Mormons and Native Americans: A Historical and Bibliographical Introduction

David J. Whittaker

INTRODUCTION

Thomas O'Dea (1957, 256) pointed out that Mormons have thought of native Americans from two perspectives. Theologically, their missionary work demanded that the Indians be viewed as converts; but practically, their colonizing efforts forced them to see Indians as most American pioneers viewed them: as primitive and usually savage peoples in the way of civilization's westward movement. One view stressed their religious nature, the other emphasized their savageness. Where one could argue for their perfectability, the other could suggest their destruction. The approach almost always depended upon whether the perspective was that of a missionary or of a pioneer. This bifurcated view follows the general approach which began in colonial times: either Indians were noble red men not far from the Garden of Eden, or they were savages, not capable of even the most fundamental Christian or civil attributes and therefore not worthy of having these characteristics applied to them (Berkhofer 1978, Billington 1981, Pearce 1952).

From the beginning, however, Mormonism has also seen a dialogue between sacred text and its interpretation and application in Mormonism. The Book of Mormon told of three migrations from the Old World to the New. Righteous groups were white, while those individuals who rejected the covenants they had made with God received a "sore cursing," even "a skin of blackness... that their seed might be distinguished from the seed of their brethren" (2 Ne. 5:21; Alma 3:6-10). Just as wickedness brought dark skin, repentance brought a return of white (3 Ne. 2:12-16). Throughout the volume, righteous groups were peaceful and enjoyed the benefits of civilization while those who were rebellious were identified as savage hunters.
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In the early chapters, the righteous are identified as Nephites after Nephi, an early prophet. The wicked are called “Lamanites” after Laman, a rebellious brother. While the terms become confused later in the volume (4 Ne. 1:17), by the final pages (about a.d. 420), the wicked are wandering the land seeking the lives of the few good survivors, including a prophet, Moroni, who has the final responsibility after his father, Mormon, to record what he has witnessed and hide the records in the hope that the account will help convert the descendants of those who are hunting him (Morm. 8:1–5).

Lamanite thus carries a potentially pejorative meaning in Mormon thought. It seems to equate white skin with goodness and dark skin with wickedness and savagery. The imagery has helped create a view of contemporary native Americans as inferior, and some argue that calling Indians Lamanites reinforces the negative stereotyping inherent in Book of Mormon worldview. (See the England and Harris essays in this volume.)

There had been several hundred years of intellectual curiosity and speculation about Indian origins before the Book of Mormon appeared. Many theories had been advanced to explain the origins of these peoples; and, like early Mormons, most authors had offered a single theory to explain the very complex tribal situation of the Americans by 1492 (Huddleston 1967, Wauchope 1962, D. Snow 1979, Dobys 1976).

Early Book of Mormon defenses rather consistently claim a Central American setting for the Book of Mormon and assume that archaeology would prove it. Pre-Utah writings link Central American descriptions with the Book of Mormon. Joseph Smith himself seems to have argued for a single explanation of the American Indian (Sorenson 1985, 1–4). He seldom referred to the Book of Mormon, referred to the Indians as “the literal descendants of Abraham,” and offered the volume as a literal history of this descent (Jessee 1984, 76). His associates seem to have thought of all native American peoples as being descendants of Nephi and his family.2

---

1 See, for example, the statements and arguments in Evening and Morning Star, 1 (June 1832): 26; 1 (Aug. 1832): 22; 1 (Dec. 1832): 54, 55; 1 (Jan. 1833): 57–59; 1 (June 1833): 99; 2 (April 1834): 150–51; LDS Messenger and Advocate 1 (April 1835): 59–61; 2 (May 1836): 319–20; 3 (Oct. 1836): 398; 3 (Jan. 1837): 433–35; 3 (Sept. 1837): 567–69; Parley P. Pratt, The Voice of Warning (1837), Ch. 4; Charles P. Thompson, Evidences in Proof of the Book of Mormon (1843); Orson Pratt, Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon (1850–51). This approach reached its culmination with the 1879 edition of the Book of Mormon when Orson Pratt, in textual footnotes, specifically identified sites in Central and South America with various Book of Mormon places. This approach influenced the Benjamin Cluff-Brigham Young Academy expedition to Central America, 1900–02. The best summaries of the uses of contemporary sources (both actual and potential) in early Mormonism are two unpublished essays by Gordon C. Thomasson: “Daddy, What’s a ‘Frontier’?; Second Thoughts on the Environment that Supposedly Produced the Book of Mormon,” and “Documents of LDS History Produced between 1830 and 1839 Relating to the Truth of the Book of Mormon,” both c1960s; Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. It is interesting to note that an early editor, probably W. W. Phelps, commented how difficult it was to define “civilized” and “savage.” Evening and Morning Star 1 (April 1833): [8].

2 See, for example, the comments of Oliver Cowdery in his remarks to the western tribes in 1830 in P. Pratt 1874, 54–56. In a letter to Joseph Smith dated 7 May 1831, Cowdery wrote of “another tribe of Lamanites . . . called Nacashoos [Navajos].” Times and Seasons 5
Smith approved Andrew Jackson's policy of moving the eastern Indian tribes to a western reservation, noting that the U.S. government was actually assisting with the gathering of Israel (HC 2:358-62, Prucha 1:183-292). During the few times Smith personally met with Indian leaders, he counselled peace and referred them to the Book of Mormon for the details of their own history. (See Parry's essay in this volume. HC 4:401-2, 5:363, 479-81, 6:401-2.)

No one essay or book can possibly treat all the complex issues of Mormon relations with native Americans. What we seek to do here is to present a historical overview, identify some key topics, and provide an adequate bibliography for serious study of native Americans and Mormons in the continental United States north of Mexico and excluding Alaska.

AN OVERVIEW OF MORMON-NATIVE AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS

The first Mormon preaching among native Americans occurred when Joseph Smith sent several missionaries to the western border of Missouri in the winter of 1830–31 (Jennings 1971; Pratt 1874). In a revelation given in Missouri on 17 July 1831 Joseph Smith told these first missionaries to the Indians: "For it is my will that in time, ye should take unto you wives of the Lamanites and Nephites that their posterity may become white, delightsome and just, for even now their females are more virtuous than the gentiles." William W. Phelps included the "substance" (two pages) of the revelation in a 12 August 1861 letter to Brigham Young, now in the Church Historical Department. Several things are apparent: (1) While the Book of Mormon strongly teaches that God removes the curse of the dark skin, this document implies that intermarriage can; (2) Some scholars think that this revelation was the initial impetus for plural marriage, as some of the missionaries had wives in Ohio; and (3) This document seems to have begun the Mormon practice of marrying native Americans. Some of the contents of the document better fit an 1861 context and it is possible that Phelps added his own understanding thirty years later. Ezra Booth confirms early talk about marrying Indians, but the reasons for doing so probably did not include polygamy or even changing skin color, but rather facilitating entrance into the reservation for missionary work (Booth 1831; W. Hall 1852, 59; J. Brown 1960, 320-23; Brooks 1944; Coates 1972; Stenhouse 1873, 657-59; Bachman 1975, 68-73).

This first Indian mission ended in failure, produced the first non-Mormon charges that Mormons and Indians were in league to destroy other whites on (15 Feb. 1844): 432. In 1833, an editorial in the Evening and Morning Star [1 (June 1833): 99] saw recent reports of archaeological excavations in North Carolina and Ohio as providing proof of both Nephite and Jaredite skills in art and science. Four months before this report, the same newspaper cited the reports of Lt. Col. Galindo from Central America about the great civilizations in ancient America. Early Mormon commentators saw no contradiction in their claims that all native Americans were explained by the Book of Mormon. This view allowed them to see evidence of Lamanites everywhere they went in North America. John Sorenson (1985) assumes a local setting, claiming that the Book of Mormon requires a locus in Central America. While this thesis promises to become the new orthodoxy within Mormonism, it modifies the thrust and content of early Mormon apologies.
the frontier, and sparked Protestant missionary efforts to prevent Mormon proselyting (Jennings 1966, Schultz 1972, Berkhofer 1963). In spite of their denials, Mormons were being charged as late as 1838 with converting Indians in Missouri to use them against the local whites.3

The most eloquent early expression of Mormon sentiments about the Indians appeared in the writings of Parley P. Pratt. In his 1837 Voice of Warning he presented the main LDS arguments. Several years later, as the first editor of the LDS Millennial Star, he wrote of the glorious future that awaited the descendants of the Book of Mormon peoples (1841, 40-42), penned one hymn, “Oh, Stop and Tell Me, Red Man,” and authored the 1845 “Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles” which announced to the rulers of the earth that “the ‘Indians’ (so called) of North and South America are a remnant of the tribes of Israel; as is now made manifest by the discovery and revelation of their ancient oracles and records. And that they are about to be gathered, civilized and made one nation in this glorious land.” The same proclamation foresaw a major work just ahead for “the sons and daughters of God” who would be required to devote a portion of their time to instructing “the children of the forest” (J. Clark 1:254, 256, 259; Clark incorrectly attributes authorship to Wilford Woodruff).

The spirit, if not the letter, of this 1845 message was manifested following the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo. Although formal missionary work was not possible, Brigham Young sought to deal fairly and peacefully with the various tribes the Mormons encountered as they moved west (Coates 1981, 1978; Bennett 1984, 189-231; Trennert 1972).

Following non-Mormon advice, the Mormons established their base of operations in the Salt Lake Valley, a neutral location between the warlike Shoshone to the north and Utes to the south. As the early years were critical to Mormon survival in the Great Basin, it is no surprise that Brigham Young fluctuated between making peace with and exterminating those who threatened the lives and success of the Mormon western colonization (Tyler 1978; Arrington and Bitton 1979, 145-60; Julina Smith 1932; Brooks 1944; A. Malouf 1945; Coates 1969, 63-115; Smaby 1975; Christy 1978).

Brigham Young’s appointment as the first governor of Utah Territory meant he would also function as ex officio Superintendent of Indian Affairs. It was during the early 1850s under Brigham Young’s leadership that the basic institutional contours of Mormon Indian policy emerged: that it was cheaper to feed the Indians than to fight them. Influential experiences included finding themselves in the middle of warring tribes, attempts to end the centuries-old Indian slave trade, and early armed encounters with various tribes (Morgan 1948, 1953, 1954; Larson 1963a and 1963b; Gowans 1963; Haynes 1968; O’Neil and Layton 1978; Prucha 1:374-80; Neil 1956; W. Snow 1929; 3 See Albert P. Rockwood to his family, November 1838, Yale University Library. Mormon sensitivity to these charges in their early experiences in Jackson County, Missouri, led Joseph Smith to change the wording of D&C 57:9: “Send goods unto the Lamanites” now reads “unto the people.” At least one early Mormon author thought that the “remnants” (D&C 87:5) left after the Civil War were the American Indians. LDS Millennial Star 22 (28 Jan. 1860): 51.

These early pioneers tried at least three approaches in relating to their Indian neighbors. They first combined their religiosity with various church programs including feeding and clothing the less fortunate natives (Arrington 1954, Jensen 1983). The second grew out of a fundamental equation of farming skills and civilization. Here Mormons, like other Americans of the time, sought to establish special Indian farms, especially during the 1850s (Beeton 1977–78, James 1967, Jackson n.d., Williams 1928, Heband 1930). The third approach was proselyting. Many colonies were first established at least partially to control or convert the local tribes and to teach farming techniques (Campbell 1973). Jacob Hamblin was but one of a number of early Mormons who worked with the Indians much of their lives.4

The Civil War brought many non-Mormons to Utah, created insecure Indian relations, and pushed the Indian situation to a more final settlement (Long 1976; 1981, 128–84; Tyler 1978; Madsen 1985a). In 1865, the Utah Indians conveyed title to their lands to the federal government by treaties in return for the establishment of a reservation in Uintah County in eastern Utah. As early as 1861, against Brigham Young’s advice, President Abraham Lincoln had declared the “entire valley of the Uintah River within Utah Territory” an Indian reservation. This movement toward reservations for Indians was part of the larger federal Indian policy shift from the early policy of placing Indians in one large Indian Territory on the Great Plains (Trennert 1975; Tyler 1978, 364; Atlas 1981, 104–5; Wright 1948; Larson 1974; O’Neil 1941). The most violent rejection of the reservation came from a group of Utes led by Black Hawk. His followers attacked various settlements beginning in the San Pete Valley, and about forty Mormons were killed during the first three years of raiding. Fighting continued until 1873, even though Black Hawk died in 1870. Gradually, most of the Utes moved onto the Uintah Reservation (Spencer 1969, Gibbs 1931, Culmsee 1973).

A non-violent rejection of the reservation was by a band of Shoshone. Mormon missionaries, led by George Washington Hill, approached them beginning in 1873. By 1889 a successful Indian farm had been established at Washakie, just north of Brigham City, Utah, for Shoshone. It became the model for other non-reservation Indian farms in Utah (Coates 1969, 303–18; Dibble 1947; Evans 1938; Madsen 1980). Surprisingly, Mormon missionary efforts fared much better off the reservation during this period. The one major exception was the conversion of the entire tribe of Catawba Indians on their

---

4 The literature on nineteenth-century Indian missions is quite extensive. Good places to begin include Rees 1922; Law 1959; Peterson 1971, 1975; Brooks 1944, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1972; Dees 1972a and 1972b; Corbett 1952; Jones 1890; Beal 1935; Nash 1967; Bigler 1967; Rice 1972; Dibble 1947; Coates 1972; Judd 1968; Hinckley 1941; Lyman 1962; Smiley 1972; Bailey 1948; Fish 1970; Seegmiller 1939; Peterson 1973, 192–216; 1975. Llewellyn Harris claimed to have healed 400 Zuni of smallpox in a letter to Orson Pratt in LDS Millennial Star 41 (2 June 1879): 337–38. For the unrelated memories of another missionary see an interview with Joshua Perry in Jorgensen 1913. An annotated guide to the larger literature (primary and secondary) is Coates 1969, 329–63.

Through the later decades of the nineteenth century, the strong persecution and prosecution of Mormons cut into Indian proselyting. The several apostles who went on Indian missions did so as much to avoid polygamy prosecutions as to convert the natives (Anderson 1900, Whitney 1890, Tullis 1982).

The massacre by federal troops of mostly helpless Indians at Wounded Knee Creek near the Pine Ridge Agency in South Dakota on 29 December 1890 came as a tragic end to a revival of Plains Indians religion that had been led by Tauibu and his son Wovoka, Piute Indians from Nevada. (See Coates essay in this volume.) In part, this revival was a means to escape the terrible realities of reservation life. But it was also a movement to return to the greatness of the past led by messianic prophets who promised Indians deliverance and restoration. The movement combined a type of Christian millennialism with a belief in God’s active role in protecting true believers. It gradually gained followers who demonstrated their worthiness in the Ghost Dance, a ritual many contemporary observers were convinced must have come from the Mormons (Mooney 1896). While these charges are essentially without foundation, the fact that early Mormons speculated over the emergence of a Lamanite prophet has not been forgotten by some Mormon extremists. Thus, while some Mormons saw the revivals as a sign that God was stirring the Indians with his Spirit, after the tragedy at Wounded Knee Mormon missionary efforts seriously declined among native Americans.

Benjamin Cluff, then president of Brigham Young Academy in Provo, Utah, led an expedition of faithful Mormons to Central America (1900–02). The purpose of the expedition was to locate Book of Mormon sites, collect fauna and flora for scientific study, and check on the possibilities for missionary work in the area. It was unsuccessful in all objectives except for items sent to Provo for study (E. Wilkinson 1:289–329). It did, however, help focus attention on native Americans in tropical regions and showed the next generation of Mormons that their Book of Mormon studies would have to be better grounded in both fieldwork and in theory.

In 1936, the First Presidency instructed the leaders of the Snowflake Arizona Stake to open formal missionary work among local Indians. In 1942 Mary Jumbo, a Navajo living at Shiprock, New Mexico, asked President Heber J. Grant to send missionaries to her people. Grant authorized George Albert Smith to organize the Southwest Indian Mission with headquarters in Gallup,
New Mexico. In 1943 the Navajo-Zuni Mission was organized and it was later added to the Southwest Indian Mission. In 1964 the Northern Indian Mission, with headquarters in Rapid City, South Dakota, was organized (Flake 1965; Parry 1972; Preece 1965; Heinze 1976, “This Mission” 1969; Blanchard 1977; Vogt and Albert 1970).

It was primarily in response to the growing awareness of terrible conditions on Southwest reservations that LDS leaders responded more institutionally to the needs of native Americans beginning in the late 1940s and 1950s. Building on earlier approaches, the Indian Placement Program came to address more modern needs and circumstances of reservation Indians (Bishop 1967; Buchanan 1974–75; Kimball and Kimball 1977, 236–48; “Indian Placement” in Church News, 1 Jan. 1972, 8; Cox 1980; Cowan and Anderson 1974, 455–80; Cowan 1979, 85–94; Packer 1962). Neil Birch’s essay in this issue recounts the determination of Helen John and the compassion of Golden Buchanan, which sparked the beginnings of this program. In July 1954, the First Presidency gave the program Church sponsorship. The 10 August 1954 letter from the First Presidency sent to the presidents of stakes that were to participate in the placement program that year states:

> It is to be made plain to the families of your stakes that there is no compulsion or pressure to be exercised in taking an Indian child into their home. If they elect so to do they must do so of their own free will and assume all responsibilities in connection therewith.

> It is understood that if an Indian child is taken into a home he comes not as a mere guest, nor as a servant, although, of course, he or she would be expected to assume such responsibilities of service as all children ought to have and share, but that he or she may enter the home as a welcomed member of the household to enjoy the spiritual and cultural atmosphere of the home, and to be given such schooling in the public schools as may be afforded to him (Bishop 1967, 43).

The placement program involved about 7,000 Indians by 1971 but has declined in the last eight years to 1,968 with an estimated additional 60 percent reduction by 1989 (“Conversation” 1985). It has not been without its critics however, who in an age of new Indian militancy, point out the dangers of a program that can create misfits who are caught between their traditional heritage and the values of middle class America (Steward and Wiley 1981; John 1970; Gottlieb and Wiley 1984, 157–77; Topper 1979; Keane 1982).

Mormon Indian programs went beyond the foster-home approach. In 1955 the Church began an Indian Seminary Program in Brigham City, Utah, in tandem with Intermountain Indian School operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This program spread to about 200 additional federal and public schools, totalling 792 Indian seminary classes by 1968. It was phased out as a separate program between 1980 and 1982.

Since 1950, the Church has sponsored a variety of programs at Brigham Young University for Indians seeking a college education (Wilkinson and Arrington 3:503–35; Bishop et al. 1971). Spencer W. Kimball, as chairman of the Church’s Indian Committee, indefatigably searched for ways to assist native Americans. Because of the poverty of the Indian tribes he was familiar
with, he proposed that the Church provide selected individuals BYU scholar-
ships. In 1951, the First Presidency authorized five scholarships.

The first students encountered the problems that most minority students
have throughout the country: lack of money, deficiency in high school prepara-
tion, and lack of a comfortable social climate. S. Lyman Tyler and others
countered with more aggressive recruiting on the reservations, conscientious
efforts to address Indian prejudice toward the Church, and increased funding
for scholarships and tutorial programs. American Indian enrollment increased

In 1960 the Institute of American Indian Studies [Service] and Research
was established

. . . primarily to serve the various agencies of the Church with programs that relate
to the Indians of the Americas; to assist the Brigham Young University and other units
within the Unified Church School System to develop programs for enlargement and
improvement of the educational opportunities for Indians; to cooperate with govern-
mental agencies in their attempts to improve Indian adjustment to and a more satis-
factory participation within the predominant society; and to work with Indian tribes
or groups as they attempt to solve their own problems (Wilkinson and Arrington
3:517).

In February 1964, Paul E. Felt was appointed director of the newly estab-
lished Office of Indian Affairs which designed a variety of curriculum pro-
grams to meet Indian academic and vocational needs.6 Organizational change
has come so rapidly in these Indian programs that outsiders have wondered if
BYU’s program is really a mission in search of an organization. A Native Ameri-
can Studies minor has been put into the curriculum. But with the recent restrict-
ing of the Department of Multi-Cultural Education, some observers see additional
evidence of institutional shifting that lacks a consistent understanding of
either the history, cultures, or needs of native Americans. Others see recent
developments as a manifestation of the older assimilationist philosophy.

Some of the most successful BYU programs use grants from a variety of
sources, many under the leadership of Dale T. Tingey, to help tribes improve
agricultural techniques and production. It is too early to fully evaluate the
impact of these BYU programs. While some studies have been done on the edu-
cational programs,7 the approach to Indian education is under appraisal, per-

---

6 Indian clubs and groups have provided important social and cultural supports for the
students. These include the Tribe of Many Feathers and the Lamanite Generation. With the
disbanding of Indian wards and the general decline of multi-cultural education at BYU, a
major shift in policy is occurring among Church leaders. The shift to Central and South
America is seen in Boyd K. Packer’s BYU Indian Week Address in February 1979, copy in
possession of the author. See also Fyans 1976.

7 Churchill and Hill (1979) point out that the prolonged federal domination of Indian
education has retarded the Indian quest for education because the federal schools were pri-
marily vehicles in accomplishing the federal policy aims of destroying native American heri-
tage and language. Throughout this history, the schools were elementary and secondary,
ience no satisfactory model of upper-level Indian education was developed. Thus BYU’s
experimentation was quite consistent with national patterns. See Adams et al. 1977. Gradu-
ate work on Mormon-Indian education, although of uneven quality, includes G. Taylor 1981;
Matthews 1967; Osborne 1975; R. Clark 1967; Hunsaker 1967; DeLand 1971; Rainer 1976;
Hall 1970; R. Smith 1968; Lundquist 1974; G. Lee 1975; Sheffield 1969; Willson 1984;
Webb 1972; De Hoyos and De Hoyos 1973; Schimmelpfenning 1971.
haps even suffering from an identity crisis, bred in large part by an ignorance of Indian cultures but fueled by genuine religious motivation.

**INDIAN-WHITE RELATIONSHIPS: THE AMERICAN CONTEXT**

Obviously Mormon interaction with native Americans has taken place against the larger backdrop of federal Indian relations. Americans have vacillated between isolating and assimilating their Indian neighbors. Both philosophies have been argued on the basis of Indian well-being — even survival. But implicit in both schools of thought was the notion of Indians as separate, dependent, and inferior while white (European) civilization was superior. Both views saw little or nothing of value in the Indian cultures (Sheehan 1980; Berkhofer 1978, 113–34; Leach 1973). These a priori images have continued to affect the ways Indians are perceived in our society.

These views are deeply imbedded in our colonial history. The first accounts of the natives by explorers lacked the pejorative stereotyping that has led to racism, but they saw the natives as different and felt the additional need to explain the differences (Prucha 1:8; Porter 1979; Axtell 1981; Nash 1982). Thus, when Puritan ministers took to discussing the natives, their accounts were already biased toward both protestant Christianity and European notions of civilization. Few early colonists questioned the superiority of Christianity over the native religions or of the greater value of farming as opposed to hunting (Berkhofer 1965, Beaver 1966, Kellaway 1961, Bowden 1981, Ronda and Axtell 1978).

During the colonial period, the use of treaties to dispossess hunting cultures became a common practice (Prucha 1:5–33; Sheehan 1969; Washburn 1971; Kupperman 1980; Leach 1973). Land-holding rights were at the center of the problem; natives viewed the land as belonging to the group and whites thought that undeveloped land was wasted earth (Washburn 1959, Jacobs 1972, Prucha 1:52–60, Sutton 1975). Whites continued to think that a signature of one or two chiefs could transfer large blocks of earth from one group to another by a people who just did not think in these terms, but whites had the superior technological might to enforce their viewpoints.

---

8 The best studies of the history of American Indian policy are the works of Prucha 1975, 1977, 1981, 1982, 1984. His bibliographical essay at the end of The Great Father, vol. 2, provides an excellent evaluation of the best studies on all major topics relating to Indian-white relationships. Particularly valuable guides include the multi-volume series being issued by Indiana University Press for the Newberry Library, under the general editorship of Francis Jennings. They include both topical and tribal titles. Swagerty 1984; Dockstader 1957, 1974; Tyler 1977. Scholarly publications that specialize in native Americans include, Ethnohistory, The Indian Historian, Journal of American Indian Law, and American Indian Quarterly. About 430 Supreme Court cases since 1810 have dealt with American Indians. The Indian Law Reporter is a valuable aid in remaining current in this complex and important area of law.

From the earliest years of contact through the early nineteenth century, the potential threat of natives militarily allied to political enemies forced whites to deal with the various tribes as foreign nations. This implied a kind of equality; but by the conclusion of the Revolution, the Indians, many of whom had sided with England, found themselves conquered peoples.

The founding fathers assigned the federal government sole power to deal with native Americans. Early experience in dealing with the problems of an expanding frontier, regulating trade, and planning for the future came to be embodied in a series of Congressional Acts called the Trade and Intercourse Acts, which sought to control the commercial relationships between the two races. Their underlying assumption was that the Indian frontier would recede as whites moved west (Prucha 1962; 1969; Viola 1974; Horsman 1967; Drinnon 1980).

The new concept of the reservation was developed in the 1820s and grew to the multi-reservation system by the 1860s (Prucha 1:179–314; Satz 1975; Hagan 1971, 21–36; Hill 1974; Stuart 1979; Trennert 1975; Alexander 1977, 42–57; 95–111, 158–71; Keller 1983; Priest 1942; Utley 1967, 1973, 1984). In 1887 the same Congress that voted with the Edmunds-Tucker Act to disincorporate the LDS Church passed the General Allotment Act. Both acts grew out of the same determination to force the Mormon Church and Indians to abandon their corporate, communal lives. Where Mormonism was forced to abandon plural marriage and ecclesiastical control of Utah society, the Indians were forced to abandon their communal life by forsaking their tribal leaders for programs that promised allotments in fee simple and citizenship to those Indians who adopted farming on individualized plots like “good” Americans. The consequence was to almost destroy what Indian cultural values remained after 300 years of struggle with western European peoples (Prucha 2:659–86; Cadwalader and Deloria 1984; Carlson 1981; Gilcrease 1967; Hoxie 1984; Otis 1934; Prucha 1976, 1979; Mardock 1971; Fritz 1963; Washburn 1975; Adams 1975; McDonnell 1980).

The 1920s saw stirrings of reform and the emergence of John Collier who, as commissioner of Indian Affairs by 1934, moved to reverse the direction federal policy had taken since the 1880s by giving the Indians a “New Deal.” Collier was largely responsible for the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934 which allowed the tribes to set up legal structures designed to aid self-government and prevent further erosion of the tribal land base (Prucha 2:921–1012; Berens 1977; Downes 1945; Freeman 1952; Kelly 1975, 1983; McNickle 1983; Philp 1977; M. Smith 1971; G. Taylor 1980). Its 138 million acres in 1887 had diminished to 48 million acres by 1934 of which 20 million acres was desert or semi-desert land (Prucha 2:671). All of the New Deal programs promised a new epoch for the Indians but it did not last (Burt 1982, Koppes 1977).

Thus, in 1953 Congress formally adopted a policy of “termination” with the specific aim of dismantling the special relationships the tribes had with the federal government (Hasse 1974; Fixico 1980; Prucha 2:1013–84; Philp 1983; Cohen 1953; Wilkinson and Briggs 1977; Watkins 1957; Hagan 1981). Several tribes were almost immediately “terminated” by statute and left to their
own resources. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, responding to the high levels of unemployment on the reservations as well as to the growing threats of Congressional termination, encouraged reservation Indians to relocate in larger American cities. The general consequence of the BIA’s program was to create Indian ghettos in several American cities from which the recent militant Indian movement has come (Sorkin 1969, 1978; Tax 1978; Waddell and Watson 1971; Tyler 1974; Hertzberg 1971; Thornton et al. 1982).

Most of the tribes fought termination, seeing it as a return to the allotment mentality, and saw its withdrawal after the 1960 elections. Paralleling other civil rights movements of the 1960s, American Indians found their own voices; and in 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed (Deloria 1969, 1973; Josephy 1971; Burnett 1972; Lazarus 1969; Parman 1976).

Another option for Indian tribes had opened in 1946 with the Indian Claims Commission, a judicial structure for adjudicating Indian tribal land claims once and for all. Until then, tribes could not sue the government without its permission. The potential costs of such suits had prevented bills from passing Congress from 1930 until 1946. It was an assimilationist movement which again sought to end any special privileges for the Indians in American society (Prucha 2:1017–23; Rosenthal 1976; G. Wilkinson 1966; Lurie 1957; LeDuc 1957; Danforth 1973; Deem and Bird 1982, 152–84).

While citizenship rights had been conferred upon native Americans in 1924, the unique relationship between the tribes and government had precluded full constitutional rights and responsibilities for most Indians. The 1968 Act amended Public Law 280 which had forced states to take a greater obligation in Indian affairs and also impressed upon the tribes the requirements of the Bill of Rights (M. Smith 1970; Lee 1974).

In 1970 President Richard Nixon helped set the current direction of federal Indian policy by restressing the trust relationship between tribes and the federal government, repudiating termination, and calling for legislation to assist tribes while not destroying their autonomy (Prucha 2:1111–15; Forbes 1981). The resulting 1974 Indian Financing Act and the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act ensured increased opportunities for federal assistance if candidates could work their way through the maze of the federal bureaucracy (Prucha 2:1139–70; Putney 1980; Szasz 1974; Prucha 1984; Butler 1978; Flannery 1980; Nickeson 1975; Porto 1979; Sorkin 1971). The growth of state programs must also be understood in this context (T. Taylor 1959, 1972).

While there are innumerable problems native Americans must still confront, they are no longer passive objects being molded into the white image. Any Mormon who seeks to relate to Indians today must not approach the task ignorant of history. This is especially true in the impact of recent federal legislation on programs like Indian placement (Guerrero 1979; Barsh 1980).

**Presidential Positions**

Mormon leaders from Joseph Smith to Spencer W. Kimball have spoken consistently about the heritage and destiny of the American Indians (Maestas
and Simons 1981). In January 1833, Joseph Smith spoke of the Book of Mormon as containing a record of the forefathers of “our western tribes of Indians. . . . By it we learn that our western tribes . . . are descendants from that Joseph which was sold into Egypt.” His pronouncements over a skeleton unearthed during the 1834 Zion’s Camp march have been used to suggest that the final battles of the Book of Mormon took place in Illinois.9 Brigham Young’s numerous statements echo the teachings of Joseph Smith but he also added his own views.10

As an apostle, John Taylor spoke of the great destiny of the American Indians, as president of the urgency of missionary work among the Indians “if we desire to retain the approval of God.” Taylor even dictated a revelation on Indian proselyting and urged that “care must be taken that the interests of the Indians on their reservations, water claims, or otherwise, are not interfered with, but they must be guarded and protected in all their rights the same as the white man.” 11

Wilford Woodruff had early in his life thought there was very little the Saints could do for the Indians except pray for them and treat them kindly until “the power of God begins to rest upon them and they are waked up by the visions of heaven.” Woodruff thought he saw this happening as the Ghost Dance revivals began in the 1870s.12

Joseph F. Smith, a missionary in the Hawaiian Islands, gave more attention to the Pacific Basin throughout his life than to North American Indians and was very cautious about seeing the spirit of God in the Ghost Dance (Smith 1891; 1919, 378–81).

Heber J. Grant, in dedicating the Hawaiian and Alberta temples, looked to a day when the “descendants of Lehi” would receive their proper inheritance as the recovered branch of Israel (Lundwall 1968, 143–50; 169–76; CR, April 1932, 9–10).

George Albert Smith initiated more active Indian missionary work. As early as 1936, President Smith had spoken of the needs of the descendants of Lehi, praising the work at the Intermountain Indian School and of the Catawba tribe in South Carolina (CR April 1951, 175–78; April 1956, 56; April 1960, 187).


11 Times and Seasons 6 (1 March 1845): 925–30; Ibid. 6 (15 July 1845): 968; and LDS Millennial Star 38 (6 June 1876): 437–38; Ibid. 44 (18 Oct. 1882): 732–33; (the revelation is in Roberts 1892, 349–51); J. Clark 2:351; JD 23:233.

Oct. 1936, 73; April 1956, 56; Oct. 1936, 73; April 1950, 184–85; April 1950, 142–46).

David O. McKay, an internationalist, made the largest number of his pronouncements about Polynesians, then joining the Church in large numbers (Law 1972, 19–21, 64–68). He referred to Polynesians as part of the one family of the American Indian, a consistent teaching of the Church since the 1850s.


By far the most consistently vocal Church leader has been Spencer W. Kimball. The key figure in the development of the Placement Program and BYU programs, he has strongly condemned prejudice among Church members and has urged a larger vision of the American Indian in contemporary Mormon thought.13

**MORMON RACIAL ATTITUDES**

Not until the end of the seventeenth century was there any reference to Indians as red, and then the term did not originally have a pejorative meaning (Prucha 1:8; Craven 1971, 39–41). By the nineteenth century, darker skin had become associated with deficient character. Much study has yet to be done on the history of white perceptions of native Americans, and as yet no study of Indians similar to Winthrop Jordan’s *White Over Black* exists (1968; Vaughan 1982; Bidney 1954; Horsman 1975; Hatch 1978). Mormons as an American subgroup seem no more prejudiced than other citizens (Mauss 1970, 158–200; Cutson 1964; Douglas and Mauss 1968; Parry 1977, 225–38; V. Brown 1972). Starting from the premise that all human beings are the sons and daughters of God and then insisting that the gospel of Jesus Christ is to go to every nation, tongue and people, it would be difficult for any member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to justify or practice any form of

---

racism. Yet the history of Mormonism reveals how far the distance can be between the ideal and the real (McConkie 1978, 137–48; Papanikolas 1976; Higham 1955).

Native Americans constitute a unique ethnic group in American culture. They are the only racial group who were in America prior to colonization, and they are the only group that still has a special relationship with the federal government. The histories of both the Indians and the European colonizers have been shaped by this unique situation, and this interaction has also influenced the general thrust of Mormon-Indian relations (McLoughlin 1984; Spicer 1961; Berkhof er 1963; Freedmon 1965).

Suggestions for Further Study

The lives of pioneers and missionaries who worked directly with the Indians need documenting. Scholars have not thoroughly used federal records on Mormon-Indian relations. We need a scholarly edition of the several hundred letters Brigham Young exchanged with various Indian chiefs. More scholarly studies of the various missions and programs of the nineteenth-century Church need to be researched and written. We still lack for the Indian what Lester Bush has done for blacks in Mormon history. We need to better understand the puritan heritage of early Mormonism, and we need a systematic analysis of the term Lamanite in our literature. We need more comprehensive studies of the various tribes, particularly in the Great Basin, that had and have significant contact with the Mormon Church (Steward 1982; Palmer 1928; W. Snow 1923; Jennings, Smith, and Dibble 1959; Crampton 1971; Covington 1949; Tyler 1951a, 1951b, 1964; O'Neil 1968, 1973, 1976; Thompson 1975; Hanson 1937; Hauck 1953; Burnham 1980; Jackson 1982; Schroeder 1965; Stewart 1966; Delaney 1971; Larson 1952, 1965; Stoffle and Evans 1976; Knack 1978; C. Malouf 1940; S. Price 1952; Defa 1980; Malouf and Smith 1947; Allen and Warner 1971; Bluth 1978; Liebler 1962; Benally 1976; Corell 1971; Thompson 1981; Wood 1981; Liljebad 1957; Madsen 1962, 1979; Fowler and Fowler 1971; Fowler 1965; King 1985; Alberts and James 1984; Sonne 1954, 1962; Green 1958). In addition to tribal histories, we need biographies of Indian leaders (Salabiye and Young 1984; Moses and Wilson 1985). So far only one native American has been called to be a General Authority in the LDS Church, and while he has no assignments or responsibilities that involve native Americans (Ensign 5 [Nov. 1975]: 136–37; 5 [Dec. 1975]: 26–27). We need to better understand his life and contribution. We need more anthropologically sensitive studies on the cultures that predate Mormon contact, and we need to follow these up with continuing analysis of changing cultures once contact was made. We need studies of the interaction of Mormon and Indian world-views. No serious study has yet been done on the teaching or more popular literature in the Church. This would include both public addresses and Church-produced manuals.14

We need to study the changing Mormon perceptions of Indians in the visual arts and Mormon literature. P. Jane Hafen (1984) has made an excellent start (see also her essay in this volume), but she concentrates on work after 1940. A full study would begin with “Joseph Smith Preaching to the Indians” and include the art work in George Reynolds, _The Study of the Book of Mormon_ (1888), the work of C. C. A. Christensen, and the paintings of John Hafen, Arnold Frieberg, and Minerva Teichert. It would also include the sculptures of such individuals as Mahonri Young, Cyrus Dallin, and Grant Speed (Oman 1982; Oman and Oman 1976; Hinton 1974). We need a comprehensive bibliographical study of the archival sources of Mormon-Indian relationships.

The twentieth century has hardly been touched. Here we need detailed histories of the many Indian missions since the 1940s, biographies of the mission presidents as well as better studies of the key Church leaders who have shaped Mormon policy, studies of the various BYU Indian programs, and biographies of the individuals who have shaped them. We do not fully understand the history of the Placement Program, nor do we comprehend the educational programs of the last twenty years. How will the Indian migration from reservations affect the future of Mormon-Indian relations?

This century has seen great emphasis on the judicial activity of tribes, and the resulting litigation has yet to be fully studied (Getches, Rosenfelt, and Wilkinson 1979, 1983; Canby 1981; Pevar 1983; Washburn 1971; Deloria and Lytle 1983; Kammer 1980). The law firm of Wilkinson, Cragun, and Barker was very influential in the early years of the Indian Claims Commission, and Mormon attorneys have continued to play a prominent role in Indian legal matters (Weyler 1982, 132–65). With the increasing importance of water and mineral rights of western tribes, western lawyers will continue to play a significant role.

Finally, we need more critical studies of the Book of Mormon as both a history and cultural record. Warnings have appeared in recent years about amateur archaeologists and historians, but more needs to be done by those who have acquired the necessary skills and expertise (Nibley 1964, 366–76; Green 1969, 1973; Sorenson 1969, 1976; Coe 1973; Madsen 1985b; Raish 1981; Strom 1969; J. Price 1974; N. Douglas 1974).

**Conclusion**

Years ago, Felix S. Cohen (1952), one of the great legal scholars of American Indian affairs, argued that the real question was not how to change Indians, but rather how to change whites. Cohen recognized that Indians have and continue to contribute important things to modern cultures. This is true whether whites recognize it. For example, an important contribution is Indian feeling for individual freedom and governmental structures which reflected this concern and which may have provided early models for American colonists.

Scholars like Frank Waters (1968), John Neihardt (1932), and Gary Witherspoon (1977) have led the attempt to make the richness of Indian cul-
ture and religions available, or at least understandable, to non-Indians (Highwater 1981; Radin 1972). This is also true of Indian religion, where complex worldviews continue to baffle whites who can only see another form of paganism (Storm 1972; Gill 1982; J. E. Brown 1953, 1982; Hultkrantz 1979).

It would seem that in Mormonism, as in the larger American culture, the relationship with native Americans has tended to be a one-way road. We continue to think our greatest gifts are material and that these are the ones we must share with the Indians. But the approach is flawed at the most fundamental level: until we can recognize and take the good in other cultures we will remain isolated from those we seek to love and relate to. We have yet to learn that cultural pluralism is desirable and that we have much to learn from other cultures without demanding these cultures merge into our own. It is this matter that Chief Dan George eloquently calls to our attention.

The Book of Mormon may yet force us to reach outside ourselves to receive as we try to give the best we have to offer. Perhaps this is the real message of Mormon-Indian relations. It is clearly time that we enter into a genuine dialogue.
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