

MMM: Brigham Young approved of the Indian attack...

Posted by: randyj ()
Date: January 28, 2016 11:17PM

Mormon apologists routinely assert that Brigham Young did not know about, nor approve of, the attack on the Baker–Fancher emigrant train beforehand. But historical research shows that Brigham Young clearly planned and approved of the specific attack on the Baker–Fancher train, during a war council which he held with 12 southern Indian chiefs six days before the attack. I detailed this in a response to a TBM [Mormon] named Kevin Zoellner on alt.religion.mormon in 2001. My remarks are in the black while Kevin's are in green.

Kevin Zoellner wrote:

I found this quote interesting, considering the argument about whether or not BY ordered the MMM.

"The first time I heard that a messenger had been sent to Brigham Young for instructions as to what should be done with the emigrants, was three or four days after I had returned home from the Meadows. Then I heard of it from Isaac C. Haight, when he came to my house and had a talk with me. He said: "we are all in a muddle. Haslem has returned from Salt Lake City, with orders from Brigham Young to let the emigrants pass in safety""

From the Confessions of John D. Lee

Randy wrote:

Kevin, I've explained this numerous times already. Lee made his above statement soon after the massacre, before he had any inkling of Young's involvement. If you'll continue to read his "Confessions," you'll discover that after all the facts became clear to him, he stated:

"I did not know then that a messenger had been sent to Brigham Young for instructions. Haight had not mentioned it to me. I now think that James Haslem was sent to Brigham Young, as a sharp play on the part of the authorities to protect themselves, if trouble ever grew out of the matter."

Kevin responded:

Yes, I read that part.

Randy :

If you read it, it's rather telling that you did not cite it. That makes one think that you're interested in only citing evidence that absolves Young, and ignoring any which indicts him.

In other words, Young's letter to Haight was a "cover your ass" effort. Young and Hamblin had met with southern Indian chiefs only days before the massacre, to plan the attack and the divvying up of the Fancher party's goods.

Yes, it was a cover your ass attempt by the local authorities.

That view doesn't make any sense. If the local southern Mormon leaders had wanted to cover their asses, they wouldn't have plotted or carried out the attack to begin with; and they MOST CERTAINLY wouldn't have sent a messenger to Young to get his counsel on what action to take, yet then turn around and massacre the Fancher party without waiting on Haslem to return with Young's message. Your theory requires Haight to have said something like "Hey guys, let's send somebody to ask Brigham what to do with these people, and if we don't hear back from him, let's whack 'em." The local Mormons would not have made such a decision without getting the okay from above beforehand. Also, as DuWayne recently pointed out (and as I have pointed out many times in the past), the very fact that local leaders felt they needed to ask Young's "counsel" on whether or not to massacre 120+ American citizens demonstrates that Young's approval of the attack was a possibility. It also demonstrates Young's absolute power over the life or death of everyone in his domain.

As I've stated many times, Young's letter to Haslem instructed Haight to "let the emigrants pass in safety," but his next sentence was "The Indians, I expect, will do as they please." That indicates that Young's intention was for the Indians to commit the crime, so that the Mormons could "plausibly deny" any culpability. But Young's plan went awry when the Indians couldn't finish off the emigrants, and the Mormons had to go in and deceive them into giving up their arms, and then finish the massacre along with the Indians.

however nothing I have read yet indicates that Young was anywhere around to talk to the indians.

Kevin, I've documented this many times, and you've been here on ARM to read it. I can only assume that you want so strongly to believe that Young's statements and policies weren't behind the MMM, that you entrance yourself into a state of intellectual denial of the facts.

ONE MORE TIME:

"Recently I was given access to an electrostatic copy of the daily journal of Brigham Young. Under date of September 1, 1857, the entry reads: 'Kanosh the Pavaunt chief with several of his band visited me gave me some council and presents. A spirit seems to be takeing possession of the Indians to assist Israel. I can hardly restrain them from exterminating the Americans.'

"This seems very significant. The 'Journal History of the Church' under this same date tells of the visit of Jacob Hamblin and twelve Indian chiefs from the south. President Young talked with them all, but it seems that Kanosh was given private audience. He was the chief who had killed Captain John W. Gunnison and several of his men as they were camped on the Sevier River on

October 28, 1853. Whether or not Kanosh and his band were at the Mountain Meadows we do not know, but we can now be certain that the Mormon war strategy was to use the natives as 'the battle-ax of the Lord,' as some of the early missionaries had stated." ("Mountain Meadows Massacre," Juanita Brooks, p. xiii.)

"Hamblin and some twelve Indian chiefs on September first met with Brigham Young and his most trusted interpreter, 49-year-old Dimick Huntington, at Great Salt Lake. Taking part in this pow-wow were Kanosh, the Mormon chief of the Pahvants; Ammon, half-brother of Walker; Tutsegabit, head chief of the Piedes; Youngwuds, another Piede chieftain, and other leaders of desert bands along the Santa Clara and Virgin Rivers.

"Little was known of what they talked about until recently when it came to light that Huntington (apparently speaking for Young) told the chiefs that he 'gave them all the cattle that had gone to Cal[ifornia by] the south rout[e].' The gift 'made them open their eyes,' he said. But 'you have told us not to steal,' the Indians replied. 'So I have,' Huntington said, but now they have come to fight us & you for when they kill us they will kill you.' The chiefs knew what cattle he was giving them. They belonged to the Baker-Fancher train." ("Forgotten Kingdom: The Mormon Theocracy in the American West," David Bigler, pp. 167-168.)

(The document that Bigler remarked had "recently come to light" was Huntington's journal in LDS archives. As Juanita Brooks didn't mention it in her book, I assume that Huntington's journal was exposed to the light of day during the "golden age" of LDS historians in the 1980's under Leonard Arrington.)

Utah historian Hubert Bancroft sheds further light on Dimick Huntington's activities:

"Major Carleton, of the first dragoons. In a despatch to the assistant adjutant-general at San Francisco, dated Mountain Meadows, May 25, 1859, he says: 'A Pah Ute chief of the Santa Clara band, named Jackson, who was one of the attacking party, and had a brother slain by the emigrants from their corral by the spring, says that orders came down in a letter from Brigham Young that the emigrants were to be killed; and a chief of the Pah Utes, named Touche, new living on the Virgin River, told me that a letter from Brigham Young to the same effect was brought down to the Virgin River band by a man named Huntingdon.' A copy of the major's despatch will be found in the Hand-book of Mormonism, 67-9. Cradlebaugh says that after the attack had been made, one of the Indians declared that a white man came to their camp with written orders from Brigham to 'go and help to whip the emigrants.' "

("History of Utah," p. 561.)

Juanita Brooks quoted from Young's letter to Jacob Hamblin of August 4, 1857:

"Continue the conciliatory policy towards the Indians.....for they must learn that they have got to help us or the United States will kill us both.....We have an abundance of 'news.' The government have appointed an entire set of

officials for the Territory. These Gentry are to have a bodyguard of 2500 of Uncle's [Sam's] regulars."

Of this excerpt, Brooks comments:

"In the version of this letter.....printed in 'Jacob Hamblin, Personal Narrative,' by James A Little, the phrase 'for they must learn that they have either got to help us or the United States will kill us both' is not included. Neither is the entire paragraph which gives the 'abundance of news.' The reason for this deletion seems clear." (Brooks, p. 35.)

The reason for the deletion of this passage in a pro-Mormon edition of Hamblin's narrative is INDEED clear: The passage clearly shows that Young instructed Hamblin to prepare the southern Indians to help the Mormons act against the U. S. government forces. The excerpt also makes clear that, contrary to some Mormon apologists' assertions that Young had no foreknowledge of why the Army was marching on SLC, and that therefore justified Young in prosecuting his guerrilla war against Johnston's Army, Young in fact knew very well that the army was sent to depose him as governor and escort the newly-appointed governor and "an entire set of officials" to replace those who had fled Utah fearing for their lives. Young's foreknowledge of the army's mission means that his orders to prevent the army from entering the Salt Lake Valley constituted an act of treason against the United States, as did his illegal declaration of martial law; that is why Mormon apologists "play dumb" on this point.

Juanita Brooks further offers:

"Jacob Hamblin.....decided to take a group of the chiefs to Great Salt Lake City for an interview with the great Mormon chief, Brigham Young. His handwritten diary, as yet unpublished, says: 'I started for Great Salt Lake City in company with Thales Haskell and Tutsegabit...He had felt anxious for a long time to visit Brigham Young. We fell in company with George A. Smith. Conosh [the Pauvant chief] joined us. Other Indian chiefs also joined our company. When we arrived in the city there were ten of them went up to see Brigham Young, the great Mormon chief. We encamped on Corn Creek on our way up; near a company of Emigrants from Arkansas, on the-----'

"Here the account stops abruptly, for the next leaf is torn out.....What Brigham Young told the chiefs in that hour was not recorded, but we might hazard an opinion that it was not out of harmony with his written instructions that 'they must learn that they have got to help us or the United States will kill us both.'.....At that time Brigham Young had to be sure of his allies, for he was conducting a war against tremendous odds. The previous Mormon policy had been to keep the natives from stealing and plundering and to teach them the peaceful pursuits of farming and cattle raising, but now Brigham Young seemed determined that he would no longer "hold them by the wrist," as he told Captain Van Vliet a few days later. The Indians must have started back home immediately, for in seven days they were harassing the emigrants at Mountain Meadows, and in ten days they

participated in the massacre of the company." (Brooks, pp. 40–42.)

In light of this information, it doesn't take a Sherlock Holmes to deduce what Young told the Indians in that meeting ten days before the MMM. It also doesn't take a great brain to understand why someone tore the next page out of Hamblin's diary: it probably gave more details of Young's "counsel" to Hamblin, Huntingdon, and the Indians as to what to do with the Baker–Fancher train.

The plan was for ONLY the Indians to attack the party, with the "brethren" waiting out of sight, supervising. That way, Young could "plausibly deny" that any Mormons had taken part in the killing. That plan went awry when the Indians failed in their initial attack, the Fancher party held out for days, and the Mormons finally had to lure them out with a promise of protection, whereupon they massacred them.

Mormons often quote Young's letter to Haight in an effort to show that Young was against the attack. However, Young's statement following his counsel to "let the emigrants pass" reveals that he knew exactly what was in the works:

"The Indians, I expect, will do as they please." Considering Young's many documented threats to use the Indians as the "battle-ax of the Lord" against any "Mericans" he so deemed to be the Mormons' enemies, it's obvious that his meeting with the southern Indian chiefs mere days before the massacre was to plan the event and have the Indians do the deed. When Young got the news of the massacre, he wasn't concerned that it happened, but he was upset that Mormons had had to take part. That is why he began a campaign to cover up the massacre and protect Mormons from prosecution for 20 years. Young told Lee to write a report to the government charging the massacre to the Indians, and Young claimed to have gotten the "word from the Lord" that the massacre was an "approved" event.

Pure speculation

To the contrary, it's exactly what the documented evidence indicates.

I will keep reading, but I do not think the conclusions you arrive at are supported in the book.

Apparently, you're operating under the mistaken impression that Lee's "Confessions" is the only contemporary source from which to draw conclusions. As I've stated many times, to arrive at correct conclusions regarding Young's culpability in the MMM, one must research ALL of the available evidence, and consider Young's own statements, church teachings and policies, and the conditions existent in Utah during the period of the MMM. Young's single statement to "let the emigrants pass in peace" (if even authentic), in light of a mountain of evidence to the contrary, becomes nothing more than as Lee opined, "a sharp play on the part of the authorities to protect themselves if trouble ever grew out of the matter."

Randy J.

Addendum: Many Ex-Mormons and other interested parties often ask if there's a "smoking gun" (such as a paper trail) which implicates Brigham Young. Dimick Huntington's journal is the most damning document. It's on-line at

<http://www.mtn-meadows-assoc.com/DepoJournals/Dimick/Dimick-2.htm>

Note that Huntington wrote freely of dealing with Indian tribes in such areas as Box Elder, Toella, and Ogden. The Mormons brought food to the Indians, and instructed them on how to cache stock they had stolen from passing emigrants in the mountains, and prepare for possible war against their common enemy, the Americans. Note Huntington's entry of August 18, where Toella Utes "express great sorrow on account of the lack of ammunition." This reveals that the Mormons had supplied the Indians with guns.

On August 30, Huntington noted giving Ogden-area natives "all the beef cattle and horses that was on the road to Calafornia, the North rout..." The north route was the one through northern Utah and into Northern California, along the Humboldt River--- basically the route which the Donner Party had taken.

Then on September 1st, Huntington noted that the Indian chiefs who met with Brigham Young were given "all the cattle that had gone to Cal. the south rout..." The south route was the one through southwestern Utah, the Las Vegas area, and into southern California---the exact route that the Fancher and Duke party had taken.

Huntington's entries make it perfectly clear that Brigham Young knew of, and approved of, the plan for southern Utah Indians to attack and rob the cattle of emigrants who were passing through the area.

[Re: MMM: Brigham Young approved of the Indian attack...](#)

Posted by: Trails end ()
Date: January 29, 2016 12:01AM

Great read randy thanks...worst part about any history to do with mormons are those missing pages and their willingness to bald face lie to protect the cause...seems i read a few months ago that brooks i believe was doing research at her sisters home in st george for the book and according to her sister burned a few herself as being too damning to the church...seems the whole bunch in south utah were criminals and not just a wee bit nuts besides....Briggy ruled with an iron fist and there is just no way this happened without his say so...then there are his words at the meadows a couple years later when the cairn was torn down...I Have Taken A Little...thats the briggy i love to dislike...as far as JDLee...pffft...some reports he was an absolute low life too...if there were nothing to hide they wouldnt need that bloody vault...would they??

[Re: MMM: Brigham Young approved of the Indian attack...](#)

Posted by: Dave the Atheist ()
Date: January 29, 2016 12:21AM

good stuff

Re: MMM: Brigham Young approved of the Indian attack...

Posted by: poopstone ()
Date: January 29, 2016 05:23AM

what's even worse the MMM was when the bretheren sent the army to exterminate the Indians up on the bear river 350 Indians were killed that day so Mormons could take over N. Utah and S. Idaho and not have to share.

The Bear River Massacre Was Conducted by Patrick Connor's Men...

Posted by: SL Cabbie ()
Date: February 16, 2016 04:49AM

Brigham Young did "loan" Col. Connor two of his trusted underlings (Danites?) as guides, and while your figure of 350 Indians killed is higher than that given by Brigham D. Madsen (one of Will Bagley's beloved mentors, and the man responsible for getting the slaughter renamed a massacre rather than the "Battle of Bear River"), you may well be correct. I've seen reports of more than 400 Indians slain. The two guides were Lot Smith, and Brigham's "Avenging Angel" himself, Orrin Porter Rockwell.

http://historytogo.utah.gov/utah_chapters/american_indians/bearrivermassacre.html

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bptajidlwqo>

Conflicts with Mormons in Cache Valley was a factor; Connor's men were a California regiment who had been sent to establish Camp Douglas on the eastern foothills of the Salt Lake Valley in order keep the telegraph lines uncut and the Overland Trail open at the onset of the Civil War.

My take on that one is sort of a "big magnum revolver in a movie" analysis. If you show a .357 or .44 revolver early on, before the show is ended, you have to use it. The California Volunteers were the big gun in that one.

The Bear River Massacre was certainly a huge stain on the U.S. Army (among many where Native Americans are concerned), and the LDS Church was indirectly complicit in that horror.

Re: MMM: Brigham Young approved of the Indian attack...

Posted by: Shummy ()
Date: January 29, 2016 08:56AM

Thanks again Randy for bringing the subject to light.

Not unlike the OJ Simpson case, despite the absence of a smoking gun, our instinct tells us that BY was guilty as hell.

Part 2 continued below



[My response to a Mormon apologist on this issue...](#)

Posted by: randyj ()
Date: February 15, 2016 06:16PM

In 2007, a Mormon apologist (and lawyer) named Robert Crockett published an article in which he tried to absolve Brigham Young of any guilt in the MMM, titled "A Trial Lawyer Reviews Will Bagley's Blood of the Prophets." I wrote a brief rebuttal to Crockett's article here on the BB. While looking for something else a few minutes ago, I found my comments archived on another site. I'm copying them here as supplemental material to this thread. I tried to locate Crockett's article so I could provide a link to it, but the links I found no longer work. I wonder if he's removed his article from the web because it contains so many inaccuracies and faulty conclusions. Anyhoo, here's my response:

Here's How To Determine The Value Of Robert D. Crockett's "Review": It was published on the FARMS website, rather than in a secular, legitimate scholarly medium. Those who know the facts about the MMM know that Crockett's crock wouldn't pass muster in a secular outlet.

I first encountered Crockett on the "Free-Saints" e-mail group about ten years ago. He didn't impress me then, and this article doesn't help his stature in my eyes either. It's kinda funny how he thinks that his stature as a lawyer is supposed to trump the status of degreed historians.

I don't know if Will Bagley has written a rebuttal of Crockett's article. It would take me many hours to compile a rebuttal myself, and I don't have that kind of time, nor the inclination to do so. However, for those readers who aren't schooled on the facts, here are a few points I want to make, so youse can judge Crockett's scholarship, credibility, and honesty. (Any TBM lurkers here are welcome to forward this to Crockett.)

Crockett comments that Bagley's book contains "troubling new evidence" to implicate Brigham Young. Actually, the Dimick Huntington diary entry, and its meaning, was thoroughly addressed in Utah historian David Bigler's "Forgotten Kingdom," which preceded Bagley's book by four years. See

<http://groups.google.com/group/alt.re...>

Years before that, in her book, Juanita Brooks had also commented that the wording of Young's letter to Isaac Haight hinted that "he might not condemn an Indian massacre" (referring to Young's comment that "the Indians, I suspect, will do as they please.") Brooks apparently didn't have access to the Huntington diary when she wrote her book; if she had, she would have undoubtedly had treated that as the smoking gun to show Young's involvement.

For an alleged attorney, Crockett demonstrates astonishing ignorance when he justifies Brigham Young's actions, using terms like "act of war" and "wartime conditions." There was no "war" at that time; there was an insurrection. Brigham Young was the federally-appointed governor of the territory. He had no authority, nor any cause, to declare any "war" against federal army troops. His actions were treasonous, and he and 50 of his subordinates were tried for treason because of their illegal acts.

Re: the Huntington diary entries relating details of the September 1 war council, Crockett asserts: "Brigham Young, if it was truly he who spoke, did not refer to a specific emigrant train." It's *obvious* that Huntington was quoting Young, because the meeting was also documented in the "Journal History of the Church." Juanita Brooks wrote:

"Recently I was given access to an electrostatic copy of the daily journal of Brigham Young. Under date of September 1, 1857, the entry reads: 'Kanosh the Pavaunt chief with several of his band visited me gave me some council and presents. A spirit seems to be takeing possession of the Indians to assist Israel. I can hardly restrain them from exterminating the Americans.' "This seems very significant. The 'Journal History of the Church' under this same date tells of the visit of Jacob Hamblin and twelve Indian

chiefs from the south. President Young talked with them all, but it seems that Kanosh was given private audience. He was the chief who had killed Captain John W. Gunnison and several of his men as they were camped on the Sevier River on October 28, 1853. Whether or not Kanosh and his band were at the Mountain Meadows we do not know, but we can now be certain that the Mormon war strategy was to use the natives as 'the battle-ax of the Lord,' as some of the early missionaries had stated." ("Mountain Meadows Massacre," Juanita Brooks, p.xiii.)

(I hope all readers noted Young's comment to the Indians: "I can hardly restrain them from exterminating the Americans." This shows that Young controlled the Indians, and that they would attack Americans upon his order.)

Note that Huntington wrote that Young gifted the Indians "all the cattle that had gone to Cal[.] the southa rout[.]" Crockett demonstrates either abject ignorance or outright disingenuousness by asserting that the "south route" referred to the route through Wyoming and Utah, upon which Johnson's army was of course traveling at the time. Crockett wants readers to believe that the cattle Young spoke of was Army cattle, which was in Wyoming at the time.

But anybody who is familiar with the history of the time knows that the term "south route" referred to the trail to southern California, through SLC, southwest through Las Vegas, and across the desert. The "north route" was the trail westward across northern Utah, into northern Nevada, following the Humboldt River, over Donner Pass, and into the Bay area. In fact, Crockett quotes Huntington's diary entry of the previous day (August 30), which relates how Huntington gifted another band of Indians *north* of SLC, near Ogden, with stolen emigrant cattle:

"I gave them all the Beef cattle and horses that was on the Road to CalAfornia[,] the North Rout[,]..."

Clearly, the "north route" referred to the trail heading west to California near Ogden--and *not* the trail in Wyoming, which the army troops were traveling on at the time, as Crockett dishonestly asserts. And of course, the very fact that Huntington specified that the cattle to be stolen were being herded to California---rather than army cattle, which were at that time, hundreds of miles to the northeast in Wyoming---makes Crockett's assertion even more disingenuous. Johnston's army never had any intention of marching to California. So the cattle Huntington referred to *had* to belong to emigrant citizens---not to the army.

Re: Crockett's remarks: >"I have substantial doubt that Brigham Young's reference to the "south rout[e]" on 1 September meant anything more than the entire route south of present-day Wyoming upon which the army was advancing. >With contemporaneous descriptions of the south route referring to the entire road south of Lander Pass in Wyoming, it is unreasonable to conclude that Brigham Young had some other meaning for "south rout[e]."

Crockett's assertion is dashed by Huntington's diary entries on consecutive days---the first noting the approval of the theft of cattle by Indians on the "north route" near Ogden, and the second which had "gone to Cal. [via] the southa route." Hilariously, Crockett manages to refute HIS OWN ASSERTION by documenting (in his note 17) that

the "southern route [w]as the route from 'St. Louis to Salt Lake City, as above; thence by way of Vegas de Santa Clara and Los Angeles."---which was the exact route taken by the Baker-Fancher train.

Crockett's arguments that those particular Indians whom Young met with on September 1 either a) didn't live in the area through which the Baker-Fancher train was traveling at the time or b) it would have been impossible for those Indians to make it back to the area from SLC in time to take part in the initial attack are rendered moot by the fact of the attack itself. Crockett alleges that the Indians made their journey home "without horses" in an effort to show the logistical impossibility. I assume that he's ignorant of the fact that the Indians were taken to SLC to meet with Young by Southern Indian mission president Jacob Hamblin:

"Jacob Hamblin, faced with his new responsibility for the Indians and concerned about making them understand their part in the approaching war, decided to take a group of the chiefs to Great Salt Lake City for an interview with the great Mormon chief, Brigham Young. His handwritten diary, as yet unpublished, says:

'I started for Great Salt Lake City in company with Thales Haskell and Tutsegabit [the Yannawant chief.] He had felt anxious for a long time to visit Brigham Young. We fell in company with George A. Smith. Conosh [the Puavant chief] joined us. Other Indian chiefs also joined our company. When we arrived in the City there were ten of them went up to see Brigham Young, the Great Mormon chief. We encamped on Corn Creek on our way up; near a company of Emigrants from Arkansas, on the-----'

"Here the account stops abruptly, for the next leaf is torn out." ("Mountain Meadows Massacre," Juanita Brooks, pp. 40-41.)

Like typical Mopologists, Crockett cites James Haslem's three-day return trip from SLC to the MM area at supposed breakneck speed to argue that the Indians who met with Young on September 1 couldn't have made it back to MM on September 7. However, as Bagley provides evidence for, Haslem actually took his sweet time getting back to the area. And as Juanita Brooks wrote, "The Indians must have started back immediately, for in seven days they were harassing the emigrants at Mountain Meadows, and in ten days they participated in the massacre of the company" p. 42.) So, in light of Young's orders in that council, the Mormons may have driven the Indians back to the MM area, rather than having to make their way back "without horses" as Crockett alleges.

Note that Hamblin lists at least three southern Indian chiefs from the area of the MMM, whom he took to SLC to meet with Young. At that moment, Johnston's army was in Wyoming---hundreds of miles away from those Indians' lands---and posed no threat whatsoever to those tribes. Thus, Crockett's assertion that the cattle Young allowed those Indians to steal were army cattle is disingenuous. It would have been pointless for Young to give those southwestern Utah Indians cattle that was presently some four hundred miles northeast of their homeland, and expect those Indians to travel to Wyoming, steal the army cattle, and drive them four hundred miles back to southwestern Utah---especially "without horses," as Crockett stupidly alleges.

Crockett complains that Bagley omits evidence which is exculpatory to Young. As an

example, he cites Army Captain Stewart van Vliet's meeting and correspondence with Young regarding securing provisions for the army. However, Crockett himself doesn't mention one of the most damning bits of information, from the pen of Brigham Young himself, in a letter to van Vliet written on September 7---THE VERY DAY OF THE INITIAL ATTACK ON THE EMIGRANT TRAIN:

"If the government dare to force the issue, I shall not hold the Indians by the wrist any longer. If the issue comes, you may tell the government to stop all emigration across the continent, FOR THE INDIANS WILL KILL ALL WHO ATTEMPT IT." (As quoted in Brooks, p. 139.)

This statement, from Young himself, combines with Huntington's diary entries and Young's other remark that he could "hardly restrain the Indians from killing the Americans" to clearly show that he approved of the attack on the emigrant train and the theft of their cattle.

This is enough for one post. I hope that you readers who are new to this subject were not fooled by Crockett's seemingly good scholarship. This is why it's important that we study these issues intensely for ourselves, so that none of these FARMSbots can pull anything over on us.

FYI Randy.

Posted by: Susan I/S ()

Date: February 15, 2016 07:07PM

If Eric can ever get retired he is going to put these together in a nice archive. I am sure he will need your help :)

Re: FYI Randy.

Posted by: randyj ()

Date: February 15, 2016 07:28PM

"If Eric can ever get retired he is going to put these together in a nice archive. I am sure he will need your help :)"

That'll be fine. I recently re-posted all of these posts about the MMM because

a) the subject comes up on this BB every couple of weeks, so it's easier for me to give people a link to posts which deal with specific parts of the issue, and

b) in case the alt.religion.mormon archives ever go kaput, the posts will still be here. It took a lot of research and typing to put those posts together, so I don't want them to be lost.