

Missouri in the summer of 1846, when the call for the battalion was made. You say that the history of that battalion 'is thrust into this book in a form to show that a mighty hardship was inflicted upon the Mormon people' by that call, and that 'so intent is the writer in making that portrayal that he does not see when he gives his own case away.' You then give what you call the real history of the matter, in which you affirm that the calling of the battalion was 'an act of unqualified mercy' on the part of the Government in response to a petition for relief made by the Mormons themselves when 'they were scattered or thrust out upon the frontier,' 'so desperately poor that they could not move.'

"Now, Mr. Editor, if your time had been less limited, and you had read the whole instead of a portion of the chapter from which you quote; or, granting that you did read it all, if you had perused it a little more carefully, you would have found that I had not failed to give the Government all due credit for what you term its 'act of unqualified mercy,' and which I myself believe was not designed as an unfriendly move, but rather the reverse, on the part of 'Uncle Sam' toward the homeless and migrating Saints. In the paragraph cited I merely strove to show how 'the main body of the Mormons' at that time 'received the startling news' that five hundred of their best men were wanted by the Government to assist in the war against Mexico. It is their view at that time, not my view at this time, that is given in the history. This is evident from the closing words of the quoted paragraph, in which, however, your typo and proof-reader are responsible for a slight mistake. I said: 'Such was the subject as it presented itself to them,' not as you make me say: 'Such was the subject which presented itself to them.' Are you prepared to prove that this was not the case, that 'the main body of the Mormons' did not feel as I say they did, when the call for the battalion first came to them? I think not; no more than you are prepared to prove that they were 'so desperately poor that they could not move,' for they had already moved across Iowa, and it is a well known fact that they contemplated sending their pioneers to the Rocky Mountains to look out a home for the people in the summer of 1846, and that the call for the battalion, however kindly meant, delayed the departure of those pioneers until the following spring. All these things are set forth in my history. You must remember, my dear sir, that however clearly you and I may see the subject now, the Mormons at that time were not in possession of any information that would lead them to look at the matter in the light that you do, or even that the poor 'mentally color blind' author of the history is now able to do. Captain Allen, the government recruiting officer from Fort Leavenworth, had arrived upon the Missouri and set the whole Mormon camp in consternation before Elder Little and Colonel Kane, who were better posted than their friends on the frontier as to the purpose of the government in calling for the battalion, had arrived from Washington. Now as to 'giving my case away,' because I speak 'two pages over,' of a farewell ball given to the

battalion prior to their departure for Fort Leavenworth, and indicate that the young fellows who had enlisted and were about to leave sweethearts, wives, parents, friends, perhaps forever, enjoyed themselves at the ball. This certainly does not prove that the call for the battalion was not startling in its nature, nor that the subsequent partings were not painful. There was a ball at Brussels on the eve of Waterloo, and British soldiers and sweethearts were there enjoying themselves in the dance, "and bright the lamps shone o'er fair women and brave men." But this did not preclude, after the battle had begun, those "sudden partings such as press the life from out young hearts" and choking sighs that ne'er might be repeated." Nor had the anticipated strife prevented those warriors from relaxing for a few hours their stern natures and indulging in the festivity. If these Mormon soldiers, at parting with their wives and sweethearts, did not throw themselves down and paw the earth and bellow it is because they were men, worthy of the uniform they were to wear and of the cause they had enlisted to defend. It does not prove that they did feel. Nor does that farewell ball tell that "there was rejoicings throughout all the Mormon camps when the notice was received that the government had concluded to accept 500 volunteers, etc." It was merely the favorite Mormon method of throwing off care, exemplified a hundred times by Brigham Young and his people—"the merry, merry Mormons"—during and after their long and arduous pilgrimage across the desolate plains. Again, you say that the battalion, when it enlisted, did not expect 'to meet an open foe in the field,' California being 'conquered practically then, and the indomitable Kearney was going ahead of this battalion.' Now, Mr. Editor, is this real history, or only one of those 'ideals' which your 'fancy has awakened through long devotion to a cause?' California was nearly two thousand miles away, with no railroads, no telegraphs intervening. It took news six months to travel from the Missouri river to the Pacific coast, and vice versa. How could the battalion have expected not to 'meet an open foe in the field,' when it was for the purpose of such a meeting that its members had enlisted? They did not know that California was 'conquered practically' at the time of their enlistment. The government did not know it, or it would not have sent the battalion. Even Kearney did not know it; though he had left Fort Leavenworth and was marching toward Santa Fe, which he captured. It was from that point that he sent the battalion, under Colonel Cook, to Southern California, via New Mexico and Arizona, while he took a shorter route and reached the coast before them, after learning en route that Fremont had defeated the Mexicans, driven them southward and taken possession of the country in the name of the United States. The Mormon Battalion, on leaving the Missouri river—yes, and on leaving Santa Fe, did expect to meet the foe, and according to Colonel Cooke made the greatest infantry march on record for the purpose of meeting them. That the fighting was over before they arrived was not their

fault, nor was it according to their expectation. Evidently there is more than one writer in Utah who is "an advocate and not a judge," who "does not render a dispassionate opinion," who "does not realize that he is writing something which in the very nature of things in many places would be impossible."

"As to your strictures on the description given in my book of the Mountain Meadows massacre—that awful crime which all citizens of Utah deplore and denounce—let me tell you that there is more truth in the account there given than in any other that has found its way into print. True, I have not laid the responsibility for it at the door of the Mormon Church, and sought to implicate the innocent with the guilty, as some chroniclers have done. But I have told a plain story and a truthful one, so far as the truth is known to me, after faithful and diligent research, and I have not sought to shield the guilty nor shade the glaring horror of their crime. You say that 'the fact that no effort was ever made by those in authority—by neither Brigham Young nor all his host—to bring these wretches who perpetrated that massacre to justice, is concealed.' Not so. I have simply not touched upon that phase of the subject. I propose to do so, however, in the second volume, when the trial of John D. Lee will be fully treated. Brigham Young, at that trial, gave his reasons for not taking the initiative in the matter of bringing the guilty to justice. He ought, in all fairness to be heard before he is condemned. I propose to give him a hearing. That is the part of "a judge," I believe, while to deny it would better become "an advocate."

You also affirm that "Judges and Governors are criticised in the same spirit that we have seen them year after year in the DESERET NEWS." The NEWS can speak for itself. All I have to say is that I have deemed it my duty to tell the truth of men, and have abused none, nor do I intend to do so. But men must stand by the records they make, nor blame the historian, if, with all his good will and charity toward them, their acts are not wholly "concealed." Judge Brochus made a fool of himself in public, Judge Drummond was both a liar and a libertine, and Judge Cradlebaugh sought to make a whole community responsible for the crimes of certain individuals. Is history to pass over and ignore such things? Should the faults and mistakes of Brigham Young and the Mormons, and not the faults and mistakes of Federal officials and the Gentiles, be included in the history of Utah? I am sure I have spoken highly of the majority of the Judges sent to the Territory—such as Judge Reed, Judge Shaver, Judge Kinney et al., as the facts will show. But you say that Governors as well as Judges are criticised. There were only two Governors of Utah during the period covered by volume one. They were Brigham Young and Alfred Cumming; one a Mormon, the other a Gentile. Then, according to your own statement, I have been impartial as to them. Yes, I believe Governor Young had his faults—and on pages 371 and 584 the history says so—and I believe Governor Cumming had his faults; but they were pretty