriages involved Jacob Hamblin. "Many of the family resent [that Hamblin had an Indian wife] even the suggestion with surprising bitterness and emphasis," Brooks wrote in 1944, but her research showed that Hamblin probably married Eliza, an adopted Indian girl in his household.49 The tradition that Hamblin did not marry Eliza continues in the Hamblin family.2 Other records, however, indicate that Hamblin married Eliza on 14 February 1863, in the Endowment House, located in Salt Lake City.50 It is also clear that one of Hamblin's adopted Indian daughters, Susan, grew to maturity and married a white man.51

There were other Indian women who married white men not documented by Brooks, but included in other historical accounts and records. Martha Johnston married an Irishman, Jim Brown, and Ruth Call married James Davids, a young soldier who had served with Johnston's army. Davids joined

5During this research's preliminary presentation in March, 1991, a member of the Hamblin family therein present, confirmed the fact that family tradition continues to affirm that the marriage did not take place.
the Mormon Church and the couple reared seven of their ten children to maturity. Julie Markham married a man of Spanish descent named Frank Perry or Frank Para and had one child before she died of malaria fever. Ann Ida Rice married a veteran of the Civil War, Francis Wilcox. He died in 1915 leaving Ann with their four daughters and five sons. Pernetta Murdock married her adopted father, John Heber Murdock, and, as already mentioned, Rose Daniels married her adopted father, Aaron Daniels. Sally Henrie married Rastus Curtis of Moroni, when she was seventeen or eighteen; Harriet Hamilton married William Myron Bemus "a white man of Manti"; and Lavina Nielson married a white man before leaving Manti. And, Ellen S. Lee, daughter of John D. Lee, married John Wesley Clark in St. George.

On a few occasions Indian men married white women. Two examples are David Lemmon, who married Caroline Nielson, and Christian Nielson, who married a white girl named Annie. Lemmon was a large and well formed man weighing in his youth nearly two-hundred pounds. An avid athlete, Lemmon regularly challenged the white boys to wrestle or race, either on foot or on horseback. He also learned to play the violin, a talent he shared often in the communities of southern Utah. Married in the LDS St. George Temple, Lemmon and Nielson had six children. Christian Nielson assisted his father, who owned one of the finest flour mills in
Manti, and "built him a comfortable home near his father's place and raised a family of children."59

Other incidents of a male Indian marrying a white woman involved Frank Warner, James Sessions, and Zenos Hill. Warner married Edna Davis of Paradise, Cache County, and later, after her death in 1919 married an "educated lady from Vermont."60 Sessions married Alice Palmer on 31 May 1875, in the Logan Temple.61 Hill married Emila Minnie Hickon 20 June 1875.62

Some adopted Indians married within their own race. Alma Shock Brown married Betsy Peacock, a woman who had also been adopted. Their marriage resulted in three children, who according to one citation, "were loved by the entire community."63 Sally Young Kanosh, an Indian girl adopted by one of Brigham Young's wives, married the well-known Chief Kanosh, a chief of the Pauvant Tribe near Fillmore.64 Albert Hanks married Ruth Wimmer and Lehi West married Edna Bayless; Mormons adopted all four individuals as children and raised them in their homes.65 Nellie Judd married Big Jim, an Indian from her tribe.66 Tony Tillohash, after his rejection by the Heatons, returned to his own people and married an Indian woman; Susie Pulsipher's sister married an Indian named Jim; Indian Joe Severe married an Indian woman from his tribe; and Matilda and Lamoni Judd were married vicariously.67
From these examples, some basic conclusions can be made. Of those fifty-eight adopted Indians who grew to maturity, thirty-five married. Of those thirty-five, twenty-two adopted Indians married white spouses—seventeen female and five male adopted Indians; thirteen adopted Indians married other Indians—seven female and six male. This data suggests that it was easier for the female adopted Indians to marry into the dominant white culture than it was for the male adopted Indians. This conclusion is further supported by data that shows twelve male Indians and nine female Indians did not marry, with two Indians not marrying—sex unknown.

Racial prejudice between the white and Indian apparently was strong enough that some whites frowned on inter-racial marriages. But marriages between white men and Indian women occurred more frequently than marriages between white women and Indian men. One probable reason for this discrepancy can be traced to instructions Brigham Young and the Mormon Church gave to Mormon missionaries who labored among the Indians. To Jacob Hamblin, Young wrote: "I have written to Br. E. Snow in relation to marrying Moqui girls, informing him that the brethren were at liberty to do so." Another example encouraging inter-racial marriage is in the journal of Joseph Fish:

Apostles Snow and Brigham Young Jr. arrived in our camp at about 5 p.m. They held meeting with us speaking upon missionary labors among the Lamanites. Bro. Snow thought that the missionaries should go and stay among
the Lamanites and teach them and bring them along, and if necessary marry them.  

In the Mormon culture inter-racial marriage between white men and Indian women had a precedent, sanctioned by Church authority, but no such precedent regarding Indian men marrying white women had been set. 

Further, the Mormon culture based itself upon a family structure headed by the male. When a white woman or man married an Indian, he or she married into an "inferior" race. However, a white male who married an Indian was far better off than a white woman who married an Indian because at least, according to the dominate culture, the white man would direct the family. A white woman who married an Indian had less control than her male counterpart; people thought she would follow her husband into the "horrible and heathen ways of the Red man." Thus, adopted Indian women could assimilate themselves into the dominant white culture easier than their male counterparts because, culturally, an inter-racial marriage between a female Indian and white male was "more acceptable" than an inter-racial marriage between a male Indian and white female.  

Research also shows that thirteen adopted Indians married other Indians, six Indian men and seven Indian women, and that twelve Indian men and nine Indian women that reached adulthood never married. Although this research cites twenty-two individuals who broke the "color line" and married into the dominant culture, another thirty-four
Indians either remained unmarried or married among themselves. That just over half of the documented cases either married among themselves or did not marry might support the following claim: that many adopted Indians, both female and male, were not fully assimilated into the dominant culture.

Even though many adopted Indians were not fully assimilated into the white culture, most accounts of these adopted Indians, written by white historians, were written in a complementary way. Fourteen historical accounts specifically mention that adopted Indians gained a common education. The most prominent case has already been mentioned--Tony Tillohash, a graduate from the Indian school at Carlisle. Other illustrations of adopted Indians who gained an education include Minnie Burgess, who was "sent to school where she learned to read and write," Frank Warner, who "received a common school education, showing marked ability in penmanship," and Zenos Hill, who had fourteen years of schooling including three terms at Brigham Young University.70

These accounts also suggest that the adopted Indians contributed to their respective communities. Dr. Kackley of Soda Springs, Idaho, paid Ruth Call this compliment, "In case of pneumonia and the caring of babies, Aunt Ruth is as good as any doctor,"71 and the people of Manti often said Alma Shock Brown had saved the town from an Indian attack by
alerting them of the raid.\textsuperscript{72} Zenos W. Hill gained recognition during the Black Hawk War as a scout, obtaining the bronze medal and red ribbon given to veterans of the War\textsuperscript{73}, and Sally Kanosh attempted to "teach the Indians to live on a higher plane" through missionary efforts.\textsuperscript{74} That these achievements were recognized by the predominantly white historians, who necessarily reflected the Mormon culture, adds even more luster to their accomplishments.

Many of the accounts suggest some common personality traits among the adopted Indians. Often the accounts said the Indian women possessed excellent homemaking skills. For example: Ruth Call "was considered an unusually good cook and her home was immaculate,"\textsuperscript{75} and Harriet Hamilton "was known throughout the city for her immaculate housekeeping."\textsuperscript{76} Adopted Indian women also were characteristically charitable and generous. Jane Knight spent a great deal of her life caring for children or those with poor health,\textsuperscript{77} as did Mary Thompson: "When Mr. Thompson was stricken with cancer, Mary helped to care for him. In those early days, cloth was very scarce, and Mary patiently washed all the bandages that were used in the care of the cruel sores."\textsuperscript{78} Mary also cared for her adopted mother, Mary Hansen Thompson, when she was ill, and raised one of her foster brother's children until he contracted diphtheria and died.\textsuperscript{79}
Adopted Indian men were known to be hard workers as well as dedicated religious men. Frank Warner helped build the Short Line Railroad from Granger, Utah, to Pocatello, Idaho, and served three Mormon missions among the Indians. Ammon Draper was "religious, honest, and industrious," and David Lemmon, although he had no formal education, learned to read the Bible "and a great portion of his later years was spent in studying the standard works of the Church."82

Research also shows name patterns among the adopted Indians. Along with the common white names of the period, many adopted Indians received names peculiar to the Mormon culture. Nine of the eighty-one adopted Indians in this sample received names taken from The Book of Mormon. These names included, Alma, Ammon, Lamoni, Lehi, Lemuel, Moroni, Samuel, and Zenos.83

Brooks stresses that the few Indians who grew up among the Mormons faced some social problems. She notes that the children differed from their predominantly Anglo-American counterparts and therefore felt like outcasts.84 Additionally, this research shows that some "outcasts" feared their own people. The account of Zadie Hunter specifically mentions her fear of "Indians":

During her childhood Zadie was somewhat afraid of her own people and, when a brother came to visit her, she asked the Hunters never to leave her alone with him for she feared the Indians might claim and take her away.85
Indian children also suffered from prejudiced comments from their playmates or adults, comments that continued to underscore their differences. Cora Harris records:

Once Mrs. Hunter overheard a remark made by some of the Relief Society officers, "Let's let Martha take this ironing since she has the Indian girl." She took the ironing but she felt sad that anyone thought of Zadie as a servant, for she had her place in the family and was treated as one of them.  

One challenge that was either overcome or ignored by adopted Indians was the in-between state of being an Indian but not being an Indian. Brooks feels that the adopted Indians developed a sense of insecurity from this situation; however, since no diaries of adopted Indians are known to exist, and the few interviews in circulation do not mention many challenges, this study cannot confirm Brooks's claim. To accurately learn of further challenges and problems, personal diaries or journals of adopted Indians must be found.

Adopted Indians also suffered governmental prejudice. They were not naturalized citizens and they could not vote. Indians could be taxed, but it is not clear if they could hold property but it is assumed that they could not.
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CHAPTER 6

RELIGIOUS ASSIMILATION AMONG THE ADOPTED INDIANS

Adopted Indians in Utah Territory faced a culture dominated by the Mormon religion. One aspect, therefore, of the acculturation process was the degree to which the adopted Indians "adopted" Mormonism as a religion. Many of the accounts about these adopted Indians come from histories compiled by the Daughter of Utah Pioneers, and other Mormon sources. These accounts are usually very positive toward the Indians and portray the Indians as "loved and accepted" individuals in the community. However, to better judge the degree of assimilation into the Mormon community it is necessary to look at Mormon ecclesiastical records to determine the extent of Indian involvement in Mormon ordinances of baptism and confirmation, temple endowment, temple marriage sealing, and temple child to parent sealing.

In Mormon theology, baptism and confirmation are and remain very important. According to Mormon doctrine all persons need the ordinance of baptism for salvation or, in Mormon terms, exaltation.¹ According to James E. Talmage,

¹For an explanation of the Mormon concepts of salvation and exaltation see James E. Talmage, A Study of the Articles of Faith 52nd ed., (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1976), ch. 4, 74-95; Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine 2nd
baptism ranks as the third principle and the first essential ordinance of the Gospel. Baptism is the gateway leading into the fold of Christ, the portal to the Church, the established rite of naturalization in the kingdom of God.  

Talmage further linked the ordinance of confirmation to baptism—"which results in the remission of sins."  

Baptism also took on an added meaning during the 1850s, especially during the Mormon reformation of 1856-7. During this time, "All lay members were expected to follow the example of ecclesiastical leaders and be rebaptized."  

To assure that each Mormon congregation accomplished this goal, as well as other goals of the reformation, either Church leaders or a special group of home missionaries visited each congregation and instructed them to follow the new initiatives. Therefore, during the early lives of many adopted Indians, baptism was emphasized.  

During the 1850s, all Mormons were expected to be baptized at the age of eight. Therefore, all adopted Indian children who lived to the age of eight should have received baptism and the accompanying ordinance of confirmation if fully assimilated into Mormon culture.  

However, not all of the adopted Indians received this and other ordinances during their lifetimes. In Mormonism, a doctrine known as "Baptism for the Dead" is taught and practiced, and some adopted Indians received a Mormon baptism after their deaths. This doctrine essentially states  

---
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that baptisms may be preformed vicariously for those who did not receive baptism in the flesh. Since Mormons believe that baptism is an essential saving ordinance for all who have lived on earth, the practice of baptisms for the dead is effected in Mormon temples for those who did not receive the ordinance in this life. Then, according to Mormon doctrine, the deceased person has the opportunity to accept or reject the baptism. 6

The temple endowment and the associated ordinance of sealing also holds a unique place in Mormon belief. According to James E. Talmage, the endowment is another important part of a Mormon's quest for salvation or exaltation. 7 Mormons also perform this ordinance for persons who are dead, or who otherwise did not receive the ordinance while they were living. Brigham Young taught that the temple endowment is:

... to receive all those ordinances in the house of the Lord, which are necessary for you, after you have departed this life, to enable you to walk back to the presence of the Father, passing the angels who stand as sentinels, being enabled to give them the key words, the signs and tokens, pertaining to the holy Priesthood, and gain your eternal exaltation in spite of earth and hell. 8

Therefore, without the Mormon temple endowment, Mormons believe that the fullest exaltation is not possible.

As to the Indians who were adopted, Young included them in the group of special beneficiaries when, at the dedication of the St. George Temple in 1877, he said,
This house (St. George Temple) was built here in this place purposely, where it is warm and pleasant in the winter time, and comfortable to work, also for the Lamanites (Indians) . . . to receive their endowments, and other blessings.9

Additionally, Mormon doctrine emphasizes that persons cannot attain salvation without being linked to a family unit.10 Mormons regard the marriage ceremony, known as the ceremony of "Sealing in Marriage"11 or temple marriage, "as the one and only perfect contract of matrimony."12 If a marriage is performed in a Mormon temple then Mormons believe it is lasting and binding for this life and beyond the veil of death. Therefore, temple marriage is an ordinance required for salvation. Children born into this union are considered to be sealed to the couple—also for time and beyond. Talmage states: "Children who are born of parents thus married are natural heirs to the Priesthood; 'children of the covenant' they are called; they require no rite of adoption or sealing to insure them place in the posterity of promise."13

For those children who were born to a couple before a "Sealing of Marriage" in a Mormon temple, Church doctrine affirms that these children must be officially sealed to their parents. Talmage states, "... so must children who have been born to parents married for time only be sealed to their parents after father and mother have been sealed to each other in the order of celestial (temple) marriage."14
The adopted Indians of this sample fall into this category of children.

Additionally, these ordinances are performed vicariously for the dead, just as baptisms and endowments are performed vicariously for the dead. Accordingly, the Church affirms that the eternal perpetuity of all family relationships depends on these ordinances, and Mormons feel that full exaltation or salvation can only be attained as a family unit.

The importance of these ordinances in Mormon belief is emphasized by Bruce R. McConkie who affirms that if individuals who participate in temple ordinances live up to their part of the covenant, they can be assured of salvation and exaltation. Therefore, baptism, confirmation, the temple endowment, the temple marriage sealing, and the associated sealing of all family members to each other, are necessary for full salvation or exaltation in Mormon belief.

Another Mormon doctrine and practice of special relevance to the adopted children is the "Law of Adoption". Practiced during the period 1830-1900, the Law of Adoption emphasized the importance of children being sealed to worthy parents, parents who were sealed into the patriarchal line extending to Adam. According to Gordon Irving, Mormon exaltation depended on being part of a patriarchal chain...
that was linked to Adam.\textsuperscript{15} Irving stresses that the law
included important social ramifications for,
\begin{quote}
The sons were to give the fathers the benefit of their
labors while the fathers offered their children not
only some measure of security in the next world but
counsel and direction in this world as well.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}
So, a sealing of an "adopted" person to adoptive parents was
a known practice, and adopted Indian children being sealed
to adoptive parents for both a temporal and a spiritual
reason had a known precedent.

This study will show how many adopted Indians from a
sample of sixty-three known adopted Indians have received
the Mormon ordinances of baptism and confirmation, the
endowment, the sealing of marriage, and the sealing of child
to parent either during their lifetimes or vicariously.

Mormons have participated in the ordinances of baptism
and confirmation since their Church's beginning. As far as
temple ordinances are concerned, Mormons have participated
in them since 1842. The information for this research has
been taken from records of The Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints' known as the Ancestral File (AF), the
International Genealogical Index (IGI), and the Temple
Records Index Bureau (TIB).

The Ancestral File is a computerized program wherein
records are recorded from L.D.S. family group sheets. Its
primary purpose is to locate and define family ties.
Included in this record are various accounts of individuals,
including data about births, deaths, baptisms, endowments, marriages, sealings, and other assorted information.

The International Genealogical Index (IGI) is a list of approximately 118 million entries. The list contains names of deceased persons for whom temple ordinances have been performed, or for whom ordinances are in the process of being performed. It also contains information about individuals, including complete names of individuals, names of parents or spouse, sex, births, christenings, marriages, dates of events, places of events, L.D.S. ordinances performed, and other assorted information. The IGI focuses on information submitted since October, 1969.

The Temple Records Index Bureau (TIB) is a card index of approximately thirty million names of individuals who received their L.D.S. Temple endowments either in life or by proxy between the years 1842-1970. It is an index to endowments received prior to the computer processing of names, which began in October 1969. Included on these index cards are the related temple or endowment house record information, the name of the individual involved, birth date, death date, marriage date, name of heir or instance of, (meaning the name of the person who initiated the ordinance work for the individual involved), father's name, mother's name, spouse's name, relationship of heir or family representative to person listed, proxy's names, endowment date, and baptism date. However, each of these items is
only listed if known. Additionally, only members of the L.D.S. Church, who have a valid temple recommend and others with special permission may use the TIB.

This study's sample of adopted Indians includes eighty-one individuals. However, of these eighty-one individuals, eighteen are known by surname only. Therefore, this section of research focuses on information about the remaining sixty-three individuals with both first and last names.

A surprising number of adopted Indians were baptized while they were living: twenty-five individuals, or forty percent of the sample. Eighteen of the twenty-five were baptized before the age of fifteen while the other seven were baptized in later years. The oldest adopted Indian to receive baptism was Ellen Lee, who was baptized at the age of forty-seven; nine individuals were baptized at age eight. The average age of those who were baptized was thirteen. Excluding the seven who were baptized after age fifteen the average was 11.6 percent.

Six individuals were baptized vicariously. However, four of these individuals, Minnie Burgess, Lorim Spilsbury, Lehi West, and Picket Murdock, who died at ages of thirty-one; twenty, twenty-one, and seventy-two, should have had a chance to receive baptism before their deaths. This group probably chose not to receive a Mormon baptism. 

Footnote: Appendix V contains a table that summarizes the L.D.S. ordinance of adopted Indians.
On the other hand, thirty-eight adopted Indians were not baptized during their lifetimes, or 60 percent of the sample. This means that a majority of adopted Indians did not receive an essential rite of passage into the Mormon culture. With the addition of baptisms performed vicariously, thirty-one individuals or forty-nine percent of the sample received baptism at some time, while thirty-two individuals or fifty-one percent of the sample did not and have not received the ordinance of baptism. The fact that half of the adopted Indians received the rites of baptism and presumably confirmation, while the other half did not, raises some serious questions about the overall assimilation of adopted Indians into Mormon culture.

Endowment records for the adopted Indians in this sample show that thirteen individuals, or 21 percent, received this ordinance during their lifetimes. An additional eighteen adopted Indians, or 29 percent of the sample, received this ordinance vicariously. In total, thirty-one individuals, or 49 percent, received this ordinance. This also means that fifty individuals, or 79 percent of the sample did not receive the ordinance of the endowment during their lifetimes; and, thirty-two individuals, or 51 percent of the sample, did not or have not received the endowment ordinance at any time, either in life or vicariously.
Some conclusions can be made from these thirty-one records of adopted Indians who have received the Mormon endowment. First, the fact that an endowment was done is a significant factor in determining the degree of acculturation. For these adopted Indians, some degree of acculturation was obtained either during their life-time or after. Thirteen of the thirty-one received their endowments of their own accord, or during their own lives. This means that some adopted Indians did become assimilated enough into the Mormon culture to receive this highly sought after ordinance during their lifetimes.

Second, nine persons received their endowments after their deaths at the instance or request of a near relative. The endowment work for four of the adopted Indian's endowment work was requested by an adopted mother or father; the remaining requests came from a nephew, a foster sister, a great grand niece, a great-grand-daughter, and other direct line relatives.

Third, five persons received their endowments at the request of friends rather than relatives. These five persons apparently did not have relatives who pressed for their endowment work to be done after their deaths; however, they did have friends who cared enough to insist that the work be done. Additionally, four persons received their endowments vicariously at the request of an unknown person.

Fourth, while thirty-one persons received the ordinance
of the endowment, thirty-three persons did not. That over half of the sample did not receive the Mormon ordinance of the endowment is significant cause to question the overall assimilation of adopted Indians into the Mormon culture. This assumption is also supported by research on the Mormon participation in the endowment during this period. According to Bean, Mineau, and Anderten, 80% of the Mormon population participated in the endowment.21

Additionally, the average age of those who received this ordinance while they were living was twenty-nine years. The average life-span for those who received the ordinance vicariously was thirty-eight point seven years. That so many adopted Indians who received the endowment ordinance vicariously lived well into their adult years is a significant factor in the evaluation of adopted Indian assimilation. Thirty-eight, almost thirty-nine years of living among the Mormon culture and not receiving their Mormon endowment, and in many cases not even baptism, leads this research to conclude that many Indian children were not fully assimilated into the Mormon community or culture.

This assumption becomes even clearer when the percent of adopted Indians who were sealed to their adopted parents during their lifetimes is researched. In all, five adopted Indians were sealed to their parents, or 8 percent of the sample. Therefore, fifty-eight adopted Indians, or 92 percent of the sample, were not sealed during their
lifetimes to their adopted parents. However, the percentage of adopted Indians who were sealed to their adopted parents rises when the vicarious work is added. Fifteen individuals were sealed to their adopted parents after their deaths, making the total percentage of those who were sealed to their adopted parents 32 percent. Also noteworthy is that eight individuals were sealed to their adopted parents before 1910, most by close relatives, while the remaining seven have been sealed since 1963.

Therefore, very few adopted Indians were fully assimilated into the Mormon family because very few adopted Indians were sealed to their foster parents. Since the rite of sealing children to parents was important in Mormon theology and to the concept of the Mormon family, the fact that very few adopted Indians were sealed to their adopted parents points to a conclusion that few adopted Indians were fully assimilated into Mormon culture. A common example of an adopted Indian who was not sealed to his adopted parents is the case of Samuel Arthur, adopted son of Christopher J. Arthur and Caroline Eliza Haight. Samuel Arthur was born in Cedar City, Iron County, Utah, on 2 November 1856. On the Arthur family group sheet, Samuel is listed as a child, but not as a sealed child. Christopher and Caroline Arthur were sealed to each other on 3 November 1857, in the Endowment House in Salt Lake City. Their child, Eliza Haight Arthur, born 7 July 1857, is listed as a sealed child; therefore, a
necessary sealing of child to parent occurred. However, a similar sealing of Samuel to his adoptive parents did not occur. 22

Another Indian child, Sally Young Kanosh, is also not listed as being sealed to her adoptive parents. This case is particularly interesting because her adoptive father was Brigham Young and Sally is and was one of the most noted of adopted Indian children.

Finally, the number of temple marriage sealings performed by adopted Indians themselves was seven. An additional five individuals were sealed vicariously. Therefore 20 percent of those married were sealed in their lifetimes, fourteen percent received the ordinance after their deaths; therefore, 34 percent of those married received the temple marriage ordinance. It is important to note that twenty-three adopted Indians or 66 percent of those married in the sample did not or have not received the ordinance of temple marriage sealing.

Another interesting fact obtained through these records, especially the (TIB) index, is that ten of the adopted Indians were classified by the temple workers or record keepers as Lamanites, ie. Native Americans. In each of these records the word "Lamanite" is linked to the person involved. Race or nationality is not usually declared on other records in the collections.
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Also, eighteen of the adopted Indian's records indicating that they have received the Mormon ordinance of the endowment have the names of their parents recorded. Fifteen of these records list the adoptive parent's names; eleven of these specifically mention that the parents were either foster or adopted parents, while five just list the parent's names. The records of Frank Warner, James Sessions and Zaidee Hunter, mention Indian fathers, even though each person was known by their adopted parents' surnames.²³

In summary, only four adopted Indians received the ordinances specified for full exaltation by the Mormon Church during their lifetimes: Ruth Call, Rhoda Carpenter, David Lemmon, and James Sessions.²⁴ In other words, only four out of sixty-three, or 6 percent of the sample, fully participated in the Mormon religious ordinances during their lifetimes. Additionally, four more adopted Indians, Sally Henrie, Matilda Judd, Ellen Lee, and Anna Ida Rice, received all the Mormon ordinances through a combination of live and vicarious participation.²⁵ Therefore 8 or 12.7 percent of the adopted Indians in the sample have received what is considered to be the saving ordinances for full salvation or exaltation in Mormon belief. Thus, as far as religious acculturation, only eight adopted Indians were fully aculturated into the Mormon culture.

To be fair, some adopted Indians received all the possible ordinances, excluding temple marriage. Richard
Nebeker, received all the ordinances possible while he lived; Ammon Draper, Albert Hamblin, Ellen Hamblin, Omar Heywood, Lemuel Hunsaker, Pickett Murdock, and Lucy Meeks received all the ordinances except marriage through a combination of vicarious and living participation. If these eight adopted Indians are added to the other eight adopted Indians, then sixteen adopted Indians, or 25 percent of the adopted Indians in this sample, were fully assimilated into the Mormon religious culture. However, if Richard Nebeker is added to the other four adopted Indians who received all the necessary ordinances while living, the total is only 8 percent.
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Prior to the Mormons' arrival in 1847, the Indian slave trade between the Mexicans and the Utah Indians was a dominant element of Native American culture. The Mormons, faced with the complexities of the slave trade, found it necessary to develop a policy that integrated the slave trade into their culture.

Brigham Young, realizing that the slave trade was already a deeply entrenched system of trade among the native Utahans, developed an Indian adoption program. Using his influence to bring about a 1852 territorial act that illegalized the slave trade between the Indians and the Mexicans, Young left the Indians with one option: to sell their slaves to the Mormons. Young urged the Mormons to adopt the Indian slaves as children and to bring them up in the Mormon faith. Young based the adoption program upon the indentured servitude clause within the territorial act; he was sure the program would benefit all parties involved. And Young hoped that Mormons could better help the Indians both temporally and spiritually.

Young's justifications for supporting an Indian Slave Act, with its necessary conditions of Indian slave adoption,
was a combination of well thought out reasons linked to expected results. First, Young felt that Mormon interaction in the slave trade, because of the present condition of Indian slave trading in Utah, was in the best interest of the Indians being sold. In Young's eyes, Mormon were better masters for the Indians than Mexican masters.

Second, under United States' law slavery was legal. However, Young also wanted to put a stop to the slave trade, especially the intra-territorial slave trade wherein Utah Indians were transferred outside of the territory. Therefore, Young used his influence to convince the territorial legislature to outlaw inter-territorial slave trade.

Third, Young made it possible for white Utah territorial residents, who were overwhelmingly Mormons, to buy slaves and make out an indenture. With Mormon masters, the Indians would be freer; they would have a better opportunity to become "civilized" after a Mormon fashion; and each adopted Indian slave would enjoy a higher quality of life than he/she otherwise would have under a non-Mormon master. Young and the Mormons made the same assumption shared by most European peoples—that the Indian was inferior in culture; therefore, they needed to adopt a higher culture or Mormon culture. Mormon masters would also become foster parents because they would integrate the adopted Indians into Mormon culture.
Fourth, Young and the Mormons' goals of further colonization would be enhanced. As Mormons pushed farther into Indian lands, interactions with Indian tribes involved in the slave trade would, Young reasoned, be more congenial because Mormons participated in the slave trade. Also, adopted Indians would be economic assets to any Mormom family.

Fifth, Young justified Mormon involvement in the slave trade because it would promote the Mormon religious goal of converting the Indians to Mormonism. Not only would the adopted Indians become members of Mormon families, but Young hoped that the adopted Indians would be assimilated into the Mormon culture as Church members. And, as the adopted Indians became members of the Mormon Church, they would fulfill a Book of Mormon prophecy that the Lamanites (Indians) would be redeemed through the gospel of Christ.

The results of Mormon interaction in the Indian slave trade varied. Young expected certain results, and in some cases the results were positive, while in others, the results were negative. The Mormon adoption program, coupled with the Slave Act, did for the most part stop the inhumane slave trade between the Mexicans and the Indians. Though slave trading between Mexicans and Indians probably continued, it continued as an underground operation—which necessitated a decrease in slave traffic. Mormons, therefore, became the principle slave traders. Instead of a
life filled with drudgery and involuntary servitude among the Mexicans or other Indian tribes, Indian slaves were placed in a better, at least in Young's eyes, position as indentured servants, or as in most cases--adopted children. Young reasoned that Mormons were better suited as trustees for the Indians than the Mexicans because he considered the Mormon culture, and his proposed policy of Indian slave treatment, to be morally superior to the Mexican culture and its policies concerning Indian slaves.

Additionally, Mormon interaction in the slave trade, as enumerated in the Indian slave act, initially enhanced Mormon goals of colonization. As Mormons moved into the southern and central valleys of Utah, they met with little initial opposition; however, opposition increased as Indians found it more and more difficult to sell Indian slaves to Mormons. Further, angry Mexican slave traders helped incite the Indian slave traders against the Mormons and the "Mormon" slave act. Therefore, Mormon interaction into the slave trade, despite hopes for peaceful Mormon-Indian relations, contributed to the Indian grievances that caused the Walker War. The Indian slave act was an attempt to appease Indians like Walker, who both a slaver and a threat to Mormon colonizers. But, the act only served as an initial buffer between the Indians and the Mormons; thereafter, it helped provoke rather than pacify the Indians.
Some adopted Indians were a great help to Mormon families. Most adopted Indians helped on the farm or in the home and therefore became an economic asset to the family. However, other adopted Indians ran away from their adopted families, possibly because of the difficult working conditions.

The results of Mormon adoptions were also varied. It is clear that some of the adopted Indians died before maturity. This sample contains five adopted Indians who died before maturity because of illness, with three others dying from accidents at a young ages. However, the majority, fifty-eight individuals, or 88 percent, of the sample of adopted Indians reached maturity. Again, it must be noted that this sample comes from historical sources that mention the Indians because they were exceptional or prominent. However, one of Young's reasons for Mormon involvement in the slave trade, to increase the quality of life, was partially fulfilled because some adopted Indians lived beyond childhood. So, some Indians, because they were adopted by Mormons, did not suffer the indignities, as perceived by Young, that their counterparts suffered under Mexican or Indian guardianship.

Still, those who lived to maturity and remained with their adopted culture faced numerous cultural challenges. Few Indian men intermarried with whites, although many Indian women did, and many Indians of both sexes remained
single either by choice or by their inability to find suitable marriage partners among whites or their native people. Also, those Indians who lived to maturity developed into a distinct social class within Mormon culture. Because Mormons perceived the Indian race as an inferior race, many Mormons did not fully accept the adopted Indians as equals. And, despite their Indian blood, many adopted Indians found it difficult to return to their native people.

Many adopted Indians received some education and, according to some written accounts, were well thought of in their communities. But these accounts are difficult to verify. Young expected the adopted Indians to be integrated into Mormon society A good indicator of adopted Indian assimilation is marriage. Those Indians who intermarried with whites, twenty-two in the sample, seemed to have had the easiest time assimilating themselves into Mormon culture. But, even these Indians faced degrees of prejudice that continued to have its effects upon descendants. Research shows there were sixty-six children who resulted from Indian-white marriages. Of these children Brooks writes:

The writer has met the descendents of Rhoda Carpenter, Minnie Hartman, Janet Leavitt, and David Lemmon. It would seem that the children of these Indian-white marriages carried a certain stigma . . . With the grandchildren, this difference is much less, while the fourth generation seems to have forgotten entirely that it has any of the "blood of Israel" in its veins . . . they mix on an equal plane with their associates.'
To what extent attitudes of prejudice excluded adopted Indians from becoming fully assimilated into Mormon society may never be known, but a good indication of assimilation can be seen through the adopted Indian's religious participation. The principle reason behind Young's justifications was a hope for a conversion to Mormonism of all adopted Indians. However, religious records show that few adopted Indians, from this sample of prominent and exceptional adopted Indians, fully accepted Mormonism.

According to ordinance records, only five adopted Indians from the sample, during their lifetimes, received all the ordinances—baptism and confirmation, the endowment, temple marriage sealing, and parent to child sealing—required by Mormon belief for exaltation. Including vicarious work, sixteen adopted Indians, or 25 percent of the sample, received all the necessary ordinances. This means that forty-seven individuals, or 75 percent of the adopted Indians in this sample, did not receive all the ordinances required for full participation in the Mormon religious culture.

Twenty-five individuals, or 40 percent of the sample, were baptized during their lifetimes, with an additional six receiving baptism vicariously. Therefore, 60 percent of the adopted Indians, or thirty-eight individuals, did not receive the ordinance of baptism and presumably confirmation.
Thirteen individuals, or 21 percent of the sample, received the ordinance of the endowment during their lifetimes, with eighteen adopted Indians receiving the ordinance vicariously. Seven adopted Indians chose to be married in the Mormon temple, while five received the ordinance vicariously. Perhaps the most revealing fact obtained from these religious records is the percentage of adopted Indians who were sealed to their adopted parents. Only five adopted Indians, or 8 percent of the sample, were sealed to their parents while the Indians were alive. Fifteen individuals were sealed to their parents vicariously.

What these records show is that a majority of adopted Indians in this sample did not receive the essential Mormon ordinances required for full integration into the Mormon religion. As already mentioned, this sample consists of adopted Indians who were either prominent or exceptional because they were mentioned in historical accounts. If a majority of the most prominent and exceptional adopted Indians did not receive the Mormon ordinances, it can be assumed the majority of adopted Indians did not received the Mormon ordinances; therefore, a majority of the adopted Indians did not become fully accepted or assimilated into the Mormon culture, at least in the religious sense, either during or after their lifetimes.
Additionally, of those individuals in the sample who did receive the ordinances, few received the ordinance during their lifetimes of their own accord. Again, the most revealing fact is that only five persons were sealed to an adopted family while they lived, suggesting that Mormons of that time period did not perceive the adopted children to be legitimate members of the family unit. That result, added to the low percentages of Indians who participated in other ordinances, implies that most adopted Indians were not fully assimilated into the Mormon religious culture.

Thus, the actual results of the adoption program implemented by Brigham Young and the Mormons were substantially different from the expected results. Young and the Mormons may have had noble intentions and expectations for the adoption program, but their intentions and expectations were never fully actualized. O'Neil and Layton, commenting on Mormon-Indian interaction of the period conclude, "The Mormon experience, then, had become the American Experience, and for the Indians the result was typically devastating." The statement of O'Neil and Layton could also be used to generally describe the results of the Mormon adoption program. Young, later said:

I will say to our government if they could hear me, "You need never fight the Indians, but if you want to get rid of them try to civilize them." At the warm springs, at this little grove where they would pitch their tents, we found perhaps three hundred Indians but I do not suppose that there are three of that band left alive now. There was another band a little south, another north,
another further east; but I do not suppose there is one in ten, perhaps not one in a hundred, now alive of those who were here when we came. Did we kill them? No, we fed them. We brought their children into our families and nursed them and did everything for them it was possible to do for human beings, but die they would.  

So, despite their good intentions, Young and the Mormon people failed to save the Indians from the usual effects of interaction with the whites. Although this research does not show that the children brought into Mormon homes died as Young implied, it does show that Mormon intentions were not enough to fully assimilate the adopted Indians into their culture. The Mormons, as many other Anglo-Americans, still destroyed the native Indian culture for the most part, and they changed the lives of Indians permanently. The few Indians that the Mormons attempted to assimilate into their culture ended up for the most part as a lost people in a middle ground, neither fully accepted as Indians, nor fully accepted as white Mormons. Nevertheless, Brigham Young and the Mormons attempted to assimilate the Indians into their culture. In evaluating the experience between the Mormons and the Utah Indians, it must be noted that the Mormons realistically attempted to help the Indians. While contact with the Mormons changed the lives of the Utah Indians, the Mormons did stop the barbaric conditions of the slave trade that were prevalent before they arrived. It is true that many Mormons bought and adopted the Indians for selfish reasons—adopted Indians
could be very beneficial to a struggling rancher, homemaker, or farmer; but many Mormons also bought and adopted the Indian slaves for Christian reasons based on their Mormon faith and their individual views of Christianity. That all the adopted Indians were not fully assimilated into the Mormon religion could be linked to numerous conditions difficult to measure, although they are implied: white prejudice, a lack of Indian desire, or a lack of general understanding by both groups. Finally, the Mormon's Indian adoption program, at a minimum, helped a few Indians to cope with the changes brought by the expansion of whites into Utah. Examples of far less humane Indian policies among Europeans and other Americans abound in history. Most Europeans and Americans did not try to assimilate the Indians into their culture, but, instead, they tried to exploit or exterminate them. The Mormons, in attempting to assimilate the Indians into their culture, achieved some success, which is better than none at all.
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Appendix I.

Definitions of Essential Terms

The term Mormon is a term that is commonly used to describe the religious denomination: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Mormons are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Brigham Young was the Church's leader from 1844 to his death in 1877. Young's position bestowed titles of both President of the Church as well as Prophet of the Church.

Lamanite is a word used by Mormons to describe the Native Americans. It is a term taken from book of Mormon scripture called The Book of Mormon. The Mormon people believe The Book of Mormon is a record of the ancient inhabitants of the Americas or the ancestors of the Native Americans.

Indian or Indians in this thesis will refer to the Native Americans who inhabited the area called the Great Basin.

Southern Utah usually refers to the area south of Provo, Utah, in the state of Utah.

Slaves were Piute or Goshute Indians captured usually by Ute Indians and who were sold primarily to the Mexicans.
Mexicans are those peoples who inhabited the Southwestern area of North America until the Spanish-American War when the Mexican peoples consisted of the inhabitants of Mexico.

Adoption in this research refers to the Mormon people adopting the Indian slaves they purchased. Under the terms of the 1852 Utah Territorial Slave Act, the Mormons could buy an Indian slave only if they intended to adopt such slave into their present family.

Assimilation is used in conjunction with the Mormon attempt to change the Indian slaves into persons who were accepted in society as a full citizen of that group. Assimilation also refers to the Mormon attempt to convert the Indian slaves to their religion. To be assimilated, an Indian would necessarily reject his/her own heritage and accept the new heritage and cultural norms of the Mormon culture. By doing so, the Indian would no longer be an outsider in Mormon society.

Endowments is a word used in conjunction with Mormon temple ordinances. According to Bruce R. McConkie, the endowment is a special spiritual set of blessings that pertain, in Mormon belief, to exaltation.

Sealing pertains to the Mormon temple ordinance wherein members of families are joined together in Mormon belief for eternity. Marriages, when possible, are first performed in Mormon temple and are know as a sealing. For those who were
married civilly, a sealing can be performed after the initial marriage. For those couples who are first married in the Mormon temple, their children are classified as Born in the Covenant (BIC). Or in other words, the children are sealed to the parents for all time. For those couples who are sealed after their marriage, and who have children born before the sealing, these couples are encouraged to seal their children to them in the temple. Thus, in this research, an important factor in the evaluation of the degree of cultural assimilation of adopted Indian children is the percentage of adopted Indians who were sealed to their adopted parents.
Appendix II.

A Preamble and An Act for the further relief of Indian Slaves and Prisoners.

Whereas, by reason of the acquisition of Upper California and New Mexico, and the subsequent organization of the Territorial Governments of New Mexico and Utah by the acts of the Congress of the United States, these Territories have organized Governments within and upon what would otherwise be considered Indian territory, and which really is Indian territory so far as the right of soil is involved, thereby presenting the novel feature of a white legalized government on Indian lands; and

Whereas, The laws of the United States in relation to intercourse with Indians are designed for and applicable to territories and countries under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; and

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

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

Whereas, They do frequently kill their women and children taken prisoners, either for revenge, or for amusement, or through the influence of tradition, unless they are tempted to exchange them for trade, which they usually do if they have an opportunity; and

Whereas, One family frequently steals the children and women of another family, and such robberies and murders are continually committed, in times of their greatest peace and amity, thus dragging free Indian women and children into Mexican servitude and slavery, or death, to the almost entire extirpation of the whole Indian race; and
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Whereas, These inhuman practices are being daily enacted before our eyes in the midst of the white settlements and within the organized counties of the Territory; and when the inhabitants do not purchase or trade for those so offered for sale, they are generally doomed to go the most miserable existence, suffering the tortures of every species of cruelty, until death kindly relieves them and closes the revolting scenery,

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

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

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

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

AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF INDIAN SLAVES AND PRISONERS

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

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

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

Sec. 4.--The master to whom the indenture is made is
hereby required to send said apprentice to school, if there
be a school in the district or vicinity, for the term of
three months in each year, at a time when said Indian child
shall be between the ages of seven and sixteen. The master
shall clothe his apprentice in a comfortable and becoming
manner, according to his, said master's condition in life.
Approved March 7, 1852.
Appendix III.

"Proclamation by the Governor"

Whereas it is made known to me by reliable information, from affidavits, an various other sources, that there is in this Territory a hord of Mexicans, or outlandish men, who are infesting the settlements, stirring up the Indians to make aggressions upon the inhabitants, and who are also furnishing the Indians with guns, ammunition, etc., contrary to the laws of this Territory and the laws of the United States:

And Whereas it is evident that it is the intention of these Mexicans or foreigners to break the laws of this Territory and the United States, utterly regardless of every restriction, furnishing Indians with guns and powder, whenever and wherever it suits their designs, convenience, or purposes:

Therefore, I, Brigham Young, Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Territory of Utah, in order to preserve peace, quell the Indians and secure the lives and property of the citizens of the Territory, hereby order and direct as follows:
1st. That a small detachment consisting of thirty men, under the charge of Captain Wall, proceed south through the entire extent of the settlements reconnoitering the country and directing the inhabitants to be on their guard against any sudden surprise.

2nd. That said reconnoitering officer communicate with the expedition now traveling south, as often as any information of importance is obtained, that I may be kept advised of every transaction.

3rd. The officer and party hereby sent upon this service are hereby authorized and directed to arrest and keep in close custody every strolling Mexican party, and those associating with them, and other suspicious persons or parties that they may encounter, and leave them safely guarded at different points of settlements to await further orders, as circumstances shall transpire and the laws direct.

4th. The Militia of the Territory are hereby instructed to be in readiness to march to any point to which they may be directed at a moment's notice.

5th. All Mexicans now in the Territory are required to remain quiet in the settlements and not attempt to leave under any consideration, until further advised; and the officers of the Territory are hereby directed to keep them in safe custody, treating them with kindness and supplying their necessary wants.
6th. While all the people should be on their constant guard, they are also requested to remain quiet and orderly, pursuing their various avocations until such times as they may be called upon to act in their own defense.

7th. The officer in command of the reconnoitering detachment is hereby directed to move with caution, that he may not be taken in ambush or surprise; to preserve his men and animals, and still be as expeditious in his movements as possible; and the people at the various settlements are hereby requested to furnish him such aid and assistance as shall be necessary.

Done at the City of Provo, in the County of Utah, this 23rd day of April, A.D. 1853. By Governor, Brigham Young.

Benj. G. Ferris, Secretary.
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Content Guide


Heart: Carter, Kate B., ed. Heart Throbs of the West. Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939-1951. Vols. 1, 2, 6, 9.


TIB  The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Temple Index Bureau. Found in Brigham Young University Genealogical Library.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur, Samuel.</td>
<td>Afn:1W3P-R2, Brooks, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker, Rhoda.</td>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong> Vol. 8, 122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless, Edna.</td>
<td>Brooks, 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, N/A.(female)</td>
<td><strong>Heart</strong> Vol. 1, 148.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, N/A.(male)</td>
<td><strong>Heart</strong> Vol. 1, 148.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess, Minnie.</td>
<td>Afn: 2NBM-VK, <em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 159-160, TIB-St. George Temple Record,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#12770, Book 1., p. 301, Arizona Temple Record, Book 9317, p. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call, Ruth.</td>
<td>Afn: 17WG-GM, <em>Heritage</em> Vol. 3, 455-6, IGI, TIB-Endowment House, #4946,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book H., p. 225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call, N/A.</td>
<td><em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call, N/A.</td>
<td><em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon, Alma.</td>
<td>Brooks, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Rhoda.</td>
<td>Afn: 245L-6Q, <em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 114-115, TIB-St. George Temple Record,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#5569, Book C., p. 550-551.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Slyvia.</td>
<td><em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 159-160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels, Rose.</td>
<td><em>Enduring</em> Vol. 7, 41-46, <em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 162.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper, Ammon.</td>
<td>Afn: 1CCJ-L7, <em>Heart</em> Vol. 1, 161-162, <em>Heritage</em> Vol. 3, 451, IGI,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIB-Manti Temple Record, #32521, Book C-Z, 1158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empey, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsythe, Moroni.</td>
<td>Brooks, 33-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamblin, Albert.</td>
<td>Afn: 37CZ-5K, Brooks, 40, TIB-Endowment House Record, #830, Book D.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 46.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122


Hamblin, Susan. Afn: 37CZ-6Q, Brooks, 40-41.

Hamblin, N/A. Brooks, 41.


Hyde, N/A. Heart Vol. 9, 424-425.

Johnston, Martha. Heritage Vol 3, 455.


Judd, Nellie. Afn: 3TS-P-C, Brooks, 33.

Judd, Matilda. Afn: 3LW5-N8, Brooks, 33, Judd, 95.


Knight, Jane. Heart Vol. 1, 114.


Kimball, Dave. Maulouf, 386.


Meeks, Lucy. Brooks, 37, IGI.

Merkley, N/A. Heart Vol. 1, 148.

Mclellan, N/A. 
Brooks, 35.

Mountain, Mary. 
Treasures Vol. 4, 365-369.

Murdock, Pernetta. 

Murdock, Pickett Albert 

Nebeker, Richard. 
Afn: 1D7Q-H6, Heritage Vol. 8, 100, TIB-Logan Temple Record, #3763, Book A., p. 105.

Nielson, Christian. 
Heart Vol. 1, 162-163, TIB-Manti Temple Record, #2748, Book G., p. 82.

Nielson, Lavina. 
Heart Vol. 1, 162-163.

Peacock, Betsy. 
Heart Vol. 1, 155.

Pulsipher, Suise. 
Brooks, 46-47.

Pulsipher, N/A. 
Brooks, 46-47.

Rice, Ida Anna. 

Sessions, James. 

Smith, Janet, (Jeanette) 
Afn: 41HW-6H, Brooks, 38.

Smith, N/A. 
Brooks, 5.
Smith, N/A.  
Snow, Micky.  
Spilsbury, Lorim.  
Thompson, Mary.  
Thorton, Alma.  
Tillohash, Tony.  
Warner, Frank.  
West, Lehi.  
Wimmer, Ruth.  
Wood, Leo.  
Young, Sally.  
Young, N/A.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith, N/A.</td>
<td>Brooks, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow, Micky.</td>
<td>Heart Vol. 1, 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Mary.</td>
<td>Heritage Vol. 8, 123-124, TIB-Salt Lake Temple Record, #6176, Book C., p. 229.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorton, Alma.</td>
<td>Brooks, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillohash, Tony.</td>
<td>Brooks, 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Leo.</td>
<td>Brooks, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Sally.</td>
<td>Heart Vol. 1, 110-111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, N/A.</td>
<td>Heart Vol. 1, 149.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, N/A.</td>
<td>Heart Vol. 1, 149.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance</th>
<th>Living</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Dead</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total done</th>
<th>% not done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptism</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealing to Parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Sealing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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