

## NMPA Cultural Diversity Course #2, New Mexico History 2

### Thomas, Benjamin

By Denise Holladay Damico

Benjamin Morris Thomas influenced New Mexican history as Secretary of the Territory and Acting Governor; his most substantial contribution to the historical record, however, was as "Indian Agent." The federal government employed Indian Agents to act as liaisons between the Department of the Interior and Native American tribes in the nineteenth century. As such, these agents were responsible for implementing policies designed to assimilate native groups into Anglo-American society. These policies included forcing nomadic tribes onto reservations, outlawing Native American ceremonial practices, attempting to teach Native Americans to farm in the Anglo-American manner, and sending native children to far-away boarding schools. The career of Benjamin Thomas reveals the impact these he had on the actual implementation of these policies. Though Thomas believed that his efforts to enact assimilation-driven policies were for the good, such efforts today seem ineffective at best and cruel at worst.

Thomas was born on July 25, 1843 in Warren County, Indiana. He grew up on a farm with eleven brothers and sisters, several of whom eventually became politically influential in their own right. These connections would serve Thomas well, even once he moved west. He trained as a dentist and would fall back upon this profession in New Mexico for several years when he failed to attain political appointments.

Thomas' health was never good. In 1870, he traveled with family friend, fellow Presbyterian, and newly-appointed Indian Agent to the Hopi, William D. Crothers, to Arizona and New Mexico. Like many, Thomas believed that New Mexico's dry, sunny climate was beneficial to those suffering from pulmonary ailments. Except for a few years in Tucson, Thomas spent the rest of his life in New Mexico.

Evidently, however, Thomas was not enamored of New Mexico during his first weeks in the Territory. Writing home, he said that Santa Fe "and this whole country is emphatically a possession of the devil" though he admired the natural beauty of the Territory. When he arrived at Fort Wingate with Crothers, Thomas met several of the Army soldiers who often worked alongside Indian Agents. He would always have a rocky relationship with many of these soldiers, particularly since he heartily disapproved of many of the rowdier parts of Army life, such as drinking, gambling, and swearing.

Crothers' health had been poor throughout the men's voyage and continued to be so at Fort Wingate, so Thomas began helping his friend with his duties as Indian Agent. 1871 marked two important developments in Thomas' life – his marriage to a long-time sweetheart, Esther V. Bradley of Indiana, and his first job in the "Indian service." Thomas officially entered the Indian service as an "Agency farmer" to the Navajo. "Agency farmers" were supposed to teach Native Americans to farm using Anglo-American methods, though such methods were never very successful in arid New Mexico.

Thomas' Presbyterian connections helped him obtain this job. The United States government contracted with many Presbyterian missionaries on Native American reservations, in addition to directly employing Indian Agents like Thomas. Thomas would go on to work as Indian Agent with the Mimbres and Jicarilla Apache, and the Ute, and the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.

Thomas became Indian Agent for the Southern Apache agency in late 1872. Tensions ran high between the Apache bands and the US Army at the agency then located at Fort Tularosa. Thomas' superior wrote that Thomas had stopped the Apache band leaders, including the famous Victorio, from distributing their government rations "to suit themselves," instead of allowing Indian Agent Thomas to do so, as was government policy. In addition, Thomas had introduced "many other much needed reforms" and, as a result, "he had become exceedingly unpopular" among the Apache bands.

For the remainder of his career as Indian Agent, Thomas would continue to enthusiastically implement reforms backed by US federal policy reforms that were unpopular among the native peoples with whom he dealt. From 1874 to 1883 Thomas was Indian Agent to the Pueblos. In his annual report to his superior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which were in turn reprinted in the "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Governor," Thomas' description of the Pueblos reflected, and likely

helped shape, common Anglo-American perceptions of the Pueblos at the time. Almost every year, Thomas described the Pueblo Indians as “quiet, industrious, reliable...susceptible of education,” and capable of “be[ing] formed into valuable citizens” in the Anglo-American mode.

He approved of the fact that the Pueblos were self-sufficient and rarely needed rations from the US government. Thomas felt that groups such as the Apache, who had recently been confined to reservations, needed to be “taught” a “civilized way of life,” one in sedentary communities, reliant upon agriculture. The Pueblos, of course, had lived in such communities since long before any European set foot in the New World.

Thomas also believed that with the federal government's help, the Pueblos' methods of agriculture could be improved. In his first report as Indian Agent to the Pueblos, in 1875, he wrote, “It would be both policy and economy on the part of Congress to make an appropriation of \$8,000 or \$10,000 for the purpose of purchasing, for the use of these people, plows, fanning-mills, spades, hoes, etc. and a thousand good apple trees for each pueblo. This would place means in their hands of effectually helping themselves to an independent position in the community.”

Noting that “such appropriations are unhesitatingly made for wild tribes, who derive only harm from the supposed benefit,” he asked, “Why not give the peaceable and industrious Pueblos a little material encouragement, even if they do steadfastly refuse to go raiding and murdering over the country whenever they do not happen to be treated as lords of creation?” He would repeat this same complaint almost every year for the remainder of his time as Agent to the Pueblos.

Thomas, whose wife had been a schoolteacher, was particularly interested in education as a means of “forming” the Pueblo peoples into “valuable citizens,” or, in other words, assimilating them into Anglo-American society. To this end, he constantly worked to gather more resources for the various “day schools,” located at some of the Pueblos during his tenure. He decried the “irregularity of attendance; home influence, and use of the native language by the children out of school hours; inadequacy of salary to secure good teacher, and effective influence against education on the part of many of the Catholic priests” as obstacles to the goal of assimilation via education in his 1875 report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

During his years as Agent to the Pueblo Indians, Thomas sought to address these obstacles in a variety of ways. In particular he advocated the use of boarding schools “away from their [the children's] home influences” as a means to ensure “the progress of the children.” In July, 1880, he managed to convince parents and leaders at three Pueblos, Zuni, Laguna, and San Felipe, to send a total of ten children to the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania. He acknowledged that: “It was hard for the Indians to part with their children, to go they knew not where.” But, he insisted: “The advantages to the Indians of this action are probably greater and farther reaching than anything that was ever before done for them.” In January 1881, he convinced parents from Acoma, Cochiti, Isleta, and Laguna to send a total of ten more children to Pennsylvania. Sometime in the summer of 1881, one of the boys from Zuni “died at Carlisle of consumption.” Thomas conceded, “This death will be a hard blow to the parents, and will cause the officers of the pueblos to seriously doubt the wisdom of their action in departing anyway from their ancient customs.”

Thomas was instrumental in the founding of, the “boarding and industrial school” that “was opened for the Pueblos” in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on January 1, 1881. Thomas worked to ensure that the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church received the government contract to operate the school. Children spent five hours in schoolwork, with additional time spent instructing boys in agriculture and girls in cooking, needlework, and other domestic activities. On October 1882, the school's superintendent reported to Thomas that some seventy children were in residence there.

Thomas' involvement with the day schools, the Carlisle School, and the Albuquerque school earned him the moniker “Father of Pueblo Education” from historian Ralph Emerson Twitchell. In addition, Thomas also worked on behalf of the Presbyterian parochial school in Santa Fe, even sending three boys from Isleta there for a few months. He was also one of the founders of the Santa Fe Academy, a private school for the Territory's elite.

Thomas was aware of the effect that the railroad had on the Pueblos of New Mexico. In particular, encroachment on Pueblo lands, always an issue, became even more so as powerful corporations sought to

build their tracks through Pueblo land. In one instance, in 1882, Thomas sought to eject some three hundred residents of a railroad boom town known as Wallace: All of whom were squatting illegally on the lands of Santo Domingo Pueblo.

Concurrent to his appointment as agent to the Pueblos, Thomas also served as Agent at the Cimarron Agency, from 1876 to 1878, when that agency was abolished and on August 20, 1878, he became agent of the Abiquiu Agency. At these agencies Thomas was to enact US policy of "removal" of various bands of Jicarilla Apache and Utes, however, where they would be removed to remained unsettled for much of Thomas' tenure. At the time, the Jicarilla Apache were "located on a private land grant, and the agency is situated in a Mexican town [Tierra Amarilla] where the Indians manage to get supplies of whiskey," he reported, adding, "Of course under these circumstances it is impossible for the agent to accomplish much for their advancement in civilization." For years Thomas wrote to his superiors in Washington of the need for a special reservation for the Jicarilla Apache. Finally, in the fall of 1880, he succeeded in obtaining a tract of land for this purpose on the Navajo River. He described the area as a "fine country in all respects except its altitude, and on that account it is rather cold sometimes for people who do not live in houses, but there is plenty of timber at hand, and this objection can be easily overcome."

During his time as Indian Agent, Thomas made several enemies, including Archbishop Jean Baptiste Lamy. Thomas, an ardent Presbyterian, worked to thwart what he saw as Catholic priests' undue influence on the Pueblos. Of course, Lamy, and the people of the Pueblos, had a very different perspective. Lamy had long fought to have Catholics appointed as Indian Agents to the Pueblos. The issue of educating the Pueblo children in a Presbyterian-dominated boarding school further heightened tensions.

In 1882, Pedro Sanchez replaced Benjamin Thomas as Indian Agent to the Pueblos. Sanchez was not only Catholic but also a prominent Hispano from the Taos area. Though Thomas was offered another agency – the Crow Creek Agency in South Dakota – he felt that his removal from the Pueblo agency was unjust so instead took a government job outside of the Indian service, as Register of the Land Office in Tucson, Arizona. Thomas thought that his dismissal from the Pueblo Agency was the result of his successful reforms among the Pueblos, which many resented. He also blamed Lamy and the Santa Fe Ring for his dismissal.

Thus Thomas lived in Tucson from 1883 to 1887 when he moved back to Santa Fe to work at his earlier occupation, opening a dental practice. However, he considered this a means of subsistence rather than a career. When fellow Republican Benjamin Harrison, who, like Thomas, originally hailed from Indiana, won the presidential election of 1888, Thomas began a letter-writing campaign seeking a federal appointment. He narrowed down his list of possible jobs from "Indian Inspector or Internal Revenue Collector" to his final goal – secretary of the New Mexico Territory, a federally appointed position. In 1889, his political ally L. Bradford Prince was appointed governor. Thomas supported Prince's nomination, writing in support of Prince to his family and other acquaintances in Indiana and Washington, D.C. This work paid off when, in May of 1889, President Harrison appointed Thomas Secretary of the Territory which he assumed on June 4, 1889. As Secretary, Thomas protested plans to use the "old adobe Palace," or Palace of the Governors, as military officers' quarters, and moved his offices into the building. Because the Secretary was also Lieutenant Governor, he served as acting governor when Prince was out of the Territory. He was acting Governor a total of six months over the three years he served as Secretary.

Evidently Thomas' health had much improved since his move west and the documentary record provides little evidence that he was ill in the decades he lived in New Mexico. However, he passed away rather suddenly at the age of forty-nine. Newspaper accounts attributed the death to "neuralgia in the head and dyspeptic disorder," culminating in "congestion of the brain and paralysis of the left arm and leg."

Though today it is difficult to approve of the policies which Thomas worked so hard to enact, it is true that he lived up to the goals he set for himself in his diary on New Year's Eve, 1880: "Application, thoroughness, earnestness, system, order – and neatness!"

#### Chronology:

- July 25, 1843: Benjamin Thomas born in Warren County, Indiana.
- 1870: Thomas comes to New Mexico for health reasons.
- 1871: Thomas enters "Indian service."

1875-1883: Thomas serves as Indian Agent to the Pueblos.  
1883: Thomas moves to Tucson, serves as register of the land office.  
1889: Thomas named secretary of the Territory of New Mexico.  
October 2, 1892: Thomas dies.

## **Genízaros**

by Malcolm Ebright

Most Genízaros in New Mexico were Plains Indians captured by other Plains tribes and then sold to individual Hispanos or Pueblos. The legal basis for this arrangement is found in the laws of the Recopilación de Leyes de Reynos de las Indias 1681, which justified the purchase of captives under the Christian obligation to ransom captive Indians. The practice was given further sanction in 1694 when a group of Navajo brought Pawnee children to New Mexico to sell to the Spanish. When the Spaniards refused to purchase the captives, the Navajos beheaded the children! After this, Charles II, King of Spain from 1665-1700, ordered that, if necessary, royal funds be used to purchase captives to avoid such an atrocity.

Traffic in Genízaros was also sanctioned by the government as a method of Christianizing Indian captives. Teaching their servants Christian doctrine was however often ignored by the Spaniards and more emphasis was placed on the amount of work Genízaros servants performed. The value of Genízaro servants varied: eighty pesos was paid for Pedro de la Cruz (to be discussed later) and fifteen mares (about one hundred fifty pesos) were paid for an Apache captive in 1731. According to Christian doctrine, once the process of Christianization had occurred and Genízaros had earned enough to pay off his their ransom, they were supposed to be freed. The standard wage for a Genízaros was three to five pesos per month, depending on the length of their service.

Genízaros were purchased at annual trade fairs held at Pecos, Taos, and Abiquiú where they were considered one of the most profitable commodities; the “richest treasure for the governor,” in the words of the Fray Pedro Serrano. Genízaros were marked with a very low social status because they were neither Spanish nor Indian; thus, it was difficult for them to obtain land, livestock, or other property required to make a living. Some Genízaros, however, such as Juana “La Galvana” Hurtado were able to use their contacts in both Hispanic and Native American worlds to their advantage, acquiring land, livestock, and a substantial amount of material goods, though they retained their Genízaro status.

The first-known group of Genízaros in New Mexico lived in the Analco barrio of Santa Fe, south of the Santa Fe River. They replaced the Tlascalcan Indians from central Mexico who were the first occupants of Analco before the Pueblo Revolt. This first Genízaro community may have been established as part of the Analco church of San Miguel even before Governor Pedro de Peralta (1610–14) moved the capitol from San Gabriel to Santa Fe in 1610. During the 1680 Pueblo Revolt, the Pueblos burned the church of San Miguel and almost wiped out the Analco settlement on the first day of the revolt, unleashing particular fury there. This may have occurred due to Pueblo Indian jealousy over the special treatment the Spaniards accorded these Indians from New Spain, some of whom are said to have had Pueblo servants.

Genízaros often spent most of their lives as servant/slaves in New Mexico households. In the contemporary documents they are called criados, genízaros, and Indio-genízaros. They were accorded few rights and were often physically abused. At the time, they were not considered slaves because when their term of servitude was completed, they were to become free. It was not always clear, however, how long this term lasted. Many Genízaro owners attempted to keep the term of service vague so that they could continue to reap the benefit of Genízaro labor long after they had completed their term of service. Spanish law differentiated between the purchase of captives for use as servants who would eventually be freed, and outright slavery, which was prohibited in the Americas, largely due of the influence of fray Bartolomé de las Casas, 1484-1566, and his books decrying Spanish mistreatment of the Indians.

The primary elements of Genízaro status were servitude or captivity and Indian blood. Within these two factors there were numerous variations, often situationally defined. Some Genízaros might be considered Spaniards in the community where they lived, but were seen as Genízaros by the people with whom they

interacted elsewhere. Genízaros lived in pueblos such as Taos, San Juan, Santa Clara, and Nambe where they served as domestic labor for Pueblo families. Genízaros were sometimes purchased by other Genízaros, as well as by Pueblo Indians and New Mexican Hispanos. Some Genízaros maintained contact with their tribe or pueblo of origin, a connection they used to their advantage in trade with those groups outside of the annual trade fairs. After being released from service to a master and given land in a frontier community, many Genízaros retained their Genízaro status within Genízaro communities such as Santo Tomás de Abiquiú, or the plaza at Belen called Nuestra Señora de los Genízaros. The population of Genízaro plazas such as Santo Tomás de Abiquiú remained relatively constant, as many former Genízaros assimilated into surrounding plazas and became full-fledged Spanish citizens through marriage to Spaniards. The Genízaro official classification in mid-eighteenth-century New Mexico often varied depending on the somewhat subjective scrutiny of the census-taker.

The practice of trading in Indian captives to be used as servants was closely connected to Indian warfare and Hispano raiding. Slave-raiding by Hispanos perpetuated the Indian wars in that slaving was often the catalyst for hostilities, and the resulting wars were often used as a cover for the “harvesting” of new crops of servant/slaves. Manuel Mestas, Andrés and Lucrecio Muñiz, and Pedro Luján are examples of Genízaros who eventually acquired vecino (land-owning Hispanic citizen) status largely through their trading - often for Indian captives - with the Utes.

In 1749 when Tomás Vélez Cachupín replaced Joaquín Codallos y Rabal as governor of New Mexico, there was a dramatic shift in the attitude of the Spanish government toward Genízaros. Before Vélez Cachupín, the judicial climate was not favorable to Pueblo Indians or Genízaros. When Governor Vélez Cachupín arrived in New Mexico in 1749, he found a frontier province surrounded by hostile Ute, Apache, Comanche, and Navajo tribes. One of his responses was to expand Spanish settlement beyond the settled areas and into the periphery of the Spanish Kingdom, making peace with friendly Indians when possible and fighting hostile ones when necessary. Once the governor had achieved a tentative peace with the surrounding indigenous peoples, he was able to turn his attention to the Genízaros who complained of mistreatment at the hands of their Spanish masters. The Genízaros sought independence and land of their own. Vélez Cachupín’s approach to lawsuits involving Genízaros was generally sympathetic, often giving them the relief they requested. He was much more concerned with the treatment of Genízaros than previous governors had been and he found ways to bring more Genízaros into frontier settlements such as Abiquiú, though his motives were not entirely altruistic—he wanted communities on the periphery of Spanish settlement as a buffer against hostile Indian attacks.

Governor Vélez Cachupín gave testimony about the Genízaros in his report to the viceroy as part of the Abiquiú witchcraft trials. He described the Genízaros as: “perverse, lazy, and with such serious vices, that they are most difficult to regulate and subdue, because they and their families love the life of the vagabond. They move from one place to another within these areas, causing much damage to the planted fields and livestock, living by theft without respect of justice. They are quarrelsome and stubborn in their ways, especially in their love of gambling.” The governor’s harsh opinion was slightly softened by his judgment that Genízaros were the best Indian fighters, whether they served as auxiliaries to Spanish troops or lived in frontier settlements such as Abiquiú, Ojo Caliente, or San Miguel del Bado. Vélez Cachupín believed that the negative character traits of the Genízaros were due, not to any “innate propensity,” but to a lack of proper training by their masters, who typically employed them as shepherds and wood-gatherers and failed to teach them Christian doctrine. Vélez Cachupín’s opinion was informed by the many complaints he received from Genízaros regarding their ill treatment. Often he removed complaining Genízaros from abusive masters, assigned them to other households, or emancipated them and sent them to be part of the Abiquiú Genízaro grant. Vélez Cachupín believed that the nomadic lifestyle of the Genízaros was “totally free and restless because they do not have possessions or a proper place to live.”

The Genízaros who settled in Abiquiú on the land granted them by Governor Vélez Cachupín were primarily Hopis, Plains Indians, and some Tewas from nearby Pueblos. At the time of the Abiquiú witch trials in 1760-66, Genízaros, like other people of New Mexico, were influenced by a multitude of cultures including Hopi, Hispano, Rio Grande Pueblo, Plains Indian, Ute, Navajo, Kiowa, Pawnee, Apache, and Comanche but the Genízaros also had tribal affiliations. Over the course of many years this tribal affiliation became lost among the Genízaros and they would simply be identified as Genízaros or “Indians of unknown parentage.” Beginning in the early nineteenth century, many individuals would cease to call themselves Genízaro, a liminal identity that marked one as lower status. Genízaros would eventually refer to themselves as

Spaniards, especially after they were freed and had married. The term “Genízaro” gradually disappeared as a designation of *casta* (caste), although the practice of Hispano households keeping such Indian servants continued into the late nineteenth century.

Today, individuals of Genízaro ancestry from Abiquiú might consider themselves Hispano throughout the year, but on the Abiquiú feast day of Santo Tomás, in late November, they identify themselves as Indians. Among the most solemn dances performed at the Abiquiú feast day are El Nanillé and Los Cánticos del Cementerio, performed in front of the church. The Nanillé is danced to the cadence of the *tombé*, or hand drum, and includes words such as “nanillé” that no one recognizes. To some the song sounds Navajo, to others it is similar to the Tewa eagle dance from Jemez. The origins of the Abiquiú songs, dances, and pantomimes, still performed on the November feast day, remain enigmatic.

One of the pantomimes performed at the Abiquiú feast day directly confronts the experience of captivity that is at the heart of the Genízaro experience. As described in *Nuevo Mexico Profundo*, “A cautivo is taken prisoner from the crowd and presented to the people with a shout of ‘¿Quién lo conoce?’—‘Who knows this person?’ Someone comes forward with the *desempeño* [ransom], which is paid to the singers. If nobody claims the captive, the person remains the ‘property’ of the singers.” This pantomime beautifully encapsulates the nature of the Genízaro experience as being in the middle, living in two worlds with the possibility of incorporating the best of those worlds into the Genízaro identity.

#### Chronology:

1712: Apache captives/servants attempt to escape with horses. SANM II: 178.

1732: Governor Cruzat y Gongora prohibited the practice of Spaniards selling Genízaros to friendly tribes who would later sell them back to other Spaniards. SANM II: 378.

1733: Petition by an anonymous advocate on behalf of 100 genízaro Indians (Apache, Kiowa, Pawnee, Ute, and Jumano) who wanted to form a new settlement at the abandoned Sandia Pueblo. Governor Cruzat y Gongora demanded that the Genízaros identify themselves by name and tribe. Only 25 did (17 families and eight single males). Then Cruzat y Gongora denied the petition. SANM I: 1208.

1744: Fray Miguel Menchero noted that the importance of the Taos trade fair was that Plains Indians entered the pueblo to sell captives.

1744: Fray Pedro Serrano referred to Genízaros as “the richest treasures for the governor.”

1746: Antonio Casados, a Kiowa genízaro who had been purchased by a genízaro servant of Sebastian Martin, claimed to be the captain of a genízaro pueblo at Belen. He traveled to Mexico City where, with the help of a lawyer he presented a petition directly to the viceroy seeking recognition of the genízaro pueblo and eviction of all Spaniards. The viceroy ordered Governor Codallos y Rabal to comply or pay a 1,000 peso fine. Instead, when Casados appeared in Santa Fe with 70 Pueblo Indians, the governor put him in jail and proceeded to hold the hearing ordered by the viceroy. There is no record of the decision, though the Belen grant to Diego Torres remained in effect with several settlements of Genízaros on the grant. SANM I: 183.

1746: Diego Torres, one of the grantees of the 1740 Belen grant, brought some 20 Genízaros to the grant to help populate and defend it.

1750: Genízaros constituted 10% of the population. In Belen the 1750 census showed a population of 68 Genízaros.

1751: To communicate with certain Comanche hostages, Governor Vélez Cachupín used as an interpreter a Kiowa woman who had been captured by the Comanche, then captured by the Utes in a raid and finally purchased by Antonio Martín.

1754: Tomás Vélez Cachupín makes a grant at Abiquiú to 60 families who settle in the Genízaro plaza of Santo Tomás which grew up next to the Hispanic community of Santa Rosa de la Capilla.

1764: Governor Vélez Cachupín made the San Gabriel de las Nutrias grant to a group of people from Tome and the Rio Arriba area. The grant was within the common lands of the Belen grant and the first census by Alcalde Miguel Lucero found 2 Genízaros, 2 coyotes (mixed blood children of a Genízaro) and one Navajo. SANM I: 780.

1765: Iturbietta v. Gallegos refers to Genízaro land on the opposite side of the acequia from the Spaniards. It was used in common by Genízaros, and was not allotted like the lands of the Spaniards. SANM I: 362.

1766: Gertrudes de Cuellar and José María Montaña, genízaro Indians, complain to Governor Vélez Cachupín about the abuses suffered at the hands of Teniente Juan Bautista Montaña who purchased José María nine years earlier for about 80 pesos in sheep and a little more. Cuellar tells Vélez Cachupín that her husband has worked for Juan Bautista Montaña for ten years yet Montaña will not allow José María to leave unless he pays him 100 pesos or agrees to serve him for another five years.

1776: Genízaros made up 54 % of the population of Abiquiú (136/254), with the average family size was 2.9 for Genizaros and 5.2 for Hispanos.

1776: Within the villa of Santa Fe there was a total of 1167 persons including 42 families of Genízaros. Thus 14% of Santa Fe residents were Genízaro.

1794: San Miguel del Bado grant was made in 1794 with initial settlement beginning around 1798. The grant was made to Lorenzo Marquez and 51 others at least 13 of whom were Genizaros.

### **Romero, Rosario**

By Any Other Name: A Story of Slavery and Her Legacy

By Estevan Rael-Galvez

In Ocate, New Mexico, sometime between 1910 and the late 1920s, a young girl named Dora Ortiz often visited with an old woman known as Rosario Romero. During those visits, she listened carefully as Rosario's stories drew Dora in as close as whisper. For Dora, Rosario may have seemed like the oldest woman in the world, with a memory as long as her wisdom was deep. She was, after all, believed then to have been well over a hundred years old. Ma-Ya-Yo was what Dora called the old woman, for she was like a grandmother to her. Although she had held the name Rosario for decades, she still remembered her first name, Ated-bah-Hozhoni, Happy Girl, a prophetic gift perhaps given with quiet ritual and intention. Her Diné name was one of the last vestiges that revealed from where she had come and who she once was. Although that name may have sounded to her like beauty and loss all wrapped together, it was a name that told her that she was once a happy girl.

In a story where indigenous names and origins were almost always irrevocably lost, this exception is significant. Rosario's life was part of an old story in villages throughout New Mexico, a story whose telling was perhaps not meant to be passed on. It was after all, a history that had been quieted over the years by whispers as much as by silence, hushed aside even by those who have inherited the story—carrying, as it is, if not its geography in their faces and hands, certainly its memory in an aching consciousness—unknown perhaps, but still there. It is the story of American Indian slavery, an institution that while perhaps obscured, certainly existed and through it, thousands of individual lives passed.

Dora's Narrative

Rosario passed away in 1930 and Dora, the young girl, who had become a young woman, then took pen to

paper and filled her Red Chief notebooks with these stories from her childhood. In that decade, she married, had children and the notebooks were put away. Forty years later, Dora Ortiz Vásquez published *Enchanted Temples of Taos: My Story of Rosario*. Part family memoir, part eulogy and perhaps even part imagination, her narrative pays homage on the one hand to her great grandfather, the famous Padre Antonio José Martínez of Taos as the benevolent master and on the other, Rosario, the sometimes recalcitrant servant. Yet, Vásquez writes against the grain of her contemporaries, naming Rosario's experience—slavery, by any other name.

While Rosario's story is certainly distinct and particular to the southwest, it is one that is now, even as it may have appeared in centuries past, seemingly out of place as a slave narrative of the United States of America, which continues to echo of another place and people. It has perpetually been defined as something else, something that is not "slavery." Ecclesiastical records of New Mexico alone reveal that thousands of Native Americans were baptized and entered into New Mexican households. More than statistics, these numbers were people, whose narratives of captivity, enslavement and presence deeply affected the community structure and complexity. The full tapestry of Rosario's story emerges in-between Vásquez's narrative and many other historical documents, all more fully woven between the delicacy and strength of her two names.

#### Ated-Bah-Hozhoni

Years later one of the Navajo headmen would recall that when 'all the nation came against the navajo, that is when they lost the children.' The day of the raid, hidden into the rocks of a cliff, Ated-Bah-Hozhoni watched as her father, husband and two small sons were killed. With them, a part of her must have broken that day. Her captors found her, clutching her one year old daughter in her arms and together, they were carried away with others.

While Vásquez appears to place Ated-Bah-Hozhoni's captivity in the very early 19th century, historical documents reveal that her violent loss and separation may have actually taken place during the 1860s and perhaps even within 1861. These were years of continual hostilities between the Navajo and New Mexican communities and by 1861 New Mexican officials legislated a means to wage war against the Navajo, a war that would culminate in their eventual defeat.

The impact of this period of warfare and kidnapping would even enter the sentiment and memory of the Navajo as phrases would be added to the language to describe what happened. Ated-Bah-Hozhoni had probably heard her father whisper the term "nahondzod," which has been defined as "the fearing time" or "under captivity, moving with fear." This fear was perhaps exactly what Ated-Bah-Hozhoni held with her the day she was carried away, a journey that became her own middle passage across desert and mountain, dust rising with each movement. She would never set her eyes upon those mountains again, leaving a part of her happiness behind.

#### Rosario

It is unclear when Ated-Bah-Hozhoni arrived in Taos, but Vásquez notes that Padre Martínez had bought her for one hundred and fifty pesos and given her a new name—Rosario. Most captives were given a name at their baptism. Remarkably, there is no baptismal record that has been located to date for either Ated-Bah-Hozhoni or her daughter, whose Diné name was lost. What Vásquez also reveals, was that Rosario's daughter was not purchased by Martínez, but by another family. This separation of mother and daughter undoubtedly compounded the loss for the young captive. Vásquez devotes two chapters to this subject, unfolding Rosario's "misbehavior," failing in her household duties, which Padre Martínez accordingly attributes to her missing her daughter. Padre Martínez then purchases Rosario's daughter.

While neither Rosario nor Soledad are included in the 1860 federal census, they are clearly identified in the 1870 census. Therein, Rosario Martínez is identified as a 40 year old Indian female, keeping house, followed by 10 year old Soledad. Census enumerators would thereafter document Rosario's presence every decade until the 1930 census, dying just one month before that enumeration. During those decades, her occupation would be listed simply as "servant," "day laborer" and finally "wool weaver." It would be impossible to fully measure Rosario's life during the seventy years she lived in New Mexico, first with Padre Martinez in Taos and then in Ocate, with Martinez's son's family, George Romero and in a third generation, next to Romero's daughter, Maria de la Luz Romero Ortiz.



Like many female captives taken as adults, Rosario, according to Vásquez's narrative attempts three times to escape her captors. In the narration of one of these attempts, seizing the opportunity, Rosario takes the young Soledad with her and runs away. Two other Navajo slaves are recognized in that chapter. The other two that accompany Rosario and escape are Maria Antonia who was held by Padre Martínez's brother, Santiago. Francisca is the other, who was held in neighboring Agustin Lucero's household. These runaway slaves were quickly apprehended and returned to their masters.

The war waged against the Navajo by the U.S. army in the first few years of the 1860s was also eclipsed by the war against slavery itself. The same year that Rosario and Soledad may have been captured was also the beginning of the Civil War. When that war ended, a special proclamation was issued abolishing Indian slavery. The reasoning followed, that even if the slavery was of "Indians"—still then considered significant obstacles and threats to westward expansion—slavery of any kind, from an ideological standpoint posed a significant problem for the nation, just then emerging from itself divided over the issue. Undoing this institution was no easy task, particularly because it was obscured. Officials would thus spend the last half of the decade attempting its demise. Vásquez portrayal of Rosario's alleged freedom appears more romanticized than real. In reality, although the military had attempted to free individuals, the courts were soon recognized as holding more pressure. It was perhaps this pressure that prompted Padre Martínez to appear before the Taos County Probate Court in its January 1867 session, petitioning not to free Maria Rosario, his "famula," maid servant, but to make him her legal guardian. Within six months, Martínez would fall ill and pass away.

With this passing, Rosario would move to Ocate with Martínez's son, George Romero and his family. Within one year, W.W. Griffin, a federal agent would be appointed to identify the crime of holding slaves. Among the 435 cases that Griffin brings before the grand jury, he charges Santiago Martinez, Agustin Lucero, both noted above, and George Romero with "holding Indian slaves." Citing "insufficient evidence," however, he eventually dropped the charges against Romero. Rosario is nonetheless listed next door to George in 1870 and in 1880 is listed as an Indian servant in his household still. Read together, these stories, names, and experiences of one individual provide a window into the story of American Indian slavery. It is a story about being Indian in the wrong place, which accentuates the discourse about family and the very contest over the images of slavery and indianness alike. It is a story that reveal that the most telling aspects of any deep and sustained study of New Mexican identity, rises from beneath layers of histories formed somewhere in between erasure and memory—histories experienced, imagined and passed down through story, telling, as it is, identities.

## Mamabuela

Ma-Ya-Yo was the name that the Martínez, Romero and Ortiz grandchildren remembered the old woman by. It was, according to Vásquez a term of endearment, whereby they recognized Rosario as being like a grandmother. Although Vásquez does include parts of the story of Rosario's daughter Soledad, what is most striking about Vásquez's account is the near complete absence of Rosario's own family in the account. What did her children and grandchildren call her? What stories were they told about and by Ated-Bah-Hozhoni.

Aside from her daughter Soledad, she also had four sons. While it does not appear as though she married, the father of her four sons may have been Juan de Dios Griego, who in the 1870 census is identified as a laborer born in Durango, Mexico. He is also present in her household in the 1880 census. Three of her sons, Albino, José and Yicero (sic) never appear to have married, but one son, José Domingo had eleven children and her daughter Soledad had at least one daughter.

By the time that she died, Rosario had five children and at least twelve grandchildren of her own. Now, nearly three quarters of a century later, Rosario has hundreds of descendants, living throughout the world. My conversations with many of these individuals have extended and deeply enriched these stories. Those descendants are each reflections of this extraordinary woman's life. Her singular beauty and strength and her original name—prophesizing happiness—is I hope, their collective legacy. New Mexico's collective identity is also born out of this astonishing complexity and as such, is part of our shared legacy as well.

## **Santa Fe Indian School**

At the end of the nineteenth century the federal government became increasingly involved in Indian education. This was due to a long and troublesome history of Indian-White relations. Two major events shifted the end of the "Indian Wars" to more assimilative campaigns. The killing of Colonel George Armstrong Custer and 250 soldiers near the Little Bighorn River in Montana by Sioux and Cheyenne warriors in 1876, and the Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890, shifted U.S. consciousness from campaigns of war to campaigns of assimilation. Once American military campaigns against Indians subsided, social reformers began to argue that through education Indians could be assimilated into American society. They advocated the establishment of boarding schools where children would be more effectively "civilized" by isolating them from their families and tribes.

Captain Richard Pratt founded the Carlisle Indian School in 1879. Pratt had been a frontier Indian fighter before becoming an educator. Ironically, the Carlisle school had been a British Army post 130 years before and was used to shelter troops that were fighting Indians in the same region. Shortly after the Civil War, Pratt persuaded the army to let him turn the building into the federal government's first Native American boarding school. The Carlisle School became the nation's most prominent Indian school and served as a model for other institutions. Pratt proclaimed that his forty years as a professional soldier were sufficient to operate a school, though he did not have a high school diploma.

By the end of the century, the Bureau of Indian Affairs created 25 off-reservation schools. The Santa Fe Indian School was part of this larger enterprise to educate Indian students. In 1885 New Mexico delegate Anthony Joseph introduced a bill to Congress to build an off-reservation boarding school in Santa Fe. The original school building was completed in 1890. This was a pivotal time in territorial New Mexico history. Trains were becoming a major mode of transportation. In 1890 the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad was completed and used to transport food, supplies and Pueblo children from reservations to boarding schools.

The Santa Fe Indian School was charged with educating the Indian children of the southwestern tribes. The school opened in 1890 with nine Pueblo students. By the end of the year there were 93 students, mostly Pueblo and Apache with a few Navajo. By 1891 the enrollment had doubled. The school followed the Carlisle example. That is, boys and girls were organized into military battalions and companies. By 1900 there were 300 students - 60% Pueblo and the rest from southwestern tribes. To handle the growing number of students, a laundry, classroom building, hospital, barn and four employee houses were built - mostly with student labor.

On their first day of school boys and girls were assigned to separate military battalions according to their age group. Immediately, their hair was cut and children were bathed. The boys were given war uniforms and assigned to carry unloaded guns while they drilled. The children were required to march everywhere from the cafeteria to their classrooms and from the classroom to the dormitories. Students woke up to the bugle call and ended the day with more marching to the bugle as the American flag was lowered. Children were instructed in English and were severely punished for speaking their Native language. Many students spent their boarding school days in "jail" – a one room building behind the main campus.

A typical curriculum included some arithmetic, writing, history and geography. But, the majority of instruction involved vocational or industrial training. Typically, the girls would learn sewing, cooking, laundry and housekeeping. In a similar vein, the boys spent hours farming or working with a tailor, shoemaker or carpenter.

As the years progressed the regiment of military style training lessened and instruction became more academically focused. Perhaps the Santa Fe Indian School is most prominently known as a training ground for artists. It was not until the 1930s and 1940s that it gained a reputation as an Indian art school. Specifically, Dorothy Dunn established the Studio School of Indian painting. Many notable Indian artists were trained during this time and further pursued successful art careers. Some examples include Geronimo Cruz Montoya (San Juan Pueblo) and Pablita Velarde (Santa Clara Pueblo). Due to funding problems and low enrollment, the government closed the Santa Fe Indian School in 1962. Santa Fe Indian School students were transferred to the Albuquerque Indian School and surrounding public schools. The Institute of American

Indian Arts - an intertribal art school designed to attract high school and post-secondary students from across the nation, filled the void left by the closing of the Santa Fe Indian School.

Later, in an exertion of Indian self-determination, the All Indian Pueblos Council lobbied Congress to take over the Santa Fe school under the management of the nineteen pueblos of New Mexico. After a long struggle, classes resumed at the Santa Fe Indian School in 1981 with about 450 students. Today, the majority of students are from the surrounding pueblos with a small percentage from the Navajo and Apache tribes. The school is still a boarding school institution, but now most of the students go home on weekends. One of the school's strongest features is its relationship with parents and tribal communities. The Pueblo governors appoint a school board, which is responsible for policy-making and hiring decisions. Grades at the Santa Fe Indian school include seventh through twelfth. Today the curriculum includes math, physics, computer science, language arts, creative writing and college level reading. The Santa Fe Indian School has evolved significantly since its days of forcibly removing students from families and placing them in military style institutions. The Santa Fe Indian School remains a pivotal institution and educational training ground for the development of Indian students and their communities.

### **Navajo Reservation Trading Posts**

By Lauren Gray

Though the Spanish and later the Mexican government had their own delicate relationships with traders in the Southwest and New Mexico, the American trader has had arguably the greatest impact on Navajo indigenous economy, livelihood and culture. Over the past 150 years, the traders' presence has become widespread on the Navajo reservation.

Part III of the U.S. Treaty with the Navajos of 1849 states that the "Government of the said States having the sole and exclusive right of regulating the trade and intercourse with the said Navajoes, it is agreed that the laws now in force regulating the trade and intercourse, and for the preservation of peace with the various tribes of Indians under the protection and guardianship of the aforesaid Government, shall have the same force and efficiency, and shall be as binding and as obligatory upon the said Navajoes, and executed in the same manner, as if said laws had been passed for their sole benefit and protection; and to this end, and for all other useful purposes, the government of New Mexico, as now organized, or as it may be by the Government of the United States, or by the legally constituted authorities of the people of New Mexico, is recognized and acknowledged by the said Navajoes; and for the due enforcement of the aforesaid laws, until the Government of the United States shall otherwise order, the territory of the Navajoes is hereby annexed to New Mexico."

The first recorded incursion into Navajo country by government-sanctioned traders was in 1852. Individuals, or traders "in groups of twos and threes," slowly began the process of shaping the Navajo landscape and economy. The first permanent trading post was located at Bosque Redondo in 1865. In that same year, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs began issuing licenses for traders who wanted to set up shop on reservation land. To trade without a license issued by the government incurred severe penalties, and there were few cases of such illicit trading within the reservation. A \$500 fine and the confiscation of all trade goods accompanied this infraction.

Anglo-American traders have historically been involved with supplying the Navajo both on and off the reservation with articles that they could not produce themselves, namely, Anglo-American goods and food stuffs. The trader typically provided flour, coffee, sugar, salt, baking powder, and canned items, such as tomatoes, peaches, pears and corned beef. Commodities such as gum, candy, cookies, rice, cheese, etc. were also available at some trading posts. Velvet for the women's clothing was also stocked, as were shoes for men, women and children, hats, and horse gear (saddles, bridles, etc, though not in great abundance). "To put it simply," trader Walter Gibson said in 1994, recounting his days working at the Mexican Water, or Nakai Toh, trading post, "we traded goods, food stuffs, clothing, etc. for wool, lambs, hides, rugs and furs, during the winters."

Although trading posts provided a variety of goods, and services to the Navajo, legislation made it illegal to sell or trade weaponry (guns) and liquor (whiskey). However, these laws only impacted traders inside the Navajo reservation: there was no authority or legislation to prevent its sale or trade outside of the reservation.

1858 military accounts report that the Navajo still used bows and arrows during battle. However, by 1883, Indian Service Agent Dennis Riordan commented that the Indians “are all armed and well armed,” most with the new brand of Winchester rifles either provided by traders or stolen in raids.

Traders who operated outside the reservation were blamed for inciting the Navajo to leave in search of whiskey and guns, and because there were no laws against such outside trades, trading posts along the boundaries of the Navajo reservation sprang up in abundance. By 1889, approximately thirty trading posts were in operation on the Navajo reservation borders, with only nine traders operating inside the reservation.

After the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed in 1848, the United States began to occupy their newly won territory. The railroad enabled Anglo-American settlement, and military outposts were built to protect the new settlers. The military camps were generally good sources of whiskey and firearms that made their way into the various trade networks of New Mexico and the greater Southwest. The term “railroad Indian” was coined during this period and was associated with thievery, fornication, but most predominantly drunkenness. Many traders who operated specifically with Native Americans avoided selling whiskey, but others complained that they could not conduct a successful business enterprise without it.

Early on, many traders were seen only as sellers of liquor and firearms. However, as more stock items were added to the trade list, most traders began to refuse to sell or trade whiskey. Still, whiskey remained a high demand commodity on the reservation that was readily available from the military encampments outside the reservation. Aside from the whiskey and gun laws, there were few restrictions imposed on traders, especially those who also catered to Anglo-American customers. Supply and demand along with competition between traders usually provided effective regulation and generally superseded government legislation.

“Anyone can establish a trading post within a quarter of a mile [of the borders or agency] and be outside the control of the agent,” Agent Alex Irvine remarked in 1876. “And one party who has such a trading post informed me that no one could prevent his trading with the Indians and getting such prices as he pleased.” A system of barter and credit-line became prevalent in trader/Indian negotiations.

It became common practice for the Navajo to pawn their hand-made concho belts, silver bridles, bracelets and turquoise, and even guns for necessary items (food stuffs, etc) during the winter. In the spring they traded their sheep wool to regain their personal items, which were held by the trader for a period of six months or more. This was an accepted practice continuing well into the twentieth century. If the credit amassed during the winter was greater than the sum of the wool brought in during the spring, then the valuables were either kept, or an exorbitant interest fee was imposed on the Navajo. Before the cash economy became prevalent on the reservation, Navajo handmade arts and crafts were used to trade for staples at the trading posts. The concept of “trading” became entrenched in reservation culture and remains active on most reservations.

Agent C.E. Vandever commented in 1889 that “the proximity of trading posts has radically changed their native costumes and modified many of the earlier barbaric traits, and also affords them good markets for their wool, peltry, woven fabrics, and other products....Firearms have almost entirely superseded the primitive weapons, and silver ornaments of their own manufacture are worn instead of copper and brass....” While the material value of their goods may have increased, Vandever failed in most aspects to recognize the cultural impact of Anglo-American trading on Navajo culture and the inequality of transactions. The trading post as an institution on the reservation was the subject of a 1969 study done by eight Navajo college students working for Southwestern Indian Development, Inc. (SID). These students found that the gross annual income of traders operating on the Navajo reservation was approximately \$17,223,338. The average annual income of Navajo families that same year was \$1,500, well below the poverty line.

The impact of the trader has been hotly contested, with groups such as SID claiming the trader is solely responsible for Navajo poverty. In their 1969 study, SID attempted to understand the relationship between the practices of Navajo traders and the marketplace by interviewing both Anglo-American traders and their

Navajo clients. SID's results serve to illuminate the cultural difference inherent in the dynamics of trade as understood by the two groups.

As the role of the Anglo-American trader developed over time, their position as store keep and trader also came to include postmaster, banker, and creditor. SID found that the trader is often an unofficial contact to various government agencies including the Welfare Department. Oftentimes, the trader receives his customers' paychecks or government checks, and then distributes the funds accordingly. SID researchers found that some traders were guilty of exploiting their roles and had been known to withhold checks to force their customers to run up credit to the trader thus spending their pay before actually receiving it. This situation often locked Navajo people into a debt-relationship with the trader.

Certainly, not all traders were underhanded in their dealings with their Navajo clients and many were honorary family members who dealt fairly with the Navajo and went out of their way to help them when they could. Many traders became knowledgeable about Navajo culture and understood the value of retaining traditional Navajo culture. In June of 2000, Mark Winter, who currently leases the Toadlena trading post, hosted a rug display that he hoped would help to revitalize the Two Grey Hills weaving style of rugs, which was in jeopardy of becoming extinct. His efforts are typical of many traders, who see their livelihood dependent on the development and continuation of Indian culture. Winter encourages weavers to create the finest woven textiles that have value both as art pieces and as a continuation of Native culture. The trading posts and the traders rely on their Navajo customers for their own income and livelihood and the two are historic partners in areas that are often remote and isolated from the mainstream economy.

The trader Walter Gibson, writing about his experiences at the Mexican Water trading post, believed that the Navajo:

"were not only our customers; but also our friends. Through the years, we have accumulated some beautiful pieces of jewelry such as necklaces, beads and bracelets. We admire the artistic ability of these Navajo people. In addition, we greatly admire the talents of the silversmiths, weavers and other artists. However, as much as we cherish these items, they are secondary to our real treasures. That is, the memories of these people, the times, and events we shared with them, which will forever be in our hearts and minds."

On the reservation, when social contact is often limited because of the spatial distances, it is sentiments such as the one above that create a bond between the trader and his customers, affording them both a mutually beneficial relationship.

## **Matachines Dance**

(From the Introduction of The Matachines Dance by Sylvia Rodriguez)

The Matachines dance is a ritual drama performed on certain saint's days in Pueblo Indian and Mexicano/Hispano communities along the upper Rio Grande valley and elsewhere in the greater Southwest. The dance is characterized by two rows of masked male dancers wearing mitrelike hats with long, multicolored ribbons down the back. In the upper Rio Grande valley of New Mexico, these ten or twelve masked figures are accompanied by a young girl in white, who is paired with an adult male dancer wearing a floral corona. They are joined by another man or boy dressed as a bull and by two clowns. The crowned man dressed like the other dancers is known as Montezuma, or El Monarca, while his female child partner is called La Malinche. The dance is made up of several sets of movements accompanied by different tunes, usually played on a violin and guitar. The procession and recession that typically bracket it, takes roughly forty-five minutes.

Most scholars agree that the Matachines dance derives from a genre of medieval European folk dramas symbolizing conflict between Christians and Moors, brought to the New World by the Spaniards as a vehicle for Christianizing the Indians. Iberian elements merged with aboriginal forms in central Mexico, and the syncretic complex was transmitted to Indians farther north, including the Rio Grande Pueblos, probably via Mexican Indians who accompanied the Spanish colonizers. As performed today in the greater Southwest, the Matachines dance symbolically telescopes centuries of Iberian-American ethnic relations and provides a

shared framework upon which individual Indian and Hispanic communities have embroidered their own particular thematic variations.

The Matachines dance exhibits a distinctive choreographic and dramatic pattern in the upper Rio Grande valley and is generally considered to be identical among Indians and Mexicanos or Hispanos. Nevertheless, the ways in which these two major ethnic grouping perform and regard the dance differ significantly.

Both agree it is Christian rather than pagan or aboriginal, but most Pueblos claim the dance was brought to them from Mexico by Montezuma, who is portrayed in the dance by the figure of el Monarca. Hispanic villagers, on the other hand, attribute its introduction to colonizer don Juan de Onate, reconquest leader don Diego de Vargas, or Cortes himself, because the drama portrays the advent of Christianity among the Indians by referring to the expulsion or conversion of the Moors, a paradigm the Spanish colonizers instantly projected onto the conquest of the New World. The dance thus has historical but differential meaning for Indian and Hispano groups because the advent of Christianity in the region does not have the same meaning for those who brought it as for those it subjugated. The differences between Pueblo and Mexicano perspectives may be mapped through close comparative examination of local Matachines performances within and across traditions. The dance both joins and divides the ethnic groups.

## THE RIO GRANDE COMPLEX

The upper Rio Grande valley as referred to here consists of the length of the river that bisects the state of New Mexico from north to south, distinguishable from the lower Rio Grande valley, which runs along the Texas-Mexico border from El Paso to Brownsville. New Mexico became New Spain's far northern frontier during the sixteenth century, when conquistadors and colonists followed the river to Taos, northernmost of the eastern pueblos, and began to establish missions and settlements along this corridor. The frontier colonial society that developed during the next three hundred years involved miscegenation as well as segregation of Hispanic and Indian populations and persistence of the social and territorial boundaries between them. Despite massive demographic reductions and shifts, nineteen of the more than one hundred pueblos existing at the time of contact survived into the late twentieth century. Most of the Rio Grande pueblos are surrounded by clusters of colonial and subsequent Mexicano settlements that coalesced upon the New Mexican landscape during four centuries of mutual opposition, growing interdependence, and, finally, separate enclavement within the U. S. nation-state.

Although the New Mexico Matachines dance shares a number of choreographic, dramatic, and symbolic elements with the dance elsewhere in the greater Southwest and Mexico, it nevertheless exhibits its own characteristic configuration. Thus it is possible and appropriate to speak of a distinctive upper Rio Grande Matachines dance complex. The most basic or universal dramatic elements of the Rio Grande Matachines performance involve several dance sets by the characters El Monarca and La Malinche, an exchange of trident (palma) and rattle (guaje) between them, a variable combination of choreographic interweavings, crossovers, and reversals between the two columns of dancers, a movement involving El Toro-the bull-and his ultimate demise, and processional and recessional marchas at the beginning and end. The clowns, known as Los Abuelos (the grand-fathers), function as conductors and provide comic relief throughout the proceedings.

The Matachines dancers, also referred to as matachines or danzantes, are distinctively costumed. Their mitrelike headdresses, or cupiles, with ribbons streaming down the back and fringe in the front, are their signature symbol. The mask consists of the band of fringe (fleco) over the eyes and a folded kerchief over the lower face. Each danzante carries the palma in his left hand and the guaje in his right. Large colorful scarves hang like capes from the backs of their shoulders. They move in two parallel rows of five or six dancers each.

El Monarca dresses like the danzantes but wears a floral corona instead of a cupil, and often white lace leggings (fundas) over his pants from the knees down. He is paired with La Malinche, a preadolescent girl in a First Holy Communion dress. El Toro is a male animal-dancer with horns and forestick(s), played in some villages by a grown man, in others by a young boy. These three characters and the danzantes are accompanied by the Abuelos, usually two masked figures who move about freely, joke or clown, interact with and keep back the audience, and generally direct the proceedings. The number and personality of the Abuelos varies from village to village, as does the prominence of the bull.

The dance sets may occur in different orders and combinations in different villages. Despite this diversity, the performance tradition within each community is said to remain fairly stable, although a careful observer will see situational variation and improvisation from year to year. Any given version contains usually from seven to nine sets. Their choreographic patterns and motifs correspond very broadly to the formats diagrammed by Gertrude Kurath on the basis of a sample of twelve Old and New World societies.

The music for the Matachines dance is typically performed by a fiddler and a guitarist. Several melodies and approximately nine dances have been identified for the Rio Grande Matachines. The tunes tend to be short, varying from four to twenty measures in length, and subject to multiple repetitions. Most are done in duple or triple count and feature conventional harmonies in dominant and tonic chords on the guitar, while the fiddle carries the melodic line in A or D. Percussive effects are added by the dancers' rattles and foot stamping and in some cases by a drum.

Many communities hold the Matachines dance at Christmas, although some do it in the summer, and at least three villages-Arroyo Seco, Alcalde, and El Rancho-have danced it in both seasons. As shall be seen, Jemez Pueblo does the dance on December 12, el dia de Guadalupe, and again on New Year's Day, and Hispanic Bernalillo performs the dance on its feast day of San Lorenzo, August 10. As a rule, Pueblo Matachines dances occur in the winter, whereas Hispanic Matachines may take place during either winter or summer. Some Hispanic villages, such as Alcalde and El Rancho, have dance troupes that perform at home on an annual cycle as well as in other places for special occasions. Pueblo Matachines somewhat resemble the Pueblo social dances, also usually performed in winter, when outside groups are parodied.

Among the Pueblo Indians, such as those of Taos, the dance enjoys religious designation while not being considered fully sacred in the "aboriginal" sense. One indication of this is that some Pueblos will allow the Matachines dance to be photographed, whereas their indigenous sacred dances cannot. Pueblo Matachines performances tend to be organized by tribal officers or kiva groups, while in Hispanic villages it is Catholic mayordomos and certain families who carry the burden. In most pueblos the dance involves the recruitment of Mexicano musicians, dancers, and/or Penitente rezadores, or prayer sayers, whereas Mexicano performances do not as a rule involve Indians. Santa Clara and Jemez pueblos perform "Indian" versions of the dance, featuring Indian costumes with moccasins, along with chanting and drumming. The degree to which costumes are embellished with elements that denote specific ethnic and religious meanings varies widely from village to village.

Along the upper Rio Grande valley, the Matachines dance has been incorporated into the annual ritual calendars of San Ildefonso, Tortugas, Santa Clara, Jemez, Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Juan, Picuris, and Taos pueblos and is performed in the Mexicano villages of Alcalde, Bernalillo, San Antonio, San Antonito, Escobosa, Sedillo, Canocito, Chilili, Carnuel, El Rancho, and Arroyo Seco (the list is not exhaustive). In all these pueblos and villages the sequence of acts, the tunes, the personalities, the dramatic embellishments, the overall style, and the precise manner in which the performers and festive occasions are organized vary markedly from one community to another.

## **Hogan**

In the Four Corners region of the state, the traditional houses of the Diné (Navajo) dot the landscape. While styles vary across time periods and are influenced by available materials, a hogan almost always opens to the East to greet the sun, and is most commonly a one-room circular structure built of wood and mud (and sometimes stone). Most also have a hole in the roof, to allow smoke from an interior fire to escape. Because the Diné people would typically abandon a dwelling after the death of a family member, or to move on to new grazing areas, hogans are not necessarily built to be permanent structures.

There are two types of hogans: male and female. Male hogans are used for ceremonies and tending to the sick; the female hogan is a center of domestic life. This is where a family eats, cooks, sleeps, and gathers. Though these structures are still a common sight in northwestern New Mexico, most hogans built today are for ceremonial purposes; relatively few Navajo considered them a primary dwelling by the late 20th century.

## **Ohkay Owingeh**

by William H. Wroth

Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, named Pueblo de San Juan de los Caballeros by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century, is a Tewa-speaking village twenty-five miles north of Santa Fe, on the Rio Grande just north of the confluence with the Chama River. In the traditional history of Ohkay Owingeh ("Place of the Strong People") the ancestors are said to have emerged from a lake in the north, hence a sipapu or place of emergence from the under world. The lake is often said to have been in southern Colorado, near the great sand dunes of the San Luis valley. The Tewa people after emergence traveled south making settlements on both sides of the Rio Grande, and at the site of Ohkay Owingeh they built two villages one on each side of the river, probably about 1200 A.D. Directly across from Ohkay Owingeh was Yungé Owingeh ("Mockingbird Place") on the west side of the Rio Grande.

In 1598 Juan de Oñate listed eleven Tewa-speaking villages. Today seven still survive; in addition to Ohkay Owingeh, are Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, and Tesuque. There is also a group of Tewa-speaking Tanos from the Galisteo Basin who were displaced by Diego de Vargas in the Reconquest and by 1701 had established themselves among the Hopis at First Mesa where they still live and are known today as the Hopi-Tewas.

The people of Ohkay Owingeh first encountered Europeans when the Francisco Vásquez de Coronado expedition came to New Mexico in 1541, but no doubt hearing of the rapacious behavior of Coronado and his men, the people fled into the mountains when the expedition came and set up camp near their village. The exploring expedition of Gaspar Castaño de Sosa briefly visited Ohkay Owingeh in 1591, but it was the colonizing expedition of Juan de Oñate in 1598 which brought the full force of the Spanish presence to the village. After living at Ohkay Owingeh for a while, which he first named San Juan Bautista, then renamed San Juan de los Caballeros, Oñate chose to make Yungé Owingeh the capital of the new Spanish colony of New Mexico, naming it San Gabriel de Yungé. Oñate forced or convinced the inhabitants of Yungé to relocate to Ohkay, and the settlers and soldiers from Mexico moved into their former homes, a Pueblo house block of some 400 apartments. They renovated Yungé according to European tastes, such as the addition of wooden doorways and window frames. Oñate's main purpose in colonizing New Mexico was to discover gold and silver mines as rich as or richer than those of his home in Zacatecas. When he discovered nothing of value and the harsh reality of life in New Mexico became apparent, he resigned under fire for his poor leadership and in 1607 returned to Mexico. The capital of New Mexico was moved in 1608 from San Gabriel de Yungé to its present site at Santa Fe.

In the decades that followed, the people of Ohkay Owingeh, like other Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, suffered under an oppressive Spanish rule in which they were conscripted into forced labor, required to pay demanding taxes in goods, and their religious activities were suppressed. By the 1670s there was a great deal of discontent amongst the Pueblo peoples which came to a head in 1675 when 47 Pueblo religious leaders were jailed in Santa Fe and were subjected to whipping for practicing their religion, viewed by the Spaniards as idolatry. Four of the men were hanged. Among those who were released was a medicine man, as the Spanish documents characterize him, from Ohkay Owingeh named Popay (Popé) who soon became the leader of the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680. Popay moved to Taos Pueblo and began plotting with confederates from other Pueblos to drive the Hispanic settlers out of New Mexico.

Soon a well-coordinated effort, which included the support of Ohkay Owingeh and other Tewa villages, was launched in August 1680. The intent was to kill the missionaries and destroy the churches at each Pueblo, and to kill any settlers who resisted and did not evacuate their settlements and leave New Mexico. As soon as the rebellion broke out, the Hispanic settlers in the Santa Cruz de la Cañada valley and other settlements close to Ohkay Owingeh abandoned their farms and assembled at the home of the Santa Cruz alcalde mayor. They then retreated en masse to Santa Fe, after which the Tewas from Ohkay Owingeh and other nearby Pueblos destroyed their houses and chapels. After the Spanish retreat to El Paso, Tewa-speaking Tano Indians from the Pueblos of San Cristóbal and San Lázaro in the Galisteo basin moved north to the Santa Cruz River valley to be close to their linguistic kin at Ohkay Owingeh and to re-establish themselves in a more fertile and safer area.

After several unsuccessful attempts by Spanish forces to re-conquer New Mexico, Diego de Vargas and his



forces marched north in 1692, and most of the Pueblos submitted to Spanish rule. However, by 1696 dissatisfaction had again come to a head. In March 1696 Fray Gerónimo Prieto at Ohkay Owingeh wrote to Vargas asking for military protection. He said that Pueblo leaders, including those from Hopi, Zuni, and Acoma, were on their way to San Juan under the pretense of coming to trade; but actually were meeting to plot a rebellion. In June 1696 the second Pueblo Rebellion began with many of the Pueblo villages participating, including Taos, Picuris, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Ohkay Owingeh, and the other Tewa and Tano Pueblos. The rebels killed five missionaries and 21 soldiers and settlers and burned several of the mission churches before fleeing into the mountains. In 1697 Vargas succeeded in subduing the rebellion among the eastern Pueblos. Ohkay Owingeh again submitted to Spanish rule, but the Tanos of the Santa Cruz valley fled westward and by 1701 had established themselves among the Hopis at First Mesa where they still live and are known today as the Hopi-Tewas.

By 1706 if not earlier, a new church was under construction at Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo with the Franciscan friar, Fray José Antonio de Torres, in residence. Through the eighteenth century it served as the religious center for the newly established and re-established Hispanic communities in the area. Little is known of this church, but in the 1740s Fray Juan José Pérez de Mirabel directed its renovation and enlargement or the construction of an entirely new church at Ohkay Owingeh. In the late 1800s this church was extensively renovated by the French priest Father Camilo Seux, and a new stone chapel in neo-gothic style dedicated to Our Lady of Lourdes was completed in 1890. The old church was finally torn down and replaced in 1912 by a brick neo-gothic church still in use today.

In the eighteenth century the Spanish authorities, both religious and political, realized that the 1680 rebellion had been caused in great part by their harsh treatment of the Indians, and after the Re-conquest they adopted a much more lenient attitude. Forced labor and tribute were no longer permitted, and the large haciendas which demanded Indian workers were replaced by smaller family-operated farms. Indigenous religious rites were no longer suppressed by the missionaries. Ohkay Owingeh and the other Pueblos were able to practice both their traditional religion and Catholicism in an accommodated blending of the two. Many of the traditional religious ceremonial dances at Ohkay Owingeh, such as the Deer Dance and the Cloud Dance, were allowed and are still performed today.

Although conditions were better, Ohkay Owingeh in the 1700s was surrounded by growing Hispanic communities while its own population was in decline. In 1776 Father Francisco Atanasio Domínguez listed the Pueblo's population as 201 individuals and 623 Hispanos living in neighboring communities. In 1781 a serious smallpox epidemic hit northern New Mexico and took the lives of about one-third of the population of Ohkay Owingeh. The census of 1810 showed the Pueblo's population back up to 200, but the neighboring Hispano communities now totaled 1733. However, relations between the people of Ohkay Owingeh and their neighbors have generally been good. In the 1700s Hispanos and Pueblo members cooperated in facing attacks by the nomadic tribes, with the men of Ohkay Owingeh and other Pueblos providing large numbers of troops. Truces were made, usually in the late summer and fall, so that trading fairs could be held with all the tribes. San Juan became an important trading center, not only for Pueblos and Hispanos but also for nomadic tribes, such as the Utes and the Navajos, especially in the late 1700s when the threat of nomadic raiding had abated.

In 1820 during the last months of the Spanish government, the Pueblo Indians were given full citizenship and were allowed to install their own municipal governments in each Pueblo. This prerogative was honored in the period of Mexican rule, 1821 to 1846, and in the American period after 1846. However, in the Mexican period, Pueblo lands, including those of Ohkay Owingeh, were under threat. The philosophy of classical eighteenth-century liberalism enshrined in the Mexican constitution of 1824 held that communal lands impeded individual liberties, were often not well utilized, and should be distributed to individual owners. In at least one case Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo was successful in averting the sale of its lands. In 1825 Governor Antonio Narbona rejected a petition by Hispanic settlers for portions of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo lands. The land issue, as well as the threat of newly enforced tax laws, contributed to the short-lived Rebellion of 1837 launched by both Hispanos and Pueblo Indians, in which members of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo participated.

The American occupation brought a change in sovereignty but did little to ameliorate Pueblo land problems until the twentieth century. The American view of Indian land in the nineteenth century was similar to that of the Mexican government. The alienation of Pueblo lands was achieved through the courts with the premise that Spanish land grants to the Pueblo Indians were legally distinct from the reservation lands of other tribes,

which were protected by treaties with the federal government. Pueblo lands were allowed to be sold by a U. S. Supreme Court ruling in 1876 but in 1913, the Court reversed this ruling, stating that the Pueblo lands had to be protected in the same manner as other Indian lands. The result of this ruling was that Pueblo land could no longer be sold, and that squatters on Pueblo lands were subject to eviction.

To protect long established communities of non-Indians on these lands, New Mexico Senator Holm Bursum introduced the so-called "Bursum Bill" which would have given clear title to virtually all squatters on Pueblo lands, thus alienating the land from the Indians and opening it to development. Fortunately this bill was defeated in Congress, and the much more favorable United States Pueblo Lands Board Act was passed in 1924. The Pueblo Lands Board Act made it very difficult for outsiders to gain title to Pueblo lands and served to extinguish many of the land claims against the Pueblos. For land claims that were approved, the Pueblos were financially compensated. In effect it meant that many squatters could not gain title through adverse possession and could be legally removed from Pueblo lands. At Ohkay Owingeh squatters had at some point in the nineteenth century re-settled the long-abandoned San Gabriel de Yungé, an integral part of the lands belonging to the Pueblo. In the 1920s these squatters were finally removed by joint action of the San Juan Pueblo council and the United States Pueblo Lands Board.

With the settling of land issues, improvements in health and education, the people of Ohkay Owingeh gradually entered the economy and way of life of twentieth-century America. They were able to do this and still maintain their traditional culture and worldview. Their ability to live comfortably in both worlds continues to the present day. For example, a recently completed affordable housing project, Tsigo bugeh Village, at the Pueblo was developed in sharp contrast to the typical federal government project imposed on Ohkay Owingeh and many other Indian communities in the past. Traditional concerns such as sacred geography, spatial directions and orientation, and maintaining ceremonial pathways were taken into account in the planning that was based upon the expressed views and needs of community members. And finally in December 2005 the tribal council formally changed the name from San Juan Pueblo back to Ohkay Owingeh, the name by which the people themselves have always called their home from long before Europeans came to the Southwest.

### **Repatriation from New Mexico to Northern Chihuahua**

by Samuel Sisneros

In 1849, following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, more than 150 families from central and southern Texas, a small group from California, close to 4,000 people from Nuevo México, along with approximately seven hundred people from the present El Paso Lower Valley (Socorro, Ysleta and San Elizario), chose to retain their Mexican citizenship and emigrate. They followed the receding and consequently redrawn border dividing México and the United States and crossed over to the Republic of México.

The emigration from New Mexico including the El Paso Lower Valley resulted in the founding of several border colonies in northern Chihuahua, México, which included present-day southern New Mexico. The emigrants established the towns of La Mesilla, Refugio de los Amoles and Santo Tomás de Iturbide, which are located in present day Doña Ana county in New Mexico, Guadalupe and San Ignacio which are located 40 to 50 miles down river from Ciudad Juárez in the state of Chihuahua, México.

As the land changed ownership, the emigrants left their patria chica or regional community and took to the road to resettle in unfamiliar and vacant land. Doing so, they made a physical protest, voting with their feet in favor of their Madre Patria or nation state. They sided with their metaphorical parents (madre "mother" and patria "father"), represented in their authority figures or in their larger nationalistic identity. To the repatriates, even though they relocated to México, they had never left Mexican soil.

The unique relationship between Mexico and those that were living in what is now the southwestern United States particularly in New Mexico was demonstrated by the actions of the Mexican peace commissioners. They rejected the first draft of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo partly because the government of México was not willing to consider U.S. annexation of the department of Nuevo México. The commissioners stated that Nuevomexicanos were not interested in becoming citizens of the United States. Additionally, during the treaty ratifications, Luis de la Rosa, Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, was quoted as arguing that the

Republic of México should not abandon New Mexico. Referring to the Texas-Santa Fé Expedition of 1841, he honored the New Mexicans by claiming:

These worthy and dignified Mexicans should not be sold like a herd of sheep, who being misfortunate and without any protection, put aside their inconveniences and rising against the invaders (United States) spilled their own blood so that they may continue to be part of the Mexican family.

Because of military pressure in Mexico City by General Winfield Scott's invading troops along with the belief that the United States was going to take over the entire country, México was forced to agree to the final version of the treaty proposed by the United States. Although Mexican officials knew that signing the treaty meant giving up half of the country's territory and the citizens residing therein, they chose to end the war and salvage what dignity and territory they could.

The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo especially affected Nuevomexicanos because New Mexico was the most populated area of northern México lost to the U.S. Some of the articles in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo were designed to provide the conquered Mexican population some assurance of citizenship including civil, religious, and property rights. Article VIII dealt with the citizen's right to choose within one year whether they wanted to remain Mexican citizens and repatriate or become U.S. citizens. The provisions in this Article stipulating repatriation to México are as follows:

Mexicans now established in the territories previously belonging to México, and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present Treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside, or to remove at any time to the Mexican Republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof and removing the proceeds wherever they please; without their being subjected, on this account, to any contribution, tax or charge whatever.

Those who shall prefer to remain in the said territories, may either retain the title and the rights of Mexican citizens, or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But, they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty: and those who shall remain in the said territories, after the expiration of that year without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States.

Immediately after signing the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, México initiated a series of decrees and laws that provided for the repatriation of its citizens which included selecting a commissioner of emigration to recruit emigrants. The recruitment and repatriation by Padre Ramón Ortiz initially gained acceptance with the Nuevomexicano populace and territorial officials and many New Mexican signed up to repatriate. But soon after the operation began, it met with conflict from the U.S. authorities. The New Mexico territorial government did not follow through but instead set up a series of obstacles. Despite these obstacles, the repatriation took place, though not as effectively as Mexican officials had anticipated.

The emigrants began their long journey in 1849, one year after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. They must have felt a sense of loss, not only because they were leaving some of their family members and their rural communities behind, but also because they were seeing, perhaps for the last time, the Cerro de Tomé, which has traditionally been a landmark hill with social and spiritual importance. As they looked to the east, they may have wondered if they would ever again see the majestic Manzano Mountains, which were always green with piñon, juniper (sabino) and pine forests. Herding their animals and carrying their belongings on horseback and on carretas (wagons), they looked onward not knowing if they would ever return and uncertain of the odyssey that lay ahead.

They continued through the bosque or wooded area along the river and onto the Camino Real, the same ancient royal highway that many of their ancestors traveled back and forth from Mexico. After traveling some fifty miles, the distance between Tomé and Socorro, approximately two days on horseback, burros or carretas, they joined the repatriates from Socorro, New Mexico. Perhaps after resting their livestock they then embarked on their long journey to northern Chihuahua. This arid area of southern New Mexico spans some two hundred and fifty miles and includes the Jornada del Muerto, "Journey of Death," a ninety-two mile stretch of the Camino Real that was waterless, desolate, and dangerous due to Apache attacks. The entire trip from Tomé to Mesilla and El Paso del Norte Valley, required nearly ten days of travel.

Upon arrival in the stretch of land between La Mesilla and El Paso del Norte, the repatriates, like other

Nuevomexicanos who made the trip south before them, must have marveled at the shapes of the Organ Mountains or at the contour lines created by time and erosion as they came upon the dry and rocky mountains known today as the Franklin Mountain range north of modern day El Paso, Texas. On the other side of the river they probably looked upon the Sierra de Juárez, the backdrop for El Paso del Norte and its mission church. This international mountain range marks the end of the great Rocky Mountains. The Mesilla Valley and the El Paso del Norte bosque oasis that lay below would soon be their refuge and new home.

Entering the community of Doña Ana, they would have met with residents who were contemplating repatriation themselves. A year later they too abandoned their lands in the Doña Ana Bent Colony emigrated across the river, where they founded the colonies of La Mesilla, Santo Tomás de Iturbide, and Refugio de los Amoles. The latter two are now called Berino and Vado, in Doña Ana County, New Mexico. These emigrants, who by 1852 totaled approximately 2000, had an entirely different emigration experience than those from the Río Abajo area.

The Mesilla Valley was still contested land claimed by both México and the U.S. The New Mexico 1850 territorial census (taken December 19) included the town of Mesilla (spelled Macia) and listed a population of 714 individuals. Just five months later, on May 23, 1851, the State of Chihuahua also conducted a census of Mesilla. The census listed 1,210 residents which indicated that there was a large continuous emigration from Doña Ana to Mesilla. As impressive as it was the emigration to Mesilla soon came to an end. As a result of the 1854 Gadsden Purchase, the U.S. bought this contested strip of land from México, and it became part of southern New Mexico. The residents once again found themselves citizens of the U.S.

Although some of the Río Abajo Nuevomexicano emigrants may have stayed in Doña Ana, joining the residents in their later repatriation to La Mesilla, many continued the journey south to the El Paso del Norte Valley. Perhaps in Doña Ana, they were met and cheered by Padre Ramón Ortiz, whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction included the Mesilla Valley or by Guadalupe Miranda, the new commissioner of emigration, and also a repatriate from northern New Mexico.

They soon joined their long-lost relatives who were descendants of those northern New Mexico refugees who did not return to New Mexico in 1692 with the De Vargas Reconquista but stayed and formed the villages of Socorro, Ysleta del Sur, and those presently incorporated into modern day Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua: El Paso del Norte, San Lorenzo and Senecú.

Perhaps in gratitude for arriving in the great oasis of El Paso del Norte, they entered into the mission church of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe to give thanks to their God and also to their patroness, the Mother of México. Like the Nuevomexicano refugees during the Pueblo Revolt, they too sought sanctuary in the area, this time not as people escaping the Pueblo Indian uprising, but as emigrants evading the United States' cultural and political intrusion and military occupation. They had arrived in the new land, escaping down the Camino Real, taking the course of less resistance.

The El Paso del Norte municipal government conducted a census of Guadalupe and San Ignacio (today Praxedis G. Guerrero) in 1852 which gave a clear picture of the makeup of the original emigrants from New Mexico. They totaled 550 persons a total of 114 families from New Mexico. The 1852 census of the two colonies discloses that 336 persons in Guadalupe listed New Mexico as their place of birth. The neighboring colony of San Ignacio was almost entirely populated by Nuevomexicanos; 214 out of 232 residents (forty out of fifty-two families) were from Nuevo México. These numbers might appear insignificant considering that they represent a mass autonomous political exodus. Dwarfing these numbers even more is the fact that the overall population of New Mexico was well over 60,000. But taking into account the population of a typical village of that time, a comparison can be made to the desertion of an entire town. Adding to the population in the new colonies was an equal number of repatriates from the San Elizario area. Therefore, the impact of an increased population in the new border colonies was significant.

The censuses also revealed that the emigrants from New Mexico originated primarily from Río Abajo villages most of which were precincts of the larger towns of Tomé and Socorro, or Socorrito as it was called in the Guadalupe census. The diminutive Socorrito (little Socorro) was used in the census to distinguish it from Socorro, Texas, which is today a precinct of the modern city of El Paso, Texas. Indeed, as we shall see, the population of Socorro, New Mexico, was half of that of Socorro, Texas, in the late 1840s. In the new Chihuahua colonies the Nuevomexicanos continued their regional ties by settling with those who came from

their same communities. Those from the Tomé area primarily settled in San Ignacio and those from Socorro area were among the founding families of Guadalupe.

Coming from all social and economic classes in New Mexico, the emigrants initially replicated social and economic relationships they had known back in the Río Abajo. The ricos maintained their elite social roles as political officials, ranchers, and merchants. The pobres continued to survive as farmers (labradores) and servants. There was a system of dependency with the rich relying on the poor who were trapped in debt servitude. These same dynamics were revealed almost immediately in the social and political machinations of the Chávez and the Otero families, who, as in New Mexico, continued their long-standing relationship in the new colonies.

Miguel Antonio Otero, a member of the rico families from Manzano, New Mexico, continued his role of political official in Guadalupe where he became Commissioner of Irrigation, responsible for overseeing the system of community canals or acequias used for irrigation of crops and pastureland. Miguel Antonio Otero's descendants still live in a colony outside of San Ignacio, originally called Plaza de los Oteros but known today as Plazitas. Maybe even more important in the formation of the colonies was Father José Antonio Otero, Miguel Otero's brother. Father Otero, who also repatriated, was educated under the famous Mexican patriot, Padre Antonio Martínez of Taos. The Otero's were wealthy and well connected to people of power in New Mexico during and after the U.S. occupation. Miguel and Padre Otero were cousins to Don Miguel Antonio Otero I, an aristocratic leader and New Mexico delegate to the U.S. Congress (1855-1861). His son, Miguel Antonio Otero II, was territorial Governor of New Mexico. Both Oteros, senior and junior, were influential in the initial quest for New Mexico's statehood.

The Chávez family legacy in the colonies and their connections in New Mexico were equally as impressive as that of the Otero family. Gerónimo Chávez and Bárbara Vallejos became the progenitors of the Chávez legacy in Guadalupe, which further extended into the El Paso del Norte area. Gerónimo Chávez was the brother of Francisco Xavier Chávez, the first Governor of the Departamento de Nuevo México under the independent Republic of México in 1823. Francisco Xavier Chávez's sons also made their marks in the history of New Mexico and México; two were New Mexican Governors. Mariano José held the office in 1835, and José in 1845. Another son, Tomás, became a prominent lawyer in Durango, México.

Given the connections that these prominent Chávez men had with the Chávez emigrants, it is apparent that the Gerónimo Chavez clan decision to repatriate was influenced by a political and economic stronghold in Nuevo México and in the interior of México. The Gerónimo Chávez family was among the elite in Los Padillas, just south of Albuquerque. Among the descendants of Gerónimo Chavez who emigrated were Francisco Chávez, Antonio Chávez, José Chávez, and Padre José Vicente Chávez. Their position in New Mexican society assured the continuity of the families' class status in northern Chihuahua.

Although the Chavez and the Otero clans were the most prosperous of the repatriates other families, in most cases connected to them by marriage, political loyalties or by debt servitude, also found their way to the new settlements. Not all were from Río Abajo rather some were from northern New Mexico who had married into Río Abajo families and settled in either of the two Río Abajo zones prior to the emigration. Among these colonizers were the Campos brothers, Ruperto and Francisco. Both were born in Santa Fé and the latter was an Alferez or military sergeant in Nuevo México. Another unexpected emigrant was Carlos Prais (Charles Price), an Anglo-American merchant whose place of origin was listed as Estados Unidos. Also the blacksmith brothers José and Juan Antonio Trujillo brought their trade to San Ignacio from Belén. In Guadalupe, Manuel Calles from Tomé was a sastre (tailor) and Antonio Silva, also from Tomé, was a carpenter. The latter appears to be the same Antonio Silva who is credited with carving the saints still hanging in the Immaculate Conception church in Tomé, Nuevo México. Don Joaquín Bazán was a scribe in Río Abajo before he repatriated to Guadalupe and became a county secretary. Bazán and his parents were recruited from the interior of México, as master weavers, to go to northern Nuevo México to teach their craft. It is not known if Bazán continued as a weaver while he served in his political occupation in Guadalupe. Another immigrant who was the most famous of historical figures at the time of the U.S. invasion was Juan Bautista Vigil y Alarid, the last Mexican governor of the territory of New Mexico. He lived in the colonies for ten years before returning to Santa Fe.

The repatriates joined together at a place that became their new home. There was a drastic movement which resulted from U.S. military occupation, war and subsequent peace treaty. The repatriation brought into

fruition Article VII of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The migration and colonization was both a continuation and a fractionalization of a long established community. It was a demonstration of an act of defiance to the U.S occupation of their homeland and an active symbol of allegiance towards the nation of Mexico as the repatriates declared their intentions to "retain the character of Mexicans."

### **1861 - Civil War Comes to New Mexico**

by William H. Wroth

New Mexico may seem far away from the traditional idea of where the American Civil War took place, and in fact the battles in the Southwest are still little known today outside of the region, but they were of great strategic importance in the course of the war. President Jefferson Davis realized that the Territory of New Mexico, which at that time included Arizona, would provide the Confederacy, not only with a huge territory with great economic potential, but also with access to California with its gold resources and its Pacific seaports. Also victory in New Mexico would be a step towards gaining control of Colorado and its gold and silver mines. In short the Confederates saw the conquest of New Mexico as a necessary prelude to taking control of the American west.

In July 1861 soon after the beginning of the war, the Second Regiment of Texas Mounted Rifles, under the leadership of Lieutenant-Colonel John R. Baylor, marched from San Antonio, Texas to El Paso and then to Mesilla, New Mexico where the Confederate forces were increased by five companies of Arizona volunteer cavalry. Taking possession of Mesilla without opposition (many citizens were supporters of the Southern cause), the Texas Mounted Rifles encamped nearby and were soon challenged by Union troops under Major Isaac Lynde at Fort Fillmore. A brief battle took place on July 26 in which the Union troops were worsted and had to retreat to the fort. Lynde, fearing disloyalty among his men (who, among other grievances, hadn't been paid for ten months), immediately ordered withdrawal from Fort Fillmore, and the Union forces began a long march over the desert towards Fort Stanton. Baylor took possession of Fort Fillmore and set out with some of his troops after the retreating Union forces. When he caught up with them near San Augustin Springs, they were in desperate condition from the heat and lack of water. Lynde felt he had no choice but to surrender, over the protests of many of his officers. Nearly 500 troops surrendered to Baylor's much smaller force of 200. Lynde was accused of cowardice for abandoning Fort Fillmore and surrendering his command, which led also to the subsequent abandonment of Fort Stanton. He was summarily dismissed from the Army, but soon after the war he was reinstated.

In August 1861 Baylor announced the establishment of the Confederate Territory of Arizona, which consisted of the southern halves of today's New Mexico and Arizona, and appointed himself governor and Mesilla the capital. In Tucson, Confederate sympathies were also strong; the citizenry formally declared allegiance to the Confederacy in the same month. In February 1862 the Territory of Arizona was formally recognized by the Confederate government of Jefferson Davis. As governor of the Confederate Territory of Arizona Baylor began a series of attacks on the Apache Indians and was said to have killed a large number of them on a raid into Chihuahua. In Texas Baylor had been a notorious Indian fighter and was implicated in the murder of Indian Agent Robert S. Neighbors, who had been an unpopular advocate of fair treatment for Texas Indians. In New Mexico in March 1862 Baylor issued a letter ordering the extermination of the Apaches, speaking of his "unsparing hatred of a relentless, merciless, and treacherous foe, and a natural desire to see them utterly driven from the face of the earth." When, months later, after his withdrawal to Texas, the Confederate government in Richmond learned of his order, Baylor was relieved of both his civil and military command, stripped of his rank and cashiered from the army.

While Baylor had defeated the Union forces at Mesilla, he could do little more to advance the Confederate cause in the Southwest, with such a small force, even with the addition of local volunteers. However, in December 1861 Brigadier-General Henry H. Sibley raised a force of more than 2500 men in San Antonio and marched to Mesilla, then headed north toward Fort Craig, which was under command of Colonel Edward R. S. Canby (ironically, he was Sibley's brother-in-law). In February, 1862 Sibley's troops came within a mile of the fort, which was defended by 1250 regular Army troops and 1350 New Mexico volunteers and militia. Sibley realized it was too well fortified to be taken by force, so he decided to bypass the fort and cut off its communications with Union military headquarters in Santa Fe. He retreated down the Rio Grande seven miles to Paraje, crossing to the east bank and headed north, intending to cross at Valverde Crossing six

miles above Fort Craig.

When Canby realized Sibley's intention, on February 21 he sent cavalry forces under command of Colonel Benjamin S. Roberts to Valverde, followed by the artillery. By midday the Union forces had crossed the river and it appeared that they would prevail. Following a brave but disastrous charge by Rebel lancers in which many of them were killed, Confederate Colonel Thomas Green launched an all-out attack on the Union artillery. In ferocious fighting the artillery was over-run. At this time Canby ordered Kit Carson's hastily-assembled New Mexico Volunteers to counterattack, but they failed to do so effectively, and the Union forces had to retreat to Fort Craig. After the battle, in court-martial proceedings, Canby blamed the volunteers for failing to support the artillery, saying that many of them disobeyed orders, resulting in many deaths of Union troops. Most of those accused were Hispanic officers and their men, many of whom were found guilty of disobedience of orders, mutiny, and related charges. However, it is likely that these volunteers were made scapegoats by Canby for the heavy Union losses during the battle. Union casualties at Valverde amounted to 222 men killed and wounded, while the Confederates lost 183. Sibley's forces with great loss of life had won the battle and continued on north to Albuquerque and Santa Fe.

Sibley was able to conquer both Albuquerque and Santa Fe with little resistance and his next goal in March 1862 was Fort Union, the only Union outpost between the Confederate forces and the gold and silver mines of Colorado. Sibley had an added advantage in his New Mexico campaign: as a U. S. Army officer prior to the Civil War (he resigned his commission and joined the Confederacy in May 1861), he had been stationed in New Mexico and in fact had been commander of Fort Union in the late 1850s. His firsthand knowledge of the terrain and the plan of the fort (he had supervised construction of its arsenal and storage buildings only a few years previously) gave his men confidence of an easy victory. From Santa Fe the only logical route through the Sangre de Cristo mountains to Fort Union was through Glorieta Pass. On March 21 Sibley sent Major Charles L. Pyron with a force of 500 men, both cavalry and artillery, towards Glorieta Pass.

At Fort Union the 800 regular Army troops were mostly Anglo-American and Hispanic New Mexican volunteers. They had just been reinforced by 1000 Colorado Volunteers who had joined up in Denver and in two weeks had marched 400 miles to the fort, covering the last 100 miles in less than two days. Colonel John Slough, commander of the volunteers, advocated an aggressive advance to meet the Confederates before they approached the fort, and he led 1000 men towards Glorieta Pass, setting up camp at Kozlowski's Ranch on the east side of the pass. On March 26, under the command of Major John M. Chivington (later of Sand Creek massacre notoriety), a smaller force reconnoitered the pass and engaged Pyron's men in the Battle of Apache Canyon, a bloody encounter for both sides, ending with the Confederates retreating to the west. On March 28 the Confederates were reinforced by the arrival of Colonel W. R. Scurry's Fourth Texas Mounted Volunteers. They met the Union forces near Pigeon's Ranch in Glorieta Pass where the battle raged all day, ending with Colonel Slough and the Union troops retreating to their camp at Kozlowski's Ranch, an apparent victory for the Confederates.

However, early in the day Slough had sent Chivington with 400 men on a mission to bypass the main force of Confederates and reach their supply lines to the west. Chivington's men were guided by Lieutenant-Colonel Manuel Chaves, a New Mexican Volunteer who knew the lay of the land. Chaves took them to a high point at the west end of the pass where they overlooked the Confederate supply wagons only guarded by a small force. They charged down the steep mountain side and easily overran the camp where they destroyed more than 60 wagons and their contents and killed all the mules, capturing 17 Confederate soldiers in the process. They quickly withdrew, this time guided by a priest from a nearby settlement. Padre Ortiz, took them by a different route back to the main body of Union troops at Kozlowski's Ranch. Colonel Scurry soon realized that the destruction of the supply train had made his position untenable. He arranged a truce with Slough to bury the dead and take care of the wounded and soon began to retreat to the south.

At the same time Slough received a communication from Colonel Canby, who was still at Fort Craig. Canby ordered him to return to Fort Union, so he had to give up the opportunity of pursuing and vanquishing the Confederate forces. But the damage had been done. Sibley's Confederate forces now had no choice but to withdraw to the south. Fort Union and Colorado Territory were safe for the Union. Sibley and his disheartened troops made their long tortuous way down the Rio Grande engaging in small skirmishes with Union forces along the way, finally retreating all the way to Texas. At the same time a force of approximately 2,300 infantry and cavalry known as the California Column, under the leadership of General James H. Carleton had entered Arizona and was threatening the Confederate Territory of Arizona from the west.

Governor Baylor and his Texas troops also had to abandon their territory and retreat to Texas. The last Confederate troops evacuated Mesilla in July 1862, and the Confederate Territory of Arizona ceased to exist. Thus ended the dream of a Confederate New Mexico and Arizona; it was also the end of the greater Confederate dream of gaining control of Colorado and California.

### **Sources Used:**

18. Thomas, Benjamin, by Denise Holladay Damico. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, 1875-1882, available at the University of New Mexico Law School Library, and online via "Google Books."

Territorial Archives of New Mexico, passim and Reel 103, frame 85; Reel 22, frames 266 and 284; Reel 112, frames 875, 888, 895, 903, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives.

Reba N. Benge, "Benjamin M. Thomas: Career in the Southwest, 1870-1992 (Ph.D. diss, University of New Mexico, 1979) (available at Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico)

Dan L. Thrapp, Victorio and the Mimbres Apaches (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974), 157-171, 351, n. 11.

Ralph Emerson Twitchell, The Leading Facts of New Mexican History, Vol. 2 (Cedar Rapids: Torch Press, 1912), 503-504.

19. Genizaros, by Malcolm Ebright. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Bailey, L.R. Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest. Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1996.

Brooks, James F. Captives and Cousins – Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands. Williamsburg: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Brooks, James F. "This Evil Extends Especially to the Feminine Sex: Negotiating Captivity in the New Mexico Borderlands." Feminist Studies 22 (Summer 1996): 279-309.

Brugge, David M. Navajos in the Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, 1694-1875. Window Rock, Arizona: Research Section, Parks and Recreation Dept. Navajo Tribe, 1968.

Demos, John. The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994).

Ebright, Malcolm. "Breaking New Ground: A Reappraisal of Governors Vélez Cachupín and Mendieta and their Land Grant Policies." Colonial Latin American Historical Review 5 (Spring 1996): 195-230.

Ebright, Malcolm and Rick Hendricks. The Witches of Abiquiú: The Governor, the Priest, the Genízaro Indians and the Devil. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006.

Gandert, Miguel; Lamadrid, Enrique; Gutiérrez, Ramón; Lippard, Lucy; and Wilson, Chris. Nuevo Mexico Profundo: Rituals of an Indo-Hispanic Homeland. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press; Albuquerque: National Hispanic Cultural Center of New Mexico, 2000, p. 58.

Head, Lafayette. "Statement of Mr. Head of Abiquiú in Regard of the Buying and Selling of Payutahs, 30 April 1852." Doc. no. 2150, Ritch Collection of Papers Pertaining to New Mexico, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.



Horvath, Steven M. Jr. "The Genízaro of Eighteenth-Century New Mexico: A Reexamination." In *Discovery: School of American Research* (1977): 25-40.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Indian Slaves for Spanish Horses." In *The Museum of the Fur Trade Quarterly* 143 (Winter 1978): 5.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Social and Political Organization of the Genízaros of Plaza de Nuestra Señora de Belén, New Mexico." Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University, 1979, pp. 130-33.

Jones, Sondra. *The Trial of Don Pedro Leon Luján: The Attack Against Indian Slavery and Mexican Traders in Utah*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2000, pp. 132-33.

Magnaghi, Russell M. "The Genízaro Experience in Spanish New Mexico," In *Spain and the Plains: Myths and Realities of Spanish Exploration and Settlement on the Great Plains*, edited by Ralph Vigil, Frances Kaye, and John Wunder. Niwot: University Press of Colorado, 1994, p. 118.

Rael Galvan, Estévan, "Identifying and Capturing Identity: Narratives of American Indian Servitude, Colorado and New Mexico, 1750-1930." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2002.

Simmons, Marc. "Tlascalans on the Spanish Borderlands." *New Mexico Historical Review* 39 (April 1964): 101-10.

Swadesh [Quintana], Frances. "They Settled by Little Bubbling Springs." *El Palacio* 84 (Fall 1978): 19-20, 42-49.

Pinart Collection, PE 52:28, Governor Tomás Vélez Cachupín, Decree, Santa Fe, 24 May 1766; PE 55:3, 1790 Census for Abiquiú.

SANM I: 85, 183, 494, 780, 1208, 1258.

SANM II: 477, 523, 555, 573.

20. Romero, Rosario: By Any Other Name – A Story of Slavery and Her Legacy, by Estevan Rael-Galvez. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

21. Santa Fe Indian School (Author: sources used). Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Cooper, Michael L. *Indian School: Teaching the White Man's Way*. New York: Clarion Books, 1999.

Hyer, Sally. *One House, One Voice, One Heart: Native American Education at the Santa Fe Indian School*. Museum of New Mexico Press, 1990.

Sando, Joe S. *Pueblo Nations Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Clear Light Publishers, 1992.

Further Reading:

Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.

Ruch, Marcella J. "Pablita Velarde: Painting Her People." *New Mexico Magazine*, 2001.

Shutes, Jeanne and Jill Mellick. *The Worlds of P'otsúnú: Geronima Cruz Montoya of San Juan Pueblo*. University of New Mexico Press, 1996.

Szasz, Margaret Connell. Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Films:

"In the White Man's Image," PBS film.

"Surviving Columbus: The Story of the Pueblo People." Diane Reyna, Director, 120 Minutes. KNME-TV, PBS Video, 1992.

22. Navajo Reservation Trading Posts, by Lauren Gray. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Gibson, Walter. Nakai Toh: My Days with the Finest People on God's Green Earth. Utah: Family History Publishers, 1994.

McNitt, Frank. The Indian Traders. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989.

Newcomb, Franc Johnson. Navaho Neighbors. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

Roberts, Willow. Stokes Carson: Twentieth-Century Trading on the Navajo Reservation. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987.

Traders on the Navajo Reservation. Arizona: Southwestern Indian Development, Inc, 1969.

Watson, Nancy. "Trader Puts Rugs on Display." Gallup Independent. 16 June 2000.

Navajoland Trading Posts, Traders, and Maps by Klara Kelly and Harris Francis

23. Matachines Dance: From the Introduction of the Matachines Dance, by Sylvia Rodriguez. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Related Materials:

Matachines--Diagram of the Dance

Bernalillo Matachines

El Rancho Matachines

Ohkay Owingeh Matachines

24. Hogan, Permission to use the article was secured from Elisa Parhad in - New Mexico, A Guide for the Eyes, EyeMuse Books, Los Angeles, CA.

Text courtesy of Elisa Parhad, from New Mexico, A Guide for the Eyes; EyeMuse Books, Los Angeles, CA.

25. Ohkay Owingeh, by William H. Wroth. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Adams, Eleanor B. and Fray Angelico Chavez, eds. The Missions of New Mexico, 1776. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1956.

Agoyo, Herman, et al. When Cultures Meet: Remembering San Gabriel del Yunge Oweenge. Santa Fe; Sunstone Press, 1987.

Blosser, Jamie. "Built Form as a Community Value: An Ethics of Architecture." In: Forward: The Quarterly Journal of the National Associates Committee, American Institute of Architects, January, 2006.

Hall, G. Emlen and David J. Weber. "Mexican Liberals and the Pueblo Indians, 1821-1829." In: New Mexico Historical Review, vol. 59, no. 1 (January 1984).

Kessell, John L. The Missions of New Mexico since 1776. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1980.

Ortiz, Alfonso. "San Juan Pueblo." In: Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9: Southwest. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1979.

Ortiz, Alfonso. The Tewa World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Simmons, Marc. "History of Pueblo-Spanish Relations to 1821." In: Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9: Southwest. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1979.

Simmons, Marc. "History of the Pueblos Since 1821." In: Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9: Southwest. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1979.

26. Repatriation from New Mexico to Northern Chihuahua: Repatriation from New Mexico to Northern Chihuahua, by Samuel Sisneros. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

Condensed from: Sisneros, Samuel. "Los Emigrantes Nuevomexicanos: The 1849 Repatriation to Guadalupe and San Ignacio, Chihuahua, Mexico." Master's Thesis, University of Texas at El Paso, 2001.

27. 1861 – Civil War Comes to New Mexico, by William H. Wroth. Article courtesy of the Office of the State Historian, New Mexico Records and Archives.

(Canby, E. R. S.). Head Quarters, Dept. Of New Mexico, Fort Craig, N. M. March 13th, 1862. General Orders No. 18. (Court-martial proceedings after the Battle of Valverde).

Colton, Ray Charles. The Civil War in the Western Territories: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959.

Hall, Martin Hardwick. Sibley's New Mexico Campaign. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.

Sibley, Henry Hopkins. The Civil War In West Texas & New Mexico: The Lost Letterbook of Brigadier General Henry Hopkins Sibley. Edited by John P. Wilson and Jerry Thompson. El Paso: Texas Western Press, 2001.

Stanley, F. The Civil War In New Mexico. Denver: The World Press, Inc., 1960.

Whitford, William Clarke. Colorado Volunteers In The Civil War. The New Mexico Campaign In 1862. Denver: State Historical and Natural History Society, 1906.