On the afternoon of October 30, 1838, the most lamentable and tragic episode of the Mormon-Missouri War took place at an isolated Mormon settlement in eastern Caldwell County known as Haun’s Mill. Seventeen Latter-day Saint civilians were killed and another fourteen wounded by an extralegal force composed of over two hundred men acting under the leadership of Thomas Jennings of Livingston County. The circumstances relating to the events, and the tragic loss of life inflicted by these county regulators upon a non-threatening and almost entirely defenseless community, illustrate the extremes to which the public majority would go to remove an unwanted religious minority from their society.

To understand why the attack occurred, it is imperative to know that the massacre was one of seven major confrontations or campaigns of the 1838 Mormon-Missouri War that included the following conflicts: (1) the confrontation between Mormons and Missouri vigilantes in Daviess County, including the intercession by regional militia (August through mid-September); (2) the Latter-day Saint defense of the Mormon population residing in Carroll County against county regulators, and the response of the regional militia to the disturbances (August through October 10); (3) the expulsion of the non-Mormon residents of Daviess County by Mormon militia (mid-October);
the encounter between Mormon and Missouri militia at Crooked River in Ray County (October 25); (5) the attack on the Mormon settlement of Haun’s Mill by Missouri vigilantes (October 30); (6) the Mormon defense of Far West against vigilante and state militia forces (October 28–31); and (7) the Mormon surrender and the military occupation conducted by authorized militia (November 1–29).

The Haun’s Mill attack had its genesis in the events that took place in Daviess County in October (number 3 above). Following the expulsion of the Latter-day Saints from De Witt in Carroll County, vigilante forces assembled in Daviess and commenced pillaging and burning a number of isolated Latter-day Saint homes and harassing Mormon settlers. To counter such actions, Mormon defenders made the decision to take aggressive action against their antagonists, most of whom were harbored in Millport, Gallatin, and the Grindstone Fork region. On October 18, these settlements (which included only a few structures) were burned by the Mormons, but no life was taken. Fearful that vigilante forces would retaliate, Mormons living in outlying regions of the county moved into Adam-ondi-Ahman for protection. Meanwhile, non-Mormon settlers also abandoned their homes and fled into nearby Livingston County, situated to the east.
News of the Mormon activities and operations conducted against the local inhabitants in Daviess County reached Governor Lilburn W. Boggs at the state capitol in Jefferson City by October 26. The governor, already prejudiced against the Latter-day Saints and one who believed the Mormons were fully to blame, immediately called out state troops to march to Daviess to reestablish control and assist the displaced citizens in restoring them to their homes. John B. Clark of Howard County was given command of the overall operation.\(^1\)

Significantly, because of the routing of Captain Samuel Bogart’s company from Ray County by Mormon militia at the Battle of Crooked River on October 25 (number 4 above), the invasion of Daviess County by the state militia did not take place as planned. On October 27, Amos Rees and Wiley C. Williams arrived in Jefferson City to inform the governor of Bogart’s defeat. Upon learning of the most recent events in the civil conflict, Boggs decided to take more aggressive action. In issuing new orders to General Clark, he wrote, “I have received by Amos Rees Esq. of Ray county and Wiley C. Williams Esq. one of my aids, information of the most appalling character which entirely changes the face of things. . . . Instead . . . of proceeding as at first directed to reinstate the citizens of Daviess in their homes, you will proceed immediately to Richmond and then operate against the Mormons.” Included in the orders were the infamous words, “The Mormons must be treated as enemies, and must be exterminated or driven from the State.”\(^2\)

Generally, historians examining the Missouri period of Mormonism have concluded that the attack made by the Livingston militia on the Haun’s Mill community was associated with the October 27 extermination order of Gov-
Executive Order of Missouri Governor Lilburn W. Boggs, October 27, 1838, often referred to as the “Extermination Order,” or the “Exterminating Order.” Image courtesy Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri.
ernor Boggs—that the commander, Thomas Jennings, upon learning of the injunction, believed it gave him authorization for such an assault. Such a conclusion is based simply on the premise that since the exterminating order was issued on October 27, and the attack at the mill occurred on October 30, the massacre was apparently connected to the governor’s injunction. For example, in his multi-volume history of the Latter-day Saints, Elder B. H. Roberts wrote that the “butchery was doubtless the first fruits” of the order. Further, “In history the Haun’s Mill massacre will stand as an incident in direct sequence of the issuance of Governor Boggs’ Order of Extermination.” Leland H. Gentry took a less definitive stance but still believed there was a connection, concluding, “While it cannot be shown for certain that [Thomas] Jennings took his sanctions from Boggs’ Order, it must be admitted that certain facts argue strongly for it.” Alma Blair, a Community of Christ historian, wrote that at the time the massacre occurred, news of the exterminating order, being “widely known,” was therefore a leading factor in the decision to move against the outlying Mormon settlement. In her biography of Joseph Smith, Donna Hill also attributed the action to the edict. In the first edition of their comprehensive history of the Latter-day Saint movement, Mormon historians James B. Allen and Glen M. Leonard state that the conflict was “part of an apparent effort to literally carry out the governor’s extermination order.” In the second edition published in 1992, the authors omitted the sentence. However, the narrative still suggests that the massacre occurred as a result of Boggs’ order. Finally, Stephen C. LeSueur suggests that the attack possibly occurred as a result of the mandate, but he does not take a position on the issue.

An examination of the sources indicates that there was no connection whatsoever with the governor’s directive. There is evidence that the attack by the county regulators upon the LDS community was actually a response or a retaliatory strike directed against the Mormons because of the raids they conducted against local vigilante leaders and settlers living in Daviess County during the latter half of October. In short, their objective was to make the Mormons “pay” for their most recent activities in Daviess—which payment would be in the price of human blood. In writing about the Missourians who carried out the tragedy at Haun’s Mill, nineteenth century Missouri historian Return I. Holcombe wrote:

Nearly all of the men were citizens of Livingston County. Perhaps twenty were from Daviess, from whence they had been driven by the Mormons during the troubles in that county a few weeks previously. The Daviess County men were very bitter against the Mormons, and vowed the direst vengeance on the entire sect. It did not matter whether or not the Mormons at the mill had taken any part in the disturbances which had occurred [in Daviess]; it was enough that they were Mormons. The Livingston
men became thoroughly imbued with the same spirit, and all were eager for the raid, . . . feel[ing] an extraordinary sympathy for the outrages suffered by their neighbors.  

Ellis Eames (also Ames), a Latter-day Saint living near the mill at the time of the massacre, said that the Mormons were on relatively friendly terms with their non-Mormon neighbors until the problems erupted in Daviess County in mid-October. He wrote, “All things continued to move on well; the inhabitants behaved themselves very friendly and purchased good[s] from [us] and used [our] mill[s] for grinding and sawing. This continued until the disturbances broke out up in Daviess county, when I observed from the[ir] conversation that they did not like the proceedings of our brethren.”

Historical sources show that plans were being made to attack the Mormon settlement even before the October 27 extermination order. Around October 25, a band of approximately twenty men headed up by Nehemiah Comstock, one of three captains who led the attack five days later, rode into Haun’s Mill and demanded that the Mormons turn over their guns and weapons. Fearing repercussions if the ruffians’ directives were not met, most of the men reluctantly complied. As soon as the anti-Mormon band made their departure, messengers were dispatched to Mormon families living along Shoal Creek that hostile bands were active in the area and to be on guard.

Anti-Mormon raiders also accosted Mormon companies traveling through the area en route to Far West. Abraham Palmer stated that while passing through Livingston County, his company was surrounded by a mob consisting of thirty-eight men who abused them and then took the only three rifles they had before allowing them to pass on. William H. Walker’s wagon company was stopped in the same area. Every wagon was searched and robbed of all its firearms and ammunitions. Then, as if the attack on the Haun’s Mill had already been planned, they were warned that if they proceeded any farther, they would all be killed. Another Mormon company led by Joseph Young, an older brother to Brigham Young, received even harsher treatment. Young’s party, composed of some ten families, had almost reached Caldwell County when they were confronted by a Livingston band headed by Thomas R. Bryan (the county clerk), his brother Jefferson Bryan, William Ewell, and James Austin. “We were taken prisoners by an armed mob that . . . demanded every bit of ammunition and every weapon we had,” wrote Amanda Smith. “We surrendered all. They knew it, for they searched our wagons.” The raiders then took them back a distance of five miles to a location known as Whitney’s Mills, where they placed them under guard and detained them for several days. After finally being released, they proceeded on to Haun’s Mill where they arrived two days before the attack.
After confiscating what weapons they could from both Mormon settlers and immigrants, vigilante leaders next sent messengers to the Mormon community, proposing that the two sides meet to bring about terms of reconciliation. “The mob . . . sent word to us that they wished to meet a committee of our people and have an understanding of each other’s movements and expressed their wish to live in peace and friendly terms with us,” wrote Ellis Eames.17 The Mormons were more than willing to oblige, recognizing they were at a distinct military disadvantage—having only a limited number of weapons, as well as being outnumbered due to the addition of the vigilantes from Livingston, Daviess, and other surrounding counties. Accordingly, David Evans, Jacob Myers Sr., and Anthony Blackburn were selected to represent the Mormons in the discussions. Sources indicate that the mill’s leaders negotiated with leaders of several vigilante groups on different occasions. One meeting was held at the Myers settlement situated a few miles east of Haun’s Mill. Here the three Mormon delegates arbitrated with Samuel E. Todd, Zachariah Lee, Isaac McCroskie, Thomas R. Bryan, and William F. Ewell, all from Livingston County.18 About this same time, by means of a messenger, President Evans deliberated a truce with Nehemiah Comstock, at which time both parties agreed to abandon their military organization.19 Finally, at least two meetings were held at the home of Oliver Walker, with local citizens representing the non-Mormon settlers living among the Mormons in Fairview township in
Caldwell County; and a third meeting was probably held with members of this same group on the day of the attack. In each of these exchanges, both sides also agreed to leave the other alone and live peaceably.

There is historical evidence, however, that the attempts made by the vigilantes to confiscate the Mormons’ weapons, followed by the peace negotiations, were actually part of the overall plan of the Missouri regulators to ensure the eradication of the Mormon community. By disarming the Latter-day Saints, both those living in the area as well as those traveling through the region, the vigilantes would leave the Mormons defenseless, making it possible for the attack on the community to take place with minimal resistance, while at the same time reducing the risk of their own casualties. The pretended truce was conducted so the Mormons would be led to believe that they had nothing to fear and that an attack was not likely to occur.

The vigilante leaders made their final plans to attack the community on Monday, October 29. Although this was after Boggs issued his executive order on October 27, it would have been impossible for copies of the governor’s mandate to be conveyed from Jefferson City to the two commanding major generals in the field—David R. Atchison (who was being replaced by Major-general John B. Clark) and Samuel D. Lucas, both of whom were encamped with their troops on Log Creek about seven miles south of Far West—and then those same orders conveyed to Livingston County in less than two days. Significantly, Lucas wrote that he and Atchison did not receive word of the extermination/removal order until sometime during the day of October 30, the very day of the massacre. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that either of the two commanding generals, Atchison, who was somewhat sympathetic to the Mormons, or even Lucas, who was bitterly anti-Mormon, would have used the exterminating order to authorize Jennings to move ahead and annihilate the Haun’s Mill community. Notably, even the Latter-day Saints at Far West did not learn of Boggs’ directive until October 31.

Put simply, Jennings and his men acted on their own, without military authorization, and without knowledge of the governor’s policy toward the Mormons as outlined in the October 27 directive. As one local history explains, “Colonel Jennings made the attack on Haun’s Mill on his own responsibility, without orders from Governor Boggs, or other superior officer, although it is said that the Governor fully approved what was done afterward.”
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