2008

Into the Den of Evils: The Genizaros in Colonial New Mexico

Doris Swann Avery
The University of Montana

INTO THE DEN OF EVILS:

THE GENíZAROS IN COLONIAL NEW MEXICO

By

DORIS SWANN AVERY

Bachelor of Arts, Duke University, Durham, NC, 1993

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in History

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2008

Approved by:

Dr. David A. Strobel, Dean
Graduate School

Dr. Dan L. Flores, Committee Chair
History

Dr. Jody Pavilack
History

Dr. David R.M. Beck
Native American Studies

Avery, Doris, M.A., Spring 2008 History

INTO THE DEN OF EVILS: THE GENíZAROS IN COLONIAL NEW MEXICO

Chairperson: Dr. Dan L. Flores

As a result of the Indian slave trade in the American Southwest, a group of detribalized Indians emerged in New Mexico during the Spanish colonial period. These Indians came to be known as the genízaros and, through the process scholars call ethnogenesis, developed their own identity by incorporating Hispano-Christian cultural practices while preserving their native ways. The genízaros were products of a widespread and lucrative trade in Plains Indian captives and, as such, they represented various tribes, including Apaches, Navajos, Comanches, Kiowas, Pawnees, Utes and Wichitas. The term "genízaro" emerged as a caste label during the Spanish colonial period and usually refers to members of these Plains Indian groups who were captured in the Indian wars and raiding expeditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and in turn sold to New Mexicans as servants to be instructed in Hispanic customs and baptized as Christians. The genízaro experience in New Mexico was an ongoing practice of cultural reinvention in the interest of self-preservation—a practice consistent with the cultural survival and legacy of other Native Americans in the region. As individuals, genízaros underwent social and cultural transformations upon leaving their native communities and entering Hispanic society through servitude. The extent to which these individual experiences produced a shared genízaro consciousness and legacy to survive and become a distinctly genízaro culture is the story that unfolds here.

Table of Contents

Preface

The genízaros of New Mexico first caught my attention with their gripping story more than 10 years ago when they came up in my readings for a course on the nineteenth-century American West. At the time, the existing literature on this seemingly obscure and inconsequential group of Indians was as contradictory as the context in which they emerged, demonstrating conflicting conclusions on who exactly they were and what their experience in Spanish New Mexican society was really like. Questions revolved around the power and status that genízaros did or did not have, the roles that they did or did not play in diplomacy and military defense, and the success they did or did not enjoy in preserving their native identities or finding acceptance in the Hispano-Christian realm. In recent years, the group has generated considerable scholarly interest as part of an expanding field of study that addresses questions of ethnicity and identity within the complex political and economic institutions of the American Southwest since the Spanish colonial period. Despite exhaustive research that has yielded substantial publication of new material, voids in the historical interpretation of the genízaros' experience remain, leaving me the opportunity to try to fill them. Resolving issues within the existing literature, then, has become as much a part of this project as unraveling the complicated intricacies that reveal an accurate picture of the genízaros of New Mexico.

The term itself remains unclear and confuses historical interpretation regarding the group's role in New Mexico, particularly during the colonial period. As a term, *genízaro* usually refers to American Indians of nomadic Plains tribes who were captured in Indian wars or raiding expeditions and then sold to Hispanic colonists as slaves. These transactions occurred most often at *rescates*, or trade fairs, which attracted both Pueblo and Plains Indians, as well as New Mexican traders who eagerly "ransomed" Indian captives from their "barbarous, heathen" captors. Records indicate that the captives for sale were largely Apaches, while others had Navajo, Ute, Kiowa, Pawnee and Comanche tribal identities. Although the New Laws of 1542 officially abolished slavery in the Spanish Empire, the Crown tolerated the genízaro trade because it provided a means to carry out Spanish policies of converting and assimilating native peoples in the Americas. The Crown considered the genízaros' servitude as compensation for their ransom and thus did not consider them slaves. As such, the government did not intend the genízaros' placement in New Mexican households to be a permanent condition but a form of debt

peonage, obligating masters to ensure the genízaros' assimilation to Hispanic culture through Catholic indoctrination.

This summation of the genízaros becomes problematic when historians restrict the term's meaning according to variations that appear in both secular and clerical primary sources throughout the colonial period. In particular, the word's linguistic origins have been a source of confusion in defining the genízaros. Historians almost always refer to the term's Turkish roots (*Yeni*, or new, and *cheri*, troops) drawing an obvious comparison between the New Mexican genízaros and the slave militias of the Ottoman Empire known as the janissaries. This connection has led many scholars to assume that the genízaro designation originated in the group's role as auxiliaries to the Spanish military, and they have relied too heavily on this connection to explain who the genízaros were. In fact, the genízaro label was somewhat fluid with time and not dependent upon one service that genízaros performed in society. Because they have studied the genízaros in different contexts and circumstances without making clear distinctions or connections between one era and another, historians have focused on the word's military connotation and overlooked the genízaro experience as an ongoing practice of cultural reinvention in the interest of self-preservation—a practice consistent with the cultural survival and legacy of other Native Americans in the region.

Genízaros reinvented themselves culturally through the process scholars call ethnogenesis. This concept provides the key to understanding the history of the genízaros. It refers to a process of social and cultural transformation, usually among indigenous groups in the face of foreign colonization and conquest as a strategy for survival. It is an ethnic reorganization that involves "an often mutable process of social reproduction" to encourage the survival of a group, although in an altered form.[1] Ethnogenesis emerged as an anthropological theory in 1969. Since then academics have applied it to aboriginal groups on almost every continent, particularly South America.[2]

---

[1] Kenneth J. Andrien, review of Karen Vieira Powers *Andean Journeys: Migration, Ethnogenesis, and the State in Colonial Quito* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995) in *Journal of Latin American Studies* 28 (October 1996): 689; Karl W. Neuenfeldt, author's abstract of *The Kyana Corroboree: Cultural Production of Indigenous Ethnogenesis* in *Sociological Inquiry* 65 (winter 1995): 21.

[2] Gary Clayton Anderson, Professor of History, University of Oklahoma, telephone conversation (April 30, 1997), notes in my possesion. See Jonathan D. Hill, ed., *History, Power and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1592-1992* (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1996). Anderson's book *The Indian*

Ethnogenesis can be applied to the genízaros of New Mexico as it aptly describes their cultural evolution. This is not to say that the genízaros transitioned from a previously disorganized and diverse grouping of Indians to become one collective socio-political community. They did not become a "tribe" or a "nation," necessarily identifying with one another from one community to the next. The unity and organization that developed among genízaros came about within local communities, but nonetheless indicated a pattern of common cultural characteristics and practices throughout New Mexico. As individuals, genízaros certainly underwent social and cultural upheaval upon leaving their native families and communities and entering Hispanic society through New Mexican households as servants. Genízaros reacted and adapted to these circumstances in ways that preserved their native identities while actively engaging with the Hispano-Christian world. The extent to which these individual experiences produced a shared genízaro consciousness and became a distinctly genízaro culture is the story that the following chapters address.

Chapter One confronts the aforementioned contradictions within the existing literature and establishes a working definition of "genízaro" that draws on the concept of ethnogenesis, the word's etymological origins, and a look at the social and economic functions genízaros performed in New Mexican society during the colonial period and after. While Chapter One discusses it in a general way, Chapter Two examines the contextual setting in which genízaros emerged more specifically. This chapter provides the necessary background on both Hispanic and Indian societies, politics and economies and how Hispanics and Indians interacted through warfare and trading. These interactions resulted in the involuntary detribalization of thousands of Plains Indians who entered New Mexican society as genízaros during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The experiences of these Indians in colonial New Mexican society both in and out of captivity are the focus of Chapter Three. Genízaros' religious practices as well as their ability and willingness to utilize the Spanish legal system, reveal that a distinct, albeit localized, ethnic identity evolved among genízaros. As the Epilogue shows, this story continued beyond the colonial period, into the Mexican era and the American

---

Southwest, 1580-1830: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999) brings the concept of ethnogenesis to North America and the Southern Plains specifically. Chapter Two will show that ethnogenesis was an important part of some of the genízaros' tribal heritages.

occupation and conquest. The Epilogue examines the persistence and continued cultural evolution of genízaros during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Typically, scholars have assumed that genízaros assimilated to the Hispano-Christian culture with little retention of their respective tribal identities. This assumption stems from the way studies of Borderlands history have glossed over the genízaros as well as from the way scholars have taken the primary records, which were written by Spanish New Mexicans—not the genízaros themselves—at face value. As is usually the challenge in studying American Indians, the journals, correspondences, and Church and court records that comprise the vast majority of the available primary evidence regarding genízaros comes from others; scholars must rely on the skewed perspectives of New Mexican priests, governors, and other military officials to ascertain how genízaros actually fared in New Mexican society. Most of this evidence is located in the Spanish Archives of New Mexico at the New Mexico State Records Center or in the documents collections of Fray Angelico Chavez, Charles W. Hackett, Alfred B. Thomas, and George P. Hammond and Agapito Reyes. While the archives and these documents collections are abundantly helpful, they require careful consideration of their context and the motives of the original authors.

I have used much of the same evidence that many before me have used, but with a different objective and approach to try to create an accurate historical analysis of the genízaro experience. Antonio Casados from Belen and Bentura Bustamente from Santa Fe, for example, appear in several other academic works, but not necessarily as examples of how political expedience bore an ethnic identity among genízaros. My interpretation of cases like these shows that a blended cultural perspective allowed genízaros to take advantage of their precarious position between two polarized worldviews and forge a group consciousness within their local communities. The lens of ethnogenesis has helped create a framework to demonstrate that the genízaros of New Mexico were hardly obscure and hardly inconsequential. They played a prominent role in New Mexican frontier society through most of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and arguably still do as an essential historical component to the contemporary mestizo culture that characterizes New Mexico's Hispano identity today.

Chapter One

Ethnogenesis and the Genízaros of New Mexico

In 1776, Fray Atanasio Dominguez described the northern New Mexican town of Abiquiu in the following way:

> Those who have taken root here and their progeny speak Spanish in a manner described with regard to the Santa Fe genízaros, for they all come from the same source, and these were taken for this pueblo. There is nothing to say about their customs, for in view of their great weakness, it will be understood that they are examples of what happens when idleness becomes the den of evils.[3]

In 2008, scholars might wonder cynically if Dominguez was right, for only a few have said much about the genízaros' customs since 1776.

Outside observers of New Mexico have traditionally viewed its ethnic composition as tri-cultural—Hispanic, Indian and Anglo-American. This limited perspective ignores New Mexico's broader multi-culturalism, both past and present, and overlooks other undeniably important components of New Mexican society, including the genízaros. The term "genízaro" emerged as a caste label during the Spanish colonial period. It usually refers to Southern Plains Indians who were captured in the Indian wars and raiding expeditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and then sold to Hispanic New Mexicans as slaves to be instructed in Hispanic customs and baptized as Christians. The descendants of these detribalized Plains Indians were also called genízaros. The genízaros were a marginalized people who nonetheless comprised an important part not only of the cultural matrix that has shaped New Mexico's history, but also of Indian-white relations. However, unlike other ethnic or racial groups of the Borderlands, the genízaros have been as marginalized in history as they were in culture and society. They remain relatively unknown outside of academic circles and New Mexico itself, despite their formidable presence in New Mexican society and their role in defending the New Mexican frontier, which in turn enabled the trade that had caused their own enslavement. In fact, genízaros eventually became slave raiders and traders themselves.

Unraveling the uniquely complicated story of the genízaros begins with understanding who should be called "genízaro." The term seems lost among a long list of labels that the Spanish Crown imported to the Americas and extended to New Mexican

[3] Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, eds. And trans., *The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Atanasio Dominguez* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1956): 126.

colonial society. These labels were used to identify social class and status according to one's parentage. Throughout New Spain, society was divided between *españoles* and *indios*. This fundamental divide was further broken down to clarify an individual's "purity of blood," or lack thereof. *Mestizo* (a person of mixed Indian and Spanish heritage) is among the most well-known of the labels within this complex social hierarchy. The mestizos' mixed blood lines placed them somewhere in the middle of the socio-cultural divide between Indian and Spanish. Although culturally speaking genízaros were also somewhere in the middle, they should not be confused with the more familiar mestizo; genízaros were the product of interracial relations. They were in fact Native Americans by blood. They were Apaches, Navajos, Comanches, Pawnees, Utes, Kiowas and Wichitas. The question then becomes, who were they culturally?

They were, and possibly still are, a social group with their own cultural identity, or at least consciousness, that extended beyond being simply Hispanicized Indians. Some have argued, or perhaps assumed, that genízaros transculturated by virtue of being detribalized, baptized, and educated in Hispanic customs and ultimately participating in New Mexican "civilized" society. Transculturization is a concept that emerged in the 1940's through the work of Cuban sociologist Fernando Ortiz, referring to the process of transitioning from one culture to another. It "necessarily involves the loss or uprooting of a previous culture."[4] Relying on Ortiz' work, in his dissertation "Missionization and Hispanicization of Santo Thomas Apostal de Abiquiu, 1750-1770," Gilberto Benito Cordova operates on the premise that genízaros left behind their Indianness because they cooperated with missionization efforts, overlooking the notion that genízaro cooperation was more than likely a mechanism for survival rather than a voluntary choice. Likewise, in his dissertation, "Identifying Captivity and Capturing Identity: Narratives of American Indian Slavery in Colorado and New Mexico, 1776-1934," Estevan Rael-Galvez casually interprets census records to indicate that the genízaros' transculturization was "complete."[5]

---

[4] Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947): 102-103.
[5] Gilberto Benito Cordova, "Missionization and Hispanicization of Santo Thomas Apostal de Abiquiu, 1750-1770," (Ph.D dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1979). Estevan Rael-Galvez, "Identifying Captivity and Capturing Identity: Narratives of American Indian Slavery in Colorado and New Mexico, 1776-1934," (Ph.D dissertation, University of Michigan, 2002): 67.

In fact, genízaros did not experience transculturalization; they did not leave behind their Native American identity and become entirely Hispanic. Nor did they fully retain their Indian identity and reject everything Hispanic. Rather, genízaros experienced the cultural change known as ethnogenesis. In *Andean Journeys*, Karen Vieira Powers defines ethnogenesis as a gradual process by which distinct ethnic cultures reinvent themselves and finds it to be particularly applicable to tribal societies that, in the face of conquest and colonialism, were forced to either adapt or perish. Similarly, in *Islands of History*, Marshall Sahlins sees ethnogenesis as a cultural change that is "externally induced yet indigenously orchestrated."[6] The genízaros' situation was exceptionally remarkable as their experience during the colonial period and after involved individuals from *multiple* Indian ethnicities coming together to produce one new identity, one that blended—rather than abandoned—their biological and cultural "Indianness" with their "externally induced" immersion into Hispanic society. For the genízaros, the process of ethnogenesis was further facilitated by their unique position as both products and agents of the warfare and trading between New Mexicans and Plains Indians that began to accelerate around the turn of the eighteenth century.

The beginning of the eighteenth century saw a dramatic shift in the balance of power among nomadic Indians of the Southern Plains. An expanding Comanche empire descended on New Mexico in pursuit of abundant buffalo herds and a lucrative horse trade. Part and parcel to this expansion was the trade in captives, extracted from both rival Indian groups and Hispanic and Anglo settlements. The Comanches reached northern New Mexico soon after 1700, encroaching on the territory of the dominant Apaches and honing in on their raiding targets, which largely included Pueblo and Hispanic communities. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the Comanche Indians had dethroned the Apaches, becoming the principal economic and political force of the Southern Plains tribes. The Comanche encroachment on the Southwest incited inter-tribal warfare that included not only Apaches, but also Utes, Navajos, Pawnees, Kiowas, and Wichitas. In 1793, Fernando de la Concha described the situation in a letter to Viceroy Conde de Revilla Gigedo:

---

[6] Powers, *Andean Journeys*, 3; Marshall Sahlins, *Islands of History* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985): viii; Anderson, 267-268.

> At the beginning of last winter, the Utes and Navajos got together for a council and they resolved to go and attack the Comanches. They set out immediately and soon encountered a rancheria left unguarded by [Comanche] men who had gone buffalo hunting. They proceeded with little difficulty to destroy it completely, capturing and killing the women and children, and running off the horseherd that was there. When news of this reached the Comanches, they swore to avenge the offense and raising a considerable war party, they attacked the village of the Utes in a like manner and completely destroyed one of their rancherias, with the result that both [tribes] have suffered almost equal harm from the other.[7]

De la Concha's astute observations lead one to conclude that economic interests—that is the market for desired commodities like horses and captives—must have driven this mutually destructive warfare that continued well into the nineteenth century. These economic interests also led Southern Plains Indians to forge alliances with both neighboring tribes and European imperialists in the area, namely the French and the Spanish.[8]

Meanwhile, Spaniards had established the colony of New Mexico in northern New Spain almost a century before the Comanches arrived on the Southern Plains. At the end of the sixteenth century, Spanish and mestizo settlers migrated from the central regions of New Spain to the northern frontier. Although initially unsuccessful, by 1610 Hispanic settlers had colonized the area that became known as New Mexico. The Spaniards' settlement of New Mexico reflected the spiritual and evangelical nature of the Crown's worldly mission to "civilize" native populations, in this case the Pueblos, with the institution of Franciscan missions and authority. The diversity of the Pueblo Indians suited the Spaniards' divide-and-conquer strategy until the Pueblos united to wage a successful war for independence in 1680. During the next several years as the balance of power on the Plains was changing, attacks from neighboring Plains tribes increasingly

---

[7] Fernando de la Concha, "Document Three: Fernando de la Concha to the Viceroy Conde de Revilla Gigedo, Santa Fe, May 6, 1793, regarding inter-tribal warfare between the Comanches and other tribes" in Marc Simmons, ed. and trans., in *Border Comanches: Seven Spanish Colonial Documents, 1785-1819* (Santa Fe, NM: Stagecoach Press, 1967): 25-26.

[8] Simmons, 8-10; L.R. Bailey, *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest* (Los Angeles, CA: Westernlore Press, 1966): 17-19; other works consulted that effectively address the Comanches rise to power and the intricacies of trade relationships on the Southern Plains include James F. Brooks' *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), Charles L. Kenner's *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969); Stanley Noyes' *Los Comanches: The Horse People, 1751-1845* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1993); and Dan Flores, "Bison Ecology and Bison Diplomacy: The Southern Plains from 1800 to 1850," *Journal of American History* 78 (September 1991): 465-485.

plagued the Pueblos, who essentially allowed the Spaniards to reclaim New Mexico in the 1690s. Likewise, the colonial government's interest in reconquering the lost colony reflected how it too was experiencing a gradual shift in its mission from one hinged on spreading Christianity and redemption to one largely driven by imperial competition and the need to clarify and defend its borders. Over the next 150 years, New Mexicans and Pueblos, along with nomadic Indians, the French, and Anglo-Americans engaged in a simultaneously hostile and peaceful coexistence; an almost constant state of warfare complemented by regular trading activity.[9]

Out of this peculiar co-existence emerged a multi-cultural society reflective of the indigenous and immigrant nature of New Mexico's early modern inhabitants. Except for the aforementioned genízaros, the stories of most of these early modern inhabitants have been told and retold. Contemporary studies continue to show an increasing interest in genízaros as a group, but with fairly limited results and only occasionally as the primary focus. The lack of attention to genízaros is somewhat remarkable in light of the population figures that many scholars have derived for them. Steven Horvath, for example, finds that the 1750 census for Belen shows that 41 per cent of the town's population was genízaro. Albert Schroeder estimates that, by the late eighteenth century, genízaros represented almost one-third the population of New Mexico. Estevan Rael-Galvez argues that the "baptismal records of New Mexico reveal that between 1700 and 1880, 4,601 nomadic Indians were baptized and entered into Spanish-Mexican households."[10]

Despite these figures, the existing literature on genízaros remains thin in comparison to other topics of interest to Borderlands history. Some of the most in-depth work can be found in a number of doctoral dissertations that have explored issues related to identity and the cultural make-up of New Mexico. Horvath, Cordova, and Rael-Galvez are among those who deal with genízaros specifically. In "The Social and Political

[9] John L. Kessell, ed., *Remote Beyond Compare: Letters of Don Diego de Vargas to His Family from New Spain and New Mexico, 1675-1706* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1989): 91-93; the ambiguity and complexity of human relations on the Southern Plains during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is a persistent theme in Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*.

[10] Rael-Galvez, 18; Albert H. Schroeder, "Rio Grande Ethnohistory," in Alfonso Ortiz, ed., *New Perspectives on the Pueblos* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1972): 62; Steven Horvath, "The Social and Political Organization of the Genízaros of the Plaza de Nuestra Señora de Los Dolores de Belen, New Mexico, 1740-1812" (Ph.D dissertation, Brown University, 1980): 64.

Organization of the Genízaros of Plaza de Nuestra Señora de Los Dolores de Belen, New Mexico, 1740-1812," Horvath seeks to understand the genízaro experience through an ethnohistorical case study of the community of Belen. He finds a genízaro population that was almost completely assimilated into the peasant class but never free from the stigmas of enslavement and being Indian. Horvath experiences some limitations in primary documentation, but manages to conclude that the genízaros of Belen had a distinct set of political and social institutions that they developed in response to their stigmatization by the dominant New Mexican society. Furthermore, he argues that the Hispanic perception of genízaros as warriors by blood gave them a source of power by enabling them to acquire land and profit from trade in exchange for military service. Horvath's findings in the case of Belen help demonstrate how settlement patterns along the northern frontier opened the door for genízaros to become a distinct ethnic group.[11]

In "Missionization and Hispanicization," Cordova, whose aim is to examine colonial educational methods and philosophy, also uses the case study approach in his analysis of Santo Thomas Apostal de Abiquiu from 1750 to 1770. Cordova is primarily concerned with how the Franciscans of New Mexico hispanicized the genízaros of Abiquiu through the processes of transculturization, enculturation, and acculturation. He argues that the institution of the Spanish mission effectively acculturated and transformed the genízaros into Hispanic citizens. The mission system represented a "civil plan designed to settle pagan Indians into Spanish style towns."[12] While he points to the Franciscans "gentle" approach in educating and civilizing detribalized Plains Indians, Cordova fails to recognize the overriding paternalism of Franciscans who treated them like children. Indeed, these Indians did not "know better," but it misses the nuances of human psychology to assume that genízaros of the eighteenth century were not savvy enough to figure out how to placate their social superiors while discreetly preserving elements of their natural cultural identity.[13] As mentioned above, this oversight fosters Cordova's premise that genízaros underwent a complete transition from one culture to another rather than remaining somewhere in the middle. Regardless of the underlying

[11] Horvath, 132-144, 145, 148-149.
[12] Cordova, 46.
[13] Ibid., 31-32.

limitations in his interpretations, however, Cordova provides useful data that helps shed light on the genízaro experience in colonial New Mexico.

Rael-Galvez takes a philosophical approach to his work on the legacy of captivity and servitude in the Southwest in "Identifying Captives and Capturing Identity: Narratives of American Indian Slavery in Colorado and New Mexico, 1776-1934." He uses genealogical and baptismal records, census data, and even maps to produce a profound body of work that identifies genízaros and their experience, though he does not necessarily find it to be one that brings about discernable cultural cohesion. Rather Rael-Galvez presents a seemingly ongoing experience that has shaped the cultural identity of New Mexico as a whole. Rael-Galvez offers a comparative analysis between the southwestern enslavement of Indians and the southeastern enslavement of Africans. He finds a fair amount of overlap between the two, with the most obvious difference resting in the fact that Indian slavery in the Southwest has been far less exposed and therefore far less understood than African slavery in the Southeast. Furthermore, his work shows that in the Southwest the enslavement of Indians persisted well beyond the American Civil War, which, of course, terminated the enslavement of Africans in the Southeast. Through extensive analysis of an array of primary documents that serve to narrate the story of Indian servitude in the Southwest, Rael-Galvez presents a story of a "people in a middle ground that could move either way depending upon survival."[14] Although as mentioned above he uses the phrase "transculturization," his interpretive analysis shows that ethnogenesis was actually the process at work.

Aside from these dissertations, the predominant historiography of the genízaros produces limited insight and often conflicting information. Most of the information can be found in the published works that serve the history of the Borderlands or Southern Plains Indians, though clearly some more than others. Scholars have included discussions of genízaros and offered some analysis of them in different contexts and circumstances, but they have made no clear distinctions or connections between one era and another. James Brooks, Ramón Gutierrez, Charles Kenner and Oakah Jones are among those who have examined the chronological development of Indian slavery and dealt with the emergence of genízaros. Each has attempted to show how genízaros

[14] Rael-Galvez, 18, 38.

ultimately blended into or remained marginalized from the dominant New Mexican culture. Fray Angelico Chavez and Frances Leon Swadesh have also pointed to an evolution of a genízaro identity, but have confined their discussions to the genízaros of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. To be fair, these scholars have not failed to synthesize whatever societal and cultural evolution might have occurred among the genízaros; they simply have not tried to do so. They have not directed their work at the genízaros specifically. Rather, genízaros have tended to be treated tangentially as one factor in a larger work. Interpretive marginalization, coupled with discrepancies between definitions of who was a genízaro and when, complicate the task of understanding the genízaros' historical significance.

In *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*, James Brooks zeroes in on New Mexico and its Indians' relations with each other and the various European cultures that infiltrated the region. He reveals a pattern played out over and over again throughout North America: a systematic and institutionalized practice of inter-cultural conflict and exchange – conflict and exchange that was both self-preserving and self-destructive. Naturally, genízaros were part of the mix. Brooks devotes the better part of his fourth chapter to an extensive discussion on the genízaros. Like other historians before him, however, his study ultimately treats the genízaros as one factor in a larger work. Brooks seeks to demonstrate the inter-cultural implications of the slave trade and suggests that the genízaros were a somewhat temporary by-product of that trade. As *Captives and Cousins* progresses into the nineteenth century, for instance, Brooks refers to genízaros only one more time, at which point he implies that they were left behind in the eighteenth century. He writes, "…most of these households were dispersed in the smaller villages on the outskirts of the settled territory. There it seems, they continued in the role of coerced cultural mediators, much as had their genízaro counterparts in the earlier era."[15] Brooks' reference to genízaro "counterparts" of the "earlier era" suggests that they had disappeared into New Mexico's cultural landscape in the nineteenth century, a point I will dispute as this story unfolds.

[15] James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002): 240.

Ramón Gutierrez also integrates genízaros into the history of New Mexico and offers considerable information in *When Jesus Came the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846*. Although he subscribes to a limited definition that bills genízaros as the "shock troops" of New Mexico, Gutierrez manages to recognize a genízaro presence that spans much of the dates of his study. He looks at their marginalization, occupations, marriage practices, illegitimacy rates, baptisms, land grants, and military roles. Gutierrez provides substantial evidence to build insightful conclusions that help depict what life was really like for genízaros in and out of captivity. But, in the end, the genízaros are only a piece of Gutierrez' larger story. The genízaro experience is not his primary concern.[16]

Other works on New Mexico and Southern Plains Indians contain useful starting points for further research. Frances Leon Swadesh's *Los Primeros Pobladores: Hispanic Americans of the Ute Frontier* attempts to redefine "genízaro" by including Pueblo Indians of the Hopi, Zuni and Santa Clara villages who settled in Abiquiu after 1750. She notes that the term genízaro was applied mainly to Indians of various nomadic tribes who had been ransomed from captivity and placed as servants in the households of New Mexican settlers. But, "in practice," adds Swadesh, "many genízaros were [also] Pueblo Indians who had been expelled from their home village for being overly adaptive to Hispanic culture. They asked for and received rights on Genízaro grants."[17] Her interest in expanding the genízaro label to include detribalized Pueblos comes from the Indians included in the actual genízaro land grants of Abiquiu and Ojo Caliente. The inclusion of these Pueblos in grants suggests that captivity and enslavement were not necessarily factors in identifying genízaros, at least not by the mid-eighteenth century. Or, perhaps the unique circumstances of land grant for Indians allowed for a similarly unique opportunity to make room for any detribalized Indians in New Mexican society, not just detribalized Plains Indians.

Early appearances of the genízaro label in primary documents from the colonial period seem to provide the source of the confusion over whether some Pueblos should

---

[16] Ramón Gutierrez, *When Jesus Came the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991): 149-156, 171-190, 195-196, 199-203, 215, 231, 252, 295-297, 305-306, 321, 323, and 333.

[17] Fances Leon Swadesh, *Los Primeros Pobladores: Hispanic Americans of the Ute Frontier* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974): xviii.

have been included in the genízaro category. For instance, in his 1705 campaign against the Navajos, Captain Roque de Madrid referred to the Jémez Pueblo warriors who assisted him as "genízaros."[18] Such primary documentation that includes Pueblo Indians in the genízaro category ultimately blurs both the economic condition, that is servitude, and the historical interpretations that have helped shape the classification of genízaros. Roque de Madrid's inclusion of Jemez Pueblos is misleading because, unlike the Pueblos at Abiquiu, there is no indication that these auxiliaries were detribalized or that they provided forced service to New Mexicans. The way Roque de Madrid used "genízaro" not only confuses the tribal affiliations or associations of genízaros but also contributes to the misconception that the real mark of a genízaro was his participation in Spanish military activities. Roque de Madrid reinforces the interpretations of scholars like Gutierrez who rely on the Turkish etymology, which implies that genízaros were thus called for their military cooperation with the Spanish regardless of whether they were Pueblos or Plains Indians, whether they were detribalized, or whether they or their ancestors ever served New Mexicans involuntarily. While it is difficult to dismiss a primary account as categorically wrong, it is not unreasonable for historians to consider that these kinds of references to genízaros are examples of how Spanish New Mexicans often neglected to bother themselves with the characteristics that differentiated one group of Indians from another.

Historians have also revealed conflicting information in addressing the social status of genízaros. In *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations*, Charles Kenner describes the genízaros' inferior social position in New Mexican society. He maintains that they lacked "land and status" because the New Mexicans considered them 'children of the enemy' and would not admit them to their pueblos."[19] On the other hand, in *Los Paisanos: Spanish Settlers on the Northern Frontier of New Spain*, Oakah Jones argues that "Comanches, Apaches, Navajos, Utes and members of various other nations simply described as 'genízaros' lived in Spanish communities and were readily accepted

[18] Rick Hendricks and John P. Wilson, trans. and eds., *The Navajos in 1705: Roque Madrid's Campaign Journal* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1996): 19, 44.
[19] Kenner, 63.

into the general society."[20] Kenner's contention seems more accurate than Jones' because it complies with the Hispanic social code of honor, from which Indians were largely excluded. Also, Kenner is reinforced by other secondary sources that find genízaros never escaped the stigmas of enslavement and being Indian. But, the truth is that they are both right, depending on when and where. Before the mid-eighteenth century, genízaros who were no longer living in Hispanic households or their descendents were largely confined to neighborhoods in the colonial centers of New Mexico, like Santa Fe's Barrio Analco. This trend changed with the institution of the Bourbon Reforms later in the eighteenth century, when land and status did become available to genízaros, so long as they were willing to live on the dangerous fringe of the colony and help defend it.[21] Unlike in the central communities, in these frontier communities, genízaros were more "readily accepted into the general society as *castas* and *españoles* lived in close proximity in the interest of security."[22]

The work of Fray Angelico Chavez has also played an important part in developing the current knowledge on genízaros. Chavez, along with Eleanor B. Adams, edited and translated *The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Atanasio Dominguez*, which has proven to be among his most informative publications. *The Missions of New Mexico* tours late eighteenth century New Mexico through the eyes of Dominguez, a Franciscan priest sent to New Mexico "to make a complete, detailed report on both the spiritual and economic status of the New Mexico missions, [which] entailed the gathering of much geographical and ethnological data as well."[23] Likewise, *My Penitente Land: Reflections on Spanish New Mexico* delivers a sense of the genízaro identity, while a brief article titled "Genízaros" manages to cover substantial ground, making pivotal conclusions about the definition of genízaros and their significance in

[20] Oakah L. Jones, *Los Paisanos: Spanish Settlers on the Northern Frontier of New Spain* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979): 132.

[21] Beginning in 1765, the reforms of the Bourbon era intended to strengthen and centralize the government in Spain and her colonies; they included a restructuring of the internal provinces that retained the viceregal system while implementing the intendency system as part of the plan to increase the Spanish military presence along the northern frontier to ward off the English and "control a restless population." One result of these reforms was a rise in slave militia activity and the practice of awarding land grants to those who participated in these militias, see Thomas Hall, *Social Change*. *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350-1880* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1989): 134-138.

[22] Rael-Galvez, 65-66.

[23] Chavez, *The Missions of New Mexico*, xv;.

New Mexican society and culture. In particular, Chavez discusses the rebellion of 1837 and Jose Angel Gonzales, a genízaro and leader of the rebellion. Gonzales helped overthrow the New Mexican Government and briefly served as interim governor, until he himself was overthrown and executed by subsequent Governor Manuel Armijo.[24]

The most in-depth, published work on the genízaros comes from Malcolm Ebright and Rick Hendricks. Their collaborative effort is called *The Witches of Abiquiu: The Governor, the Priest, the Genízaro Indians and the Devil*. As the title suggests, it offers a close-up examination of the witchcraft proceedings that implicated several genízaros of Abiquiu during the 1750s and 1760s. Ebright and Hendricks surgically examine the cast of players involved and the forces that shaped each faction's mindset and resulting actions. Although they seem to make some miscalculations regarding various individuals' actual ethnic identities or their motives along the way, Ebright and Hendricks offer the most intricate study of genízaros to date. Their focus is somewhat narrow, but the implications of Ebright and Hendricks' meticulous look at the witchcraft proceedings in Abiquiu and the lasting legacy of these events have made *The Witches of Abiquiu* an invaluable resource. Much of what they have discovered about the genízaros holds true in other parts of New Mexico as well.[25]

Any serious intellectual debate regarding the genízaros requires an established definition of who the group has included at different points in time. Yet, despite the insights and bibliographies of the aforementioned works, the existing literature fails to provide consistency on this issue. In fact, it seems to raise more questions than it answers. Many of the unanswered questions or discrepancies pertain to exactly who fit into the genízaro category, a question created, as noted earlier, by the term itself and the way it appears in primary documents. Genízaro usually refers in a general way to American Indians of nomadic Plains tribes who were captured in intertribal warfare or raiding and then sold to Hispanic colonists as slaves. The transactions occurred most often at *rescates*, or trade fairs, which attracted both Pueblo and Plains Indians as well as Hispanic traders. As Spanish colonists justified their participation in the slave trade as

[24] Chavez, "Genízaros" in *Handbook of North American Indians* 9 (Washington, DC, 1979): 200; Chavez, *My Penitente Land: Reflections on Spanish New Mexico* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974): 241-243.
[25] Malcolm Ebright and Rick Hendricks, *The Witches of Abiquiu: The Governor, the Priest, the Genízaro Indians, and the Devil* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2006).

nothing short of "rescuing" Plains Indians from their "barbarous" captors, it is hardly coincidental that these trade fairs were known as "rescates," which literally translated means "rescue" or "ransom."

The annual rescates at Pecos and Taos were the biggest and most important formal trading events. Fray Dominguez discussed the rescates at Taos: At this fair they sell buffalo hides, "white elkskins," horses, mules, buffalo meat, pagan Indians (of both sexes, children and adults) whom they capture from other nations."[26] The captives for sale were usually of Apache, Comanche, Navajo, Ute, Kiowa, Pawnee, and Wichita tribal identities.[27] As John Kessell observes about Pecos, Indian captives were a particularly prized commodity:

> Although in volume and worth the trade in buffalo hides and fine tanned skins far exceeded the 'ransom' of non-Christian captives, no item was more important to local Hispanos or more avidly sought after than these human *piezas*. Mostly they were children or young women, for their men died fighting, were put to death, or were too tough to "domesticate." No Hispano of New Mexico, however lowly his station, felt that he had made good until he had one or more of these children to train as servants in his home and to give his name. Men wanted to present them to their brides as wedding gifts. They were as sure a symbol of status as a fine horse.[28]

Although the New Laws of 1542 officially abolished slavery in the Spanish Empire, the colonial government and clergy rationalized Indian slavery through the fifth century theory of "just war, in which self-defense and the recovery of stolen property was used to justify retribution against perpetrators of such crimes and hostilities."[29] In New Mexico, "just war" provided a means to carry out Spanish policies of assimilating and converting native peoples in the Americas while giving *españoles* their slaves "legally."

Genízaros began to emerge as an identifiable, though not necessarily cohesive, group early in the eighteenth century. The trade in Plains Indian captives appears to have gained momentum at the end of the seventeenth century when the Spaniards had reconquered New Mexico, but on the Pueblos' terms; namely no more enslavement of Pueblos and a certain latitude for Pueblos to maintain their religious and social customs

---

[26] Adams and Chavez, *Missions of New Mexico*, 252.
[27] Gutierrez,151; David M. Brugge, *Navajos in the Catholic Church: Records of New Mexico, 1694-1875* (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1985): 17-32, 107; Swadesh, 148.
[28] John L. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown: The Pecos Indians and New Mexico, 1540-1840* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, US Department of the Interior, 1979): 366.
[29] Rael-Galvez, 27; Rael-Galvez draws his interpretation of the application of "just war" theory from Robert A. Williams, Jr., *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990): 29-31.

and to remain apart from the Hispanic communities. Limited access to Pueblo labor and a lagging provincial economy helped make Plains Indian captives the desired commodity described above. They provided labor and status for Hispanic New Mexicans while the slave trade itself helped boost the economy. The Crown intended the slaves' bondage not as a permanent condition but as a form of debt peonage and obligated owners to Hispanicize and Christianize their genízaros, a policy that served to justify their servitude. Owners typically employed genízaros as domestic servants and day laborers until they earned their ransom, which typically took at least several years and for younger captives usually occurred upon marriage or reaching adulthood. The trade in captives continued into the nineteenth century, but historians differ on its scope and magnitude, with some maintaining that the trade had noticeably declined by the end of the eighteenth century and others asserting that it continued unabated beyond the American conquest of the region and even the American Civil War.[30]

This definition of genízaros is deceptively straightforward. The term becomes confusing when historians and anthropologists expand the category to include enslaved Pueblo Indians or Plains Indians who voluntarily lived in Spanish towns. As noted earlier, Swadesh, for one, thinks Pueblo Indians should be included. She writes:

> The word 'Genízaro' supposedly refers to detribalized, nomadic Indians, often of mixed ancestry, who came from both east and west of New Mexico and who had been ransomed from captivity among the nomadic tribes. In Abiquiu the church records tell a somewhat different story. In addition to the record of Hopis settled at the Montoya homestead in 1750, records of later years show that people from the Hopi Villages, Zunis, Isletas, Santa Claras and other Pueblo Indians continued to come to Abiquiu throughout the eighteenth century, apparently forming the majority of the local Genízaro population. Those Genízaros identified as nomadic or of non-New Mexican origin were in the minority…[31]

Swadesh rightly suggests that the word's meaning experienced an evolution during the colonial period in New Mexico. Yet, she overreaches with the information she found in the Abiquiu records, which weakens her attempt to challenge the definition of "genízaro." Swadesh seems to work on the premise that Abiquiu was a settlement that consisted exclusively of genízaros and thus considers the town's Pueblo residents to be genízaros by virtue of living there. Living in Abiquiu did not make one a genízaro. Yet, Swadesh's

[30] Robert Archibald, "Acculturation and Assimilation in Colonial New Mexico," in *New Mexico Historical Review* 53 (July 1978): 205-206; Bailey, 8-11; Horvath, 101; Rael-Galvez, 18.
[31] Swadesh, 40.

conclusions point to a shift in the meaning of "genízaro." By the mid-eighteenth century genízaro referred to detribalization as much as an individual's status as a slave, freed slave, or a descendant of slaves. Ultimately, though, the presence of Pueblos in Abiquiu after 1750 illustrates the multi-cultural nature of frontier towns more than it challenges the definition of genízaros.

Swadesh's argument is problematic mostly because equating genízaros with Pueblos does not recognize their post-1680 cultural independence from both the Hispanic and Indian slave populations; it ignores their distinct cultural identities, or so it would seem. Recall that, in addition to records of a few years earlier, Swadesh's inclusion of Pueblos in the genízaro category comes in part from the land grants. The oversight, then, really comes from the perceptions of primary sources, which must be considered when trying to process "first-hand" observations. Robert Archibald offers assistance to clarify the Pueblos' cultural distinctiveness. He writes that after the 1680 Revolt, the "Pueblo Indians were not enslaved, nor were they, as a rule, forcibly brought into Spanish society. They were, and remain, a group apart."[32] As mentioned above, the Spaniards' reconquest of New Mexico at the end of the seventeenth century demonstrated a certain level of cooperation between Spaniards and Pueblos in which the Pueblos maintained an identity separate from the genízaros as well as other Indians. James Brooks demonstrates this point in his discussion of the "witchcraft frenzy that erupted in the village of Abiquiu" in 1763. He writes, "…all of the settlements along the Rio Chama exploded in accusations and counteraccusations…Joaquín and his brother, Juan Largo, defended themselves and pointed instead to the genízaros Miguel Ontiveros (Pawnee), Agustín Tagle (Kiowa), and Vicente Trujillo…as among fifteen genízaros…who adopted the 'idolotrous and sexually promiscuous Turtle Dance from their Rio Grande Pueblo neighbors.'"[33] Brooks' anecdote demonstrates that genízaros and Pueblos were not one in the same and they themselves saw the need to make the distinction clear.

The confusion over the term genízaro continues when scholars include non-slave Indians in the genízaro category. Above all, this confusion detracts from the significance of the legacy of enslavement that typically characterizes the genízaro identity. While

[32] Archibald, 205-206.
[33] Brooks, 136.

Swadesh suggests that over time captivity and forced servitude became less important in classifying genízaros, enslavement and its legacy remained a common indicator of a genízaro's identity. Part of the problem comes from the way primary records use the word loosely as an ethnic designation, as we saw with Captain Roque de Madrid. Social and economic roles that distinguished genízaros from other Indian groups did not always appear in the documents. In some cases the oversight stemmed from ignorance; in others, from a lack of interest in making distinctions among the groups that comprised the lowest tier of the Hispanic social hierarchy. Often record takers based their assessment of an individual's genízaro identity on any one of a set of characteristics that suggested "Indianness." Horvath observes that such traits included "coarse habits, inability to speak Spanish properly, dark complexion, [and] pagan religion."[34] Perhaps this is how Captain Roque de Madrid decided the ethnicity of his Jémez auxiliaries.

Similarly, government and religious authorities tended to label all sedentary or "civilized" Indians living in Spanish settlements as genízaros, regardless of whether they or their ancestors had entered those settlements through captivity and involuntary servitude. This assessment, as Swadesh has shown, often included Pueblos who had been outcast by their communities, which happened to those considered too heavily influenced by Hispanic culture and society.[35] While some authorities could not be bothered to notice ethnic diversity among Indians, others often noted tribal identities along with the distinction or implication of genízaro. L.R. Bailey notes that numerous entries bearing the designation "*niño de nación de Apache*" (child of the Apache nation) appear in the records.[36] These kinds of labels tell us who the captives likely were even though one's condition as servant or slave was not always indicated. Apache designations are particularly helpful because, as we will see in Chapter Two, large numbers of Apaches were taken captive and subsequently represented a significant portion of the genízaro population. Thus, we cannot categorically exclude detribalized Indians from the genízaro grouping simply because they were not documented as captives or servants when they were included by the dominant culture that created the ethnic designation in the first place.

---

[34] Horvath, 15.
[35] Ibid., 68-69; Swadesh, xviii.
[36] Bailey, 16.

Another point of confusion in defining genízaros arises from a second function that they performed in New Mexican society beginning mostly in the mid-eighteenth century. After they earned their ransom, genízaros, whose enslavement had made them social outcasts, often petitioned the colonial government for land grants to settle in strategically placed villages that served as "buffers" between Hispanic settlements and raiding Plains Indians. In other instances, these communities provided refuge for mistreated slaves who were given their freedom for their participation in the ongoing wars between New Spain and Plains Indians. Teodoro Croix, Commandant General of the northern provinces, noted the necessity of the towns for New Spain's security. In 1781, he contended that New Mexico's "conservation is so important that if we should lose New Mexico a second time [Croix is referring to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680], we would have upon Vizcaya, Sonora, and Coahuila all the enemies which now invade the province."[37] The genízaros were desired residents for the frontier because their Indian heritage theoretically made them able warriors or heightened their potential to negotiate successfully with their former tribes. Abiquiu (1754), Belen (1740), San Miguel del Vado (1794), Ojo Caliente (1754), and Santa Fe' Analco neighborhood (ca. 1700) were among the frontier communities that had significant numbers of genízaros living in them. The communities formed a buffer around Santa Fe and Albuquerque–New Mexico's most important Spanish settlements. Voluntarily or involuntarily, members of these communities became protectors of the trade relationship that had produced their identity.[38]

Although they were established to serve the purposes of the New Mexican government, the frontier towns provided opportunities for genízaros that they otherwise would not have had given their status as both Indians and former slaves. As Horvath notes, "…the administrative application of a common history and ancestry, as Christianized Plains Indians, to all members of this category opened certain avenues of economic gain such as service as scouts, interpreters, and militia troops and as pioneering

[37] "General Report of 1781 by Teodoro de Croix," in Alfred B. Thomas, ed. and trans., *Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941): 106.
[38] Horvath, 48, 55, 157-158, 167, 173; Archibald, 211; Gutierrez, 305.

settlers on the defensive perimeter of the province."[39] These experiences gave the genízaros access to the coveted Hispanic code of honor, which was something hardly foreign to the native cultural identities. They achieved what Ana Alonso calls "warrior-honor," which she observed among the Serrano peasants of Namiquipa in northern Mexico. Warrior-honor was derived from situations or practices in which "valor and military skills [were] central to the construction of masculinity," making one's status as a warrior a source of prestige and even power.[40] Alonso's theory builds on a frontier ideology in which rights to land and status were contingent on the fulfillment of military obligations, an ideology evident among various Southern Plains Indian cultures as well.

Alonso's warrior-honor becomes apparent among genízaros in the descriptions by the Hispanic New Mexicans who observed them. Horvath, summarizes many of these first-hand impressions.

> Morfi described them as 'fine soldiers, very warlike, and most formidable against our enemies' (Simmons, 1977: 34). Menchero found them to be energetic and zealous in the pursuit of enemies (Hackett, 1937: vol. II, 401-2)…Teodoro Croix commended them for their 'prosperous' clashes with Apaches (SANM, Reel 10, Frame 925). These words of praise came from men who held very divergent opinions about the state of the province. Yet, they uniformly had high opinions of the ability of the Genizaros as warriors.[41]

These commendations from religious and government officials indicate that the genízaros' military roles allowed them to demonstrate their superior ability as warriors and, in the eyes of the men mentioned above, as defenders of the state. In turn, as they settled and defended frontier communities, genízaros gained access to land, another important indicator of status.

The genízaros' military function in society heightens confusion over who exactly the genízaros were because it parallels the linguistic origins of the term itself and, as such, has led some scholars to confine the categorization of genízaros. As noted earlier, the word, many have argued, comes from the Turkish *Yeni*, meaning "new", and *Cheri*, or "troops."

---

[39] Horvath, 99-100.
[40] Ana Maria Alonso, *Thread of Blood: Colonialism, Revolution and Gender on Mexico's Frontier*, (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1995): 102, 135.
[41] As quoted in Horvath, 173.

Gutierrez, for example, compares the New Mexican genízaros to the janissaries of the Ottoman Empire, who were slaves seized to serve as "shock troops" in the Sultan's wars. He writes:

> As defeated enemies living in Spanish towns, [genízaros] were considered permanent outsiders who had to submit to the moral and cultural superiority of their conquerors. The term *genízaro* itself (from the Turkish *Yeni*, "new", and *Cheri*, "troops") reflects this fact. The janissaries of the Ottoman Empire were slaves, primarily children, who had been seized from the subject Christians for use as shock troops in the sultan's wars.[42]

This connection has led many scholars to assume that the genízaros were thus called because they served as auxiliaries to the Spanish military.

Brooks is among those adopting this interpretation. In his glossary of terms, for instance, Brooks defines "genízaro" as "Janissary; in New Mexico, detribalized nomadic Indians reduced to slavery, converted, resettled in Spanish homes or villages and deployed as military auxiliaries."[43] He applies this definition in his interpretive analysis of "Segesser I (ca. 1720-1729)," an anonymous hide painting depicting a raid on what appears to be Apaches. It shows a

> raid by mounted horsemen on a mountain tipi encampment whose defenders are afoot and armed only with bows and arrows. Watching the conflict unfold are the women of the ranchería, gathered behind a defensive palisade. The men who confront the attackers are clearly of a single cultural group—their hairstyles, weaponry, and shields are nearly identical—probably represent an Apache band. The nine aggressors (probably more, for a section of the hide is missing), on the other hand, are signified as from diverse indigenous cultures and seem to have been outfitted by Spanish patrons. Their horses are equipped with Spanish bits, bridles, and rawhide *cueros* (leather armor), they wield Spanish *espadas anchas* (cavalry sabers) and steel-tipped lances, and they attack in a formation that puts the lancers in the vanguard. But eight are also unmistakably Indian; they exhibit distinctive and different headdresses and hairstyles and carry round leather shields…[44]

Brooks assumes that the unknown Indians in "Segesser I" were genízaros. He lauds the painting as a "historical jewel" that "provides a visual opening into one of the most distinctive and complicated phenomena that the Southwest Borderlands would produce– the creation of slave militias."[45] Indeed the creation of slave militias was a complicated and distinctive phenomenon, but it did not happen until later in the eighteenth century. While it is possible that the Indians in the painting were genízaros, there is not enough

[42] Gutierrez, 151.
[43] Brooks, 374.
[44] Ibid. 121-122.
[45] Ibid., 123.

evidence to confirm it nor is it likely given the date. They could just as easily be Pueblo auxiliaries, possibly representing different pueblos—which would account for their "distinctive and different headdresses"—or Plains Indian scouts. Interestingly, Brooks criticizes his source, Gottfried Hotz, for being "'unfortunately constrained' by an insistence on seeing this scene as a 'Mexican Indian militia' operating in the 'Sierra Madre mountains of northern Sonora' and misses the more specific genízaro… connections."[46] It seems that Brooks is the one "unfortunately constrained" by his own assumption that figures in a partial reproduction of a hide painting must have been genízaros simply because they were Indians fighting alongside Spaniards against other Indians.

If Brooks' interpretations are accurate, then *genízaro* should refer only to those Indian slaves or their descendants who lived in the frontier towns and assisted the colonial war effort against Plains tribes. Historical documents and analyses, however, render this definition inadequate, if not incorrect. Chavez, for example, finds that Spanish authorities applied the term to detribalized Indians decades before any of them performed official military duties. He even downplays the role that genízaros performed in an official military capacity. Chavez argues that "it is true that much later, in widely scattered instances, small groups of *genízaros* were martially employed, as in the example that Thomas cites and a few other occasions in the years 1777, 1800, 1808, and 1809…but this was decades after the ethnic designation had been firmly established."[47]

Chavez traces the word's earliest usage back to Spain, "where it designated a Spaniard having foreign European blood, like French, Italian or Greek."[48] The word shows up in New Mexico for the first time in the 1660s. It appears again with more frequency after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and even more so after the reconquest of the 1690s,[49] when the enslavement of Pueblo Indians was no longer an option and Plains Indians were indeed foreigners in the eyes of Hispanic New Mexicans. Chavez' findings regarding the word's original appearance suggests that it became an ethnic designation without any military connotations. If this early usage is true, it begs the question of how

[46] Ibid., 122-123; "Segesser I" is discussed in Gottfried Hotz, *The Segesser Hide Paintings: Masterpieces Depicting Spanish Colonial New Mexico* (Santa Fe, NM, 1991): 15-78.
[47] Chavez, "Genízaros," in *Handbook of North American Indians* 9, 198.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Brooks, 129.

the term was chosen to refer to Plains Indian captives sold into slavery and their descendants. Since Spanish authorities commonly referred to Indian tribes as "nations," the word "genízaro" likely referred to the "foreigners" from the Plains who were living among them, albeit involuntarily.

Defining genízaro accurately requires taking a look at a different linguistic origin, such as Latin—from which the Spanish language is largely derived—and being willing to accept a certain elasticity that allows the meaning to bend with time. For example, by the late eighteenth century, so-called genízaro communities had been established but, as discussed above, their populations were not limited to emancipated Plains Indian slaves. Yet, contemporaries of the day saw fit to include these "others" as genízaros. Perhaps such inclusion represents ignorance or laziness, as discussed earlier, or perhaps it demonstrates variability in the word's usage that the primary recorders understood but failed to explain. Going beyond the word's Turkish roots helps create the flexibility necessary to defining it in a way that is consistent with how the primary sources used it. Horvath has examined the word's etymology through its Latin origins by working off of the analysis of Matías Callendrelli. Horvath explains:

> According to Callendrelli the adjective *genízaro* was applied to a child of parents of different nations; such as Spain and France (Callendrelli 1911: 2779). The Spanish word *geno* (lineage, race, progeny, etc.) is the root and the addition of two suffixes, *-izo*, and *–aro*, to this root yields *genízaro*. In New Mexico, *genízaro* was often used as an adjective as in …*indio genízaro*. The Spanish also consistently referred to Indian tribes as nations and the diversity of the tribes represented in the *genízaro* ranks made for many international marriages.[50]

While the exact meaning of the suffixes that Callendrelli observes remains unclear, his definition of *geno* concurs with clerical accounts. In fact, Horvath, as well as Chavez, rely on Fray Juan Agustin Morfi's definition of genízaros, which he offers in a description of New Mexico in 1782. Morfi reports, "This name [*genízaro*] is given to the children of different nations who have married in the province."[51] This definition suggests that the genízaro label served as a "catchall" term to classify miscellaneous Indians, detribalized or otherwise unassociated. Morfi's explanation of the term makes

[50] Horvath, 73-74.
[51] Fray Juan Agustin Morfi, "Geographical Description of New Mexico written by the Reverend Preacher Fray Agustin de Morfi, Reader Jubilado and son of this province of Santo Evangelico of Mexico, 1782," in Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers: A Study of the Spanish Indian Policy of Don Juan Bautista de Anza Governor of New Mexico 1777-1787* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1932): 91-92.

sense in the context of the Hispanic caste system, which ranked classes according to genetic qualities or racial mixtures, not occupational categories, such as military service. The caste system reflected the Hispanic effort to "categorize and organize" its multi-racial society.[52] The nature of this system therefore refutes the assertion that the term genízaro was derived solely from the military functions of freed Indian slaves and their descendants. It also helps explain why, as Chavez finds, the term was used decades before genízaros performed military-related duties for the New Mexican government. The term genízaro might have been a "convenient catchall label used by Spanish colonial bureaucrats to define a population of unassociated but clearly Indian people who did not fit into any of the established categories."[53]

Morfi's reference to genízaros as children of different nations is reinforced by other primary sources. Nicolás de Lafora, for example, noted the presence of genízaros while on a military expedition to evaluate the defenses of the northern frontier. Lafora, captain of the Spanish Royal Engineers, was a member of the military inspection party that toured New Mexico from 1766 to1768. In his report, he mentioned genízaros several times. He noted that "the inhabitants of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe are Spaniards, mestizos, mulattoes, and Indians of the Tigua and Piro nations and Genízaros." In Bethlem, or Belen, he counted "thirty-eight families of Spaniards and Genízaros." Later he described another area: "It has thirty-seven settlements…In them live 2,703 families of Teguas, Genizaros, Abiquius Pecuris, Taos, Pecos, Janos, Zunis, Acomas, Moquinos, Queres, Xemes, Sumas, and Piro Indians, making a total of 10,524 persons."[54] These references do not define "genízaro" but the contexts in which Lafora uses the word correspond with Morfi's explanation. As Horvath observes, Lafora places the genízaros "in an intermediate position between Indians (both pagan nomads and Christian Pueblo) and the Spanish-speaking settlers of the province."[55]

Personal accounts by members of the clergy and government officials reflect some "common denominators" in the genízaros' identities that prevent Morfi's definition from being interpreted too broadly. These factors include nomadic tribal ancestry,

[52] Horvath, 74, 91.
[53] Ibid., 70-71.
[54] Nicolás de Lafora, "Jurisdiction of New Mexico," in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed., *The Frontiers of New Spain: Nicolás de Lafora's Desrcription, 1766-1768* (Berkeley, CA: The Quivira Society, 1958): 83, 89.
[55] Horvath, 83.

Christianization, and Hispanicization. Lafora's description, for example, categorized genízaros as Indians, yet sets them apart from the Pueblo identities he lists. This distinction suggests the genízaros were of only nomadic Plains ancestry. Fray Dominguez observed:

> In this Belen there is a group of genízaros…And some of them have small plots of arable land, and others have nothing, supporting themselves as their luck helps them (only they and God know whether they have managed to get their hands on what belongs to their neighbors).[56]

Dominguez' reference to their owning "small plots of arable land" implies a certain level of Hispanicization among some of the genízaros of Belen. Whatever their tribal heritage, these Indians had adapted to Hispanic agricultural practices by acquiring land as individuals or families and farming it, instead of continuing with nomadic buffalo hunting or communal farming.

The etymological definition of genízaro is critical to understanding who belonged to the genízaro identity, but perhaps it is inconsequential as to whether the genízaros' had a distinguishable culture. Whether the word's meaning stems from Latin or Turkish orgins, genízaros possessed their own ethnic identity and it emerged through the process of ethnogenesis. Indeed, as individuals, genízaros underwent social and cultural transformations upon leaving nomadic Plains tribal lifeways and entering Hispanic households as servants and then Hispanic society. To what extent they experienced a transformation as a group will be the focus of the work that follows. The story to unfold will reveal a convergence of various Indian cultures into one identifiable as genízaro.

As discussed earlier, scholars of intercultural relations often find that the products of such relations experience a process of transculturization rather than ethnogenesis. Transculturization refers to "the process whereby individuals under a variety of circumstances are temporarily or permanently detached from one group, enter the web of social relations that constitute another society, and come under the influence of its customs, ideas, and values."[57] For example, Bailey argues that most of the Hispanic New Mexicans who were captured and adopted by Plains tribes became culturally Indian. Similarly, many have observed that mestizos, the offspring of Spaniards and Indians, tended to "go Spanish." Observers of the Indian slave trade in the Southwest, including

[56]Adams and Chavez, *The Missions of New Mexico*, 208.
[57] A. Irving Hallowell, "American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturization," in *Current Anthropology* (December 1963): 523.

Bailey, have maintained that a similar phenomenon occurred among Indian captives who entered Hispanic society throughout the region, particularly among those who were taken out of their native culture at an early age.[58] The genízaros of New Mexico, however, did not "go Spanish" entirely, nor did they remain entirely Indian. Their adherence to certain aspects of their Native American heritage and their adaptations to Hispanic culture suggest that the genízaros experienced ethnogenesis rather than transculturization. Group settlement in frontier communities is one critical indicator of this process.

The best evidence for ethnogenesis is found in an analysis of the frontier towns where many genízaros settled in the second half of the eighteenth century. As noted in Fray Dominguez' comments above, genízaros often took up farming, which reflected an adaptation to Hispanic society and culture. They acquired land through grants from the New Mexican government eager to settle the frontier as a defense to encroaching Plains Indians. Many genízaros also became artisans or day laborers. Gutierrez finds that, according to 1790 census data, 21 per cent of genízaros living in frontier villages were farmers, 36.8 per cent were artisans, and 28.9 per cent were day laborers. Although Gutierrez derives his percentages from a small sample, his numbers help show that these occupations integrated genízaros into the New Mexican economy.[59]

Genízaros living in these settlements, however, did not demonstrate full adaptation to Hispanic culture. Abiquiu, for instance, had a governor, an *aguacil* (constable), and a *fiscal* (church warden). This government structure followed the pattern of an Indian pueblo, not a Spanish town. Similarly, many genízaros who moved to the frontier changed their Christian baptismal names for Indian names. Relying on primary evidence in the archives of both Mexico City and Santa Fe, Gutierrez writes, "Antonio Jimenez called himself "Cuasipe"…Miguel Reano was "Tasago"…Juana, the Apache slave of Diego Velasquez, was Guisachi."[60] Likewise, as mentioned above, the New Mexican government encouraged genízaros to reprise the stereotypical Indian role of warrior, which became a source of pride and power for genízaros on the frontier. These observations regarding the frontier communities suggest the towns provided a means for

[58] Bailey, 181-183.
[59] Gutierrez, 203-204.
[60] Ibid., 305.

the development of a distinct genízaro identity, an identity that was neither exclusively Hispanic nor Indian, but bi-cultural.

Religious and related social practices provide additional evidence that suggests genízaros experienced the process of ethnogenesis to produce a bi-cultural identity. To an extent, genízaros practiced Catholicism. They baptized their children, yet genízaros did not put much stock in or have much access to the sacrament of marriage. This discrepancy appears to be an issue of practicality. Baptisms were practical because of the godparent system. Among captives, for example, baptismal records show that genízaros' godparents were most often not their owners. David Brugge concludes that "the godparent system extended kin obligation beyond those of actual blood relationships, and, it increased the number of people to whom a captive turned for aid."[61] Marriage, on the other hand, did not offer much security or change in the lives of genízaros. For other groups in Hispanic society, marriage often meant acquisition of property and progression in the social hierarchy. Since genízaros had relatively little property and minimal chances for upward social mobility, unless they married a non-Indian, marriage offered negligible practical benefits, if it was even an option. When genízaros did marry, they tended to marry each other.[62]

Language was another area that demonstrated a bi-cultural identity among genízaros. Since they came from a myriad of tribes, genízaros did not have a common native language. Their common language was Spanish. Generally, however, genízaros did not master Spanish; rather, they spoke a distinctly broken form of the language. For example, Fray Dominguez described the Santa Fe genízaros language patterns:

> There are a number of genízaro Indians in this villa [Santa Fe] who after being ransomed from the pagans by our people, are then emancipated to work out their account under them. Although they are servants among our people, they are not fluent in speaking and understanding Castilian perfectly, for however much they may talk or learn the language, they do not wholly understand it or speak it without twisting it somewhat.[63]

[61] Brugge, 114.
[62] Horvath, 127; Gutierrez, 296, Brugge, 109-110.
[63] Adams and Chavez, 42.

The genízaros' brand of improper Spanish may have been looked upon negatively by Hispanic New Mexicans, but it also distinguished them as a group. Dominguez' observations here suggest that, in a sense, the genízaros developed their own language.

While his writings from the late eighteenth century have provided valuable insights to the genízaros, helping us to figure out who they were and how they lived, Fray Dominguez was wrong about the genízaros. There is a lot to say about their customs, in fact, enough to prove that the genízaros possessed an identity that contributed significantly to New Mexican society during the colonial period and after. New Mexico's security interests created an avenue by which genízaros could prove themselves to skeptical government leaders. Similarly, these interests provided a means for genízaros to achieve some economic gains. Even though such gains were largely obtainable because genízaros lived in often dangerous frontier settlements that existed to serve the needs of the New Mexican government, they were gains nonetheless. They facilitated the growth of a genízaro consciousness born out of the process of ethnogenesis.

Chapter Two

Setting the Stage: The Context in which the Genízaros Emerged

French explorers traveling around the northeastern frontier of New Mexico at the end of the seventeenth century shared disturbing reports about what they saw:

> The Navajos, accustomed to make long journeys to Quivira, frequently fought the French and Pawnees, in alliance at that time, and brought the spoil to trade in New Mexico. On one occasion in 1694 they returned with some captive children whom they beheaded after the Spaniards had refused to ransom them. The atrocity so shocked the Spanish King that he ordered thereafter the use of royal funds to save such unfortunates.[64]

This incident marked a turning point in the questionable practice of "ransoming" Plains captives, setting the stage for the genízaro experience in New Mexico.

Understanding the genízaro experience and the process of ethnogenesis requires understanding the context in which the genízaros emerged. They did not migrate onto the Plains from Mexico or the Great Basin, nor did they come into New Mexico by boat from the other side of the world. Rather, genízaros came to be as a result of inter-cultural interactions, including violent confrontations as well as economic and political negotiations. Among the most pivotal of these interactions were the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and the Spanish Reconquest of the 1690s. These events and the increasingly dire circumstances of the surrounding region shaped the terms of an arrangement between Spanish colonizers and Pueblo Indians. Ultimately, this arrangement put the focus of the southwestern slave trade on Plains Indian captives and expanded a captive exchange system that became progressively more dependent on violent inter-tribal raiding as well as peaceful organized trading. This ambiguous exchange system was part and parcel of a complex economy that created genízaros as an identifiable group of people. Trading and raiding became a way of life for everyone involved, even eventually the genízaros themselves.

The American Southwest of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries featured an extensive cast of characters engaged in an ongoing struggle for economically driven political power as they battled for access to and control of markets, territories and resources, both natural and human. Of course, some enjoyed more success than others. In the eighteenth century, the major players included not only an array of powerful Native American groups—the Apaches, Comanches, Navajos, and Pueblos—who worked with and against each other through trade and warfare, but also a handful of

[64] "Early Reports of Frenchmen in the Northeast," in Thomas, *After Coronado: Spanish Exploration Northeast of New Mexico, 1697-1727* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935): 13-14.

imperial competitors, including obviously the Spaniards as well as the French, who threatened the Spaniards' fragile hold on their northern frontier. In the nineteenth century, the encroachment of displaced eastern and northern Indians along with Anglo-American traders and colonizers complicated matters even further.

By the early eighteenth century, most of these players were in New Mexico while others were on the horizon looking for a hand in the region's longstanding and expansive trade economy. Native people living in the Southwest had been experiencing the effects of the Europeans' presence in the Americas and their markets for nearly 200 years, coming in direct contact with each other through the Spanish exploratory expeditions of the mid-sixteenth century. Contact profoundly impacted, even transformed, inter- and intra-tribal political and social interactions among the various native groups in the region. In fact, the changes some of these groups experienced as a result of contact reveal that many genízaros came from tribal societies that were engaged in the process of ethnogenesis as a means to survive and prosper in the colonial setting. Meanwhile, the Spanish Crown found contact with natives promising and fairly quickly extended its colonial operations northward from Mexico to find new resources and impose their "enlightened" worldview on the local residents. The Spanish brought with them an Inquisition mindset and, with blinders on, underestimated the strength and resolve of native societies that clearly possessed their own political agendas, economic interests and, above all, the will to survive.[65]

In New Mexico specifically, Spanish colonizers initially found the Pueblos to be the most attractive recipients of redemption. Here, multi-cultural and economic inter-play was just as pervasive as in the rest of the region. As the Spaniards crept up from the south and inserted themselves into the local mix, they encountered about 100 different native communities "whose citizens spoke eight or more mutually unintelligible languages" and each one had its own "politically autonomous unit."[66] Dubbing them "Pueblos" as they lived in organized fortified villages and practiced agriculture, the Spaniards were drawn to these "civilized" Indians. Likewise, the Spanish intruders took interest in the well-established and highly active trading that these various communities

[65] Anderson, 3-8.
[66] Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 12.

engaged in with one another as well as with neighboring Plains hunters. Eager to participate in, if not control, this trade, Spanish colonizers saw potential in these "nearly-civilized" Pueblos, who with salvation and guidance could achieve the Spanish ideal. They underestimated, however, the Pueblos' commitment to their own religion, which would prove to be a costly oversight later that would lead to a new emphasis on Plains Indian captives.[67]

Spaniards first endeavored to colonize New Mexico in 1598 under the leadership of Don Juan de Oñate, who brought along 500 settlers, 61 wagons carrying goods and supplies, and herds of livestock. Along for the ride, though independent of Oñate's authority, were nine Franciscan priests to launch the Crown's "missionary enterprise." King Philip II intended the New Mexican colony to be "apostolic and Christian, and not a butchery." Oñate was to work within the regulations of the Orders for New Discoveries of 1573, which outlined the humane intent of the Crown and provided, officially anyway, the underlying principles governing the Spanish Empire for the next 250 years.[68] Oñate's instructions read, "Your main purpose shall be the service of God our Lord, the spreading of His holy Catholic faith, and the reduction and pacification of the natives of the said provinces."[69] Even though, in theory, conquest and enslavement were not to be the methods for "reducing" and "pacifying" the local populations, in practice, on the remote fringes of the Royal Empire, they were.

Oñate abused his power, cutting short his tenure and threatening the survival of the colony. But his successor, Pedro de Peralta, essentially carried the torch through royally-sanctioned alternatives and solidified the Spanish presence in New Mexico. Reducing and pacifying the Pueblos translated into attempting to eliminate Puebloan worship practices altogether while instituting the *encomienda*, which required Indians to give their labor and pay tribute in exchange for religious instruction and ensured physical

---

[67] Colin G. Calloway, *One Vast Winter Count: The Native American West before Lewis and Clark* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2003): 75; Kenner, chapter 1; Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown,* 12; Brooks, 45-48.

[68] Elizabeth A.H. John, "Indians in the Spanish Southwest," in Clyde A. Milner's *Major Problems in the History of the American West* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1989): 51; David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992): 79.

[69] George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, eds., *Don Juan de Oñate: Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1953): 4-9.

safety.[70] The *encomienda* and reduction amounted to forced labor and conversion and left the Pueblos vulnerable to exploitation and oppression. Despite King Philip's supposedly noble intentions, the Spanish presence in faraway New Mexico bore an uncanny resemblance to conquest and enslavement. Colonial rule reigned uninterrupted in New Mexico, dominating the indigenous Pueblo societies, until 1680 when the Pueblos rebelled against the Spaniards and won.

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 did not flare up out of nowhere. Rather it had been brewing for years in "a context of rebellion and resistance that was long established and widespread."[71] Native Americans throughout the Spanish Empire had fought against conquest, colonialism and Christianity in varying degrees since the "founding" of New Spain. From the Chichimecas in Zacatecas to the Zuaques in Sinaloa, the Conchos in Nueva Vizcaya, the Cacaxtles in Nuevo León, and, of course, the Pueblos in New Mexico, Iberian invaders met wars of united resistance as well as small-scale uprisings and quiet acts of defiance. In New Mexico, resistance efforts percolated within a few decades of colonization as extremely difficult conditions caused the missionaries to lose ground with the few inroads they had made. Drought, famine and disease caused devastating effects on Pueblo populations while relentless attacks from Plains Apaches, who had been longtime trading partners but were also starving and falling ill, continued to wreak havoc. As Colin Calloway puts it, "Spanish soldiers could not protect the Pueblos against Apache raiders; Spanish priests could not protect them against drought and pestilence; Pueblo husbands and fathers could not protect their wives and daughters against the priests."[72] In response to these circumstances, Pueblo people doubted the benevolence and power of the Catholics' God and looked to what they knew—traditional dances, ceremonies, and prayers—to bring back what they missed: their pre-colonial, pre-Christian way of life.

Hindsight gave at least one Franciscan priest the perspective to see, or perhaps rationalize, that for the Pueblos, Catholicism never stood a chance against the *Kivas*. Fray Francisco de Ayeta complained in December 1681 that "they have been found to be so pleased with liberty of conscience and so attached to the belief in the worship of Satan

[70] John, 52-53; Brooks, 373.
[71] Calloway, 165.
[72] Ibid., 172, 166-170; Gutierrez, 113, 123.

that up to present not a sign has been visible of their ever having been Christians."[73] Likewise, Sergeant Major Luis de Quintana observed that "most of them have never forsaken idolatry, and they appear to be Christians more by force than to be Indians who are reduced to the Holy Faith."[74] Having never really accepted the Christian faith and able to see their world unraveling around them, the Pueblos got serious about removing the Spaniards. Up to this point, colonial authorities had managed to quell periodic disjointed movements, which all lacked the necessary unity and synchronicity to pose any real threat to the colony's staying power. At one point, "conspirators" from the pueblo of Taos had circulated "two deerskins with some pictures on them…in order to convoke the people to a new rebellion." In Moqui, they refused to accept them and the effort stalled. But it was different in 1680 because, as Pedro Naranjo, a Pueblo prisoner, remembered in 1681, even though "the pact which they had been forming ceased" for a time "they always kept in their hearts the desire to carry it out, so as to live as they are living today."[75] In August 1680, most Pueblos put aside their political differences to bridge a previously untenable alliance in the name of driving out the Spaniards once and for all.

And so, the Spaniards who survived the revolt left, for 12 years anyway. During that time, the Spaniards were never far away, lurking on the periphery and looking for opportunities to reconquer. In 1681, the military set up a presidio at El Paso to protect refugees and the Franciscans built mission communities near La Junta de los Rios. Meanwhile, the Pueblo alliance deteriorated as old habits of political disunity and mistrust resurfaced. For many Pueblos the goal of the Revolt had been to eject the physical presence of the colonial regime, while others had envisioned the return of a purely pre-colonial existence. Wool production and Spanish livestock and crops had reshaped Pueblos' lives and many refused to give them up. Similarly, many Pueblos were not willing to give up European goods and tools or to walk away from Christian marriages. Discord thus stemmed from the split between those who refused to give up the lifestyle they had become accustomed to under Spanish control and those who sought to return to pre-contact lifeways. Making matters worse, neither drought conditions nor

[73] Charles W. Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermín's Attempted Reconquest 1680-1682* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1942): 2:309.
[74] Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians*, 2:291.
[75] Ibid., 2:246.

Apache aggravations left with the Spaniards.[76] Without the unifying force of anti-Spanish sentiment, the Pueblos could not hold their alliance together and they set themselves up for the *reconquista* of the 1690s. But this time, with the Pueblos able to utilize leverage from their 1680 success and both Pueblos and Spaniards realizing that they needed each other, things would be different.

In 1692, Don Diego de Vargas mounted a formal effort to reclaim the lost colony through the power of persuasion. Initially, Vargas met negligible resistance as he made the rounds to several Pueblo communities, including Pecos, Santa Ana, Zia, and San Felipe, to perform a bloodless, ritualistic reconquest of New Mexico. But Pueblos in Santa Fe and elsewhere were less willing to accept the Spaniards' return and tensions escalated to "war without quarter."[77] Vargas finally secured the colony in 1696, but recognized that he would have to make some concessions to the Pueblos to thwart any more serious resistance efforts. Most importantly, the *encomienda* became a thing of the past, and although, for the most part, Pueblos agreed to accept Catholicism, the Franciscans had to accept that the Pueblos would do so alongside their own religious practices.[78] "Not often in the eighteenth century," John Kessell observes, "did they condemn Pueblo Indian *Kivas* as dens of devilish idolatry, as they had in the previous century."[79]

This kind of concession from the priests might have reflected the art of negotiation but it more obviously demonstrated a power shift among the Spanish authorities as well as the imminent threat from both Plains natives and other Europeans. Throughout the seventeenth century, a palpable rift between civil and ecclesiastic leaders persisted as they bickered over the colony's purpose and who held ultimate authority, with one side constantly accusing the other of abuses of power and immoral treatment of Indians. As New Spain endured into the eighteenth century, however, the governors gained the upper hand and the Franciscans' authority significantly weakened. Imperial forces and interests were affecting this gradual change in Mexico City's focus, wherein "pragmatic accommodation" began to replace "the crusading intolerance of the age of

[76] Calloway, 186-187, 201.
[77] Kessell, *Remote Beyond Compare*, 62-65.
[78] Weber, 141; Calloway, 200-202.
[79] Kessell, *Remote Beyond Compare*, 91-92.

spiritual conquest." This change in priorities bred a cooperative relationship between Hispanic and Indian New Mexicans rooted in the shared interest of self-preservation. With the colonial leadership in Mexico feeling the pressures of imperial competition and New Mexico itself "increasingly beset by Apaches, Navajos, Utes and Comanches [who all now had horses from the 1680 Revolt], the Hispanic and Pueblo peoples of the Rio Grande found their best defense in cooperation."[80] Turning a blind eye to *kiva* worship then was easy enough given the colony's very real security concerns.

The threat of "hostile" Indians was only surpassed by the threat of other Europeans, specifically the French coming from the east out of the Gulf of Mexico in the late seventeenth century. French expansion and their willingness to trade firearms with already dangerous natives from the Plains fed Spanish insecurity and made them understandably uneasy. Their collaborative efforts were therefore not restricted to the Pueblos. In 1719, for example, Viceroy Marqués de Valero ordered:

> Let a dispatch be prepared for the governor ordering him to employ with the greatest efficiency all his care to allure and entertain them [the Apaches] extensively…Warn him that it is necessary to hold this nation because of the hostilities which the French have launched among the Tejas, because the Duke of Orleans has threatened to declare war on our crown…As the Apache nations aided by ourselves could inflict considerable damage on the French and block their evil designs, the governor must assist with all the people that he can and on such occasions which offer themselves as await his zeal.[81]

When it came to the French, Spaniards found the ferocity and antagonism of enemies like the Apaches advantageous and found no shame in using them. Clearly, in the eighteenth century, the colonial government's interest in New Mexico became more about competing with other European expansionists and defending its borders than about spreading Christianity. In this context, contentious rivalries could be as tenuous as longstanding alliances.

Despite this alteration in the colonial government's priorities, redeeming heathen Indians hardly took a backseat and remained a convenient excuse for conquest and enslavement—just not as much for the Pueblos anymore. The abolition of the *encomienda* relieved the Pueblos from the burden of forced labor and the Spaniards thus turned their attention to nomadic Plains peoples. As raiding was a means for accessing

---

[80] Ibid.
[81] "Order of Valero, México, August 1, 1719," in Thomas, *After Coronado*: 138-139; Noyes, 15-16, 19, 21; Weber 146.

resources, Plains Indians regularly attacked New Mexican settlements and, by virtue of being roaming hunters instead of sedentary agriculturalists, they were not "civilized." These points allowed the Spanish to rationalize that the people of the Plains were in desperate need of redemption. As the Spanish saw it, just outside the safety of their settlements was the "the land of infidel, heathen, and barbarous Indians, one continually in a state of open warfare."[82] The tumultuous situation on the Plains served well the purposes of the Crown's renewed mission in New Mexico: first, to clarify and protect its borders against other encroaching Europeans and Plains Indians, both looking to expand their territories and profit from exceptional trading opportunities; and second, to acculturate and convert "barbarous, heathen" Indians. This mindset fueled the Spanish practice of "liberating" Plains Indians captives from the trappings of uncivilized pagan life through detribalization and forced labor; a practice that produced the genízaro class and identity.

Although the turn of the eighteenth century marked an upswing in this activity, Spaniards had brought home Plains Indian captives for quite some time. In fact, the Spanish colonizers brought a penchant for enslaving nomadic peoples with them as they moved in from the south in the sixteenth century. They needed labor for their mines and the farms that supplied them. The Chichimecas of Mexico's central plateau were among the first forced into servitude, then the Guachichiles, the Coahuilas, the Tepehuanes and on to the southern Pimas, Seris, Yaquis, and eventually the Athabaskans, who became known as the Apaches and Navajos.[83] In New Mexico before 1680, the mission and *encomienda* programs directed at the Pueblos had generated the bulk of Indian labor, but not all of it. Slave raiding on the Plains was happening well before Oñate arrived with his wagons in 1598. And, by 1638, unable to compete with the Franciscans for the Pueblos' loyalty and submission, Governor Luis de Rosas set his sights on other Indians and began campaigns to round up slaves to man his wool mills. Although Rosas went after Utes, too, most of his raiding expeditions targeted the Apaches. Of course, the

[82] Don Diego de Vargas, "Diego de Vargas to Isabel María de Vargas Pimentel, Mexico City, 4 November 1690" in Kessell, *Remote Beyond Compare*, 146.
[83] Bailey, 9-10.

Apaches were hardly helpless victims. They came into Pecos every year to trade hides, meat and captives of their own.[84]

While slave raiding was somewhat less common in the seventeenth century than in the eighteenth, it was no less controversial. The practice disgruntled both Pueblos and Franciscans. State-sponsored slaving expeditions against the Apaches in particular upset trade relations with the Pueblos, who felt the brunt of Apache retaliation, while the Franciscans abhorred the fact that such expeditions fell outside the realm of their missionization program and thereby their control. In 1659, a handful of friars complained:

> Very great, Sir, has been the covetousness of the governors of this kingdom, wherein they have, under color of chastising the neighboring enemy, made opportunity to send, apparently in the service of his Majesty, squadrons of men to El Parral to sell (as governor Don Bernardo López de Mendizábal is doing at present, he having sent there more than seventy Indian men and women to be sold). This is a thing which his Majesty and the señores viceroys have forbidden, under penalty of disgrace, deprivation of office, and loss of property, but no attention is paid to the order on account of the great interests involved; hence God our, our Lord, through this inhuman practice is losing innumerable souls of the heathen hereabout, who have, from fear of it, conceived a mortal hatred for our holy faith and enmity for the Spanish nation.[85]

Clearly displeased with governors both past and present, the Franciscans highlighted the travesty of unbaptized heathens leaving New Mexico while making sure to draw attention to the Crown's ban on slave trading. Of course, their concerns were shrouded in hypocrisy as the priests were no strangers to dealing slaves themselves, despite prohibitions from within the Church. Even though the friars did not ship them off without redemption, the Church clearly forbade them from obtaining "heathens," even in the name of Christianization and Hispanicization. And, like their secular counterparts, they did it anyway.[86] Regardless, the Franciscans did not shy away from exposing what the governors were up to. They knew which buttons to push and fielded their concerns in terms that could potentially threaten the governors' mandate. In the above excerpt, they stopped short of questioning the colonial government's commitment to protecting and

---

[84] "Gallegos' Relation of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez Expedition," in Hammond and Rey, *The Rediscovery of New Mexico, 1580-1594: The Explorations of Chamuscado, Espejo, Castaño de Sosa, Morlete and Leyva de Bonilla de Humana* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1966): 71; Gutierrez, 112; Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 222.

[85] "Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado, Santa Fe, September 1661," Hackett, *Historical Documents* 3: 186-187.

[86] Kessell, *Kiva,Cross, and Crown*, 367.

serving God's will while very obviously making note of the governors' participation in supposedly illegal trading.

In 1714, Governor Don Juan Ignacio Flores Mogollón responded to such concerns accordingly and ordered that captives had to be cleansed before setting off on dangerous passage in order to ensure their salvation should they not survive the journey. Anyone facilitating the departure of Apache captives not known to be baptized properly would be banned from trading:

> …I have news that the Apaches, that bought in large and small exchanges by the citizens of this kingdom and other outside jurisdictions that take them to distant places to sell, go without being baptized, which is the principal reason that the King…permits and tolerates this traffic and the risk with which the souls depart, for I am informed that on the roads it sometimes happens that the children fall from their mounts and are killed…I command all the Citizens of the Kingdom that as soon as they hear or receive news of this [Bando] they proceed to take all the Apaches with which they are found to the Reverend Father Ministers, so that they might Baptize them with the warning that I will not permit any to depart from the Kingdom that I do not know to be Baptized...that for said [disobedience] I set the punishment of loss of said Apaches that might be recognized going without Baptism, and of not permitting them to trade in them for their omission and carelessness…[87]

Without baptisms, the slave trade could not be justified and without the slave trade the tenuous New Mexican economy might collapse. The priests perhaps no longer wielded the same kind of power they had in the previous century, but they continued to protect their interests by playing on the temptation for economic gain. Governors like Flores Mogollón could not rationally ignore any blatant disregard for the Crown's "duty" to cleanse heathen souls anymore than they could allow overzealous traders to get in the way of a perfectly good thing. As such, colonial authorities made a critical prerequisite to participating in captive exchanges a matter of public record and reiterated it as needed.

The friars in 1659 also pointed to another significant threat to the colony's survivability that would not escape the attention of high-ranking officials. The pursuit of the "heathen," according to the priests, yielded unbearable consequences as government-sponsored slaving expeditions incited Indian retaliations and left New Mexicans defenseless against such retaliations:

> For this purpose of making captives…the governor sent out an army of eight hundred Christian Indians and forty Spaniards, though there was evident risk at the time the army set out that trouble would ensue, for the kingdom was then full of bands of heathen who have entered the pueblos of Las Salinas, the *camino real*, and the farms of El Río and also into the pueblos of

[87]Flores Mogollón, Santa Fe, bando ordering baptism of Apache captives, September 26, 1714, *Spanish Archives of New Mexico* (SANM) II 4:1102, translation from Brugge, xix-xx.

> Hemes, San Ildefonso, and San Felipe. In these pueblos they have killed some Christian Indians and have carried off others alive to perish in cruel martyrdom. They have also driven off some herds of horses and mares. All this is because the populous region is undefended, the troops having been sent off inland for slaves under the pretense above stated, and we are afraid, lest the heathen may come in suddenly while they are absent and destroy some of the settlements.[88]

While the friars' criticisms here continue to speak to the tensions between the Franciscans and the local colonial leadership, they also highlight the violent nature of the slave trade and why the Spanish "sought alternative, diplomatic routes to pacification of the 'wild' Indians."[89] The friars' declaration shows that as early as the mid-seventeenth century, the Spanish were preoccupied with acquiring Plains Indian servants, to the detriment of their settlements and their own well-being. But rather than backing away from slavery, Hispanic New Mexicans remained committed to the pursuit of Indian captives and relied more heavily on other, less self-destructive, avenues to obtain their coveted commodities.

Before 1680, the main method for securing captives had been warfare and the "just war" rationalization referred to in chapter one. As inter-tribal warfare and raiding escalated to provide captives for the surging trade, the Spaniards found such methods to be just as costly for themselves as for the Indians, and increasingly allowed the Indians to fight it out as the middlemen and turned to safer means to get what they wanted. After the Reconquest of New Mexico, while Spaniards did continue to raid for slaves, the main method of acquiring Indian labor became formal trade fairs or smaller *cambalaches* in local villages or at trading places on the Plains. By 1703, trading was regular enough outside of the Spanish settlements to lead the cabildo in Santa Fe to complain to the governor about New Mexicans going out to trade horses for captives with the Jicarilla Apaches. The practice of trading outside of Spanish settlements was supposed to be banned. But, once again, not trading was not an option. In fact, trading on the Plains remained steadfast and unabated until the late nineteenth century, when all New Mexican-Plains Indian trading came to an end with the destruction of the buffalo and the final Indian wars with the American government. Like the slave trade itself, informal

[88]"Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado, Santa Fe, September 1661," Hackett, *Historical Documents* 3: 186-187.
[89] Brooks, 124-125.

Plains trading along with the fairs were not new practices in the eighteenth century; they just became significantly more important.[90]

Personal accounts and official reports point to the methods of acquiring captives but do not help quantify the scale of the trade. Church records corroborate the notable increase in the "redemption" of captives from nomadic and pastoral tribes after the turn of the eighteenth century. Records of Indian baptisms in particular help the story of Native American captivity and servitude to unfold. Many of these records did not survive the colonial period, but what remains available reveals the scope and longevity of the trade. The records cannot tell us how many or which of these Indians came into Hispanic society to receive the sacrament of baptism at the hands of the Spaniards themselves or through trading with Indian captors. However, they let us know who many of the slaves were, as the recorders often noted tribal identity along with modifying euphemisms like "indio de rescate," "indio genízaro," or "criado."[91] David Brugge's work with these records reveals that the Athabaskan-speakers, that is the Apaches and Navajos, were the most largely represented native groups entering Hispanic society through servitude over time, and that the peaks and valleys in their numbers coincide with dramatic political developments in the region. For instance,

> From 1700 to the 1750s more captives were obtained from tribes identified merely as 'Apache' than from any other category with a peak in the 1740s. The records of this period correspond well with the expansion of the Comanches into the plains, disrupting and disorganizing the Plains Apaches, and it would seem a logical deduction that most of these 'Apaches' came from plains groups.[92]

Similarly, the pastoral Navajos were the principal victims of the slave trade in the 1820s as a result of Governor José Antonio Vizcarra's campaign of 1823, but dipped to some of their lowest numbers in the 1850s during New Mexico's confusing adjustment to Anglo-American rule. Brugge's research also finds significant spikes in the enslavement of Comanches in the 1780s and the Utes through the middle decades of the nineteenth century.[93]

---

[90] Ibid.; Cabildo of Santa Fe to governor complaining of sale of horses to Jicarillas, November, 26, 1703, SANM II, 3:823; The abundance and persistence of trading on the northern frontier is the thrust of Kenner's work in *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations.*

[91] Brugge, 1-2, 22; Brooks, 125; Rael-Galvez, 16.

[92] Brugge, 21-22.

[93] Ibid., 23-24.

The economic, social and political dynamics at play within and between the tribes explain why the Plains Apaches and the pastoral Navajos were more prone to captivity than their Comanche or Ute counterparts. The highpoint in Apache captivity during the first half of the eighteenth century, for example, stems from a myriad of factors, particularly their own social, political and economic structures. Brugge's work with the church records shows that the rise in Apache baptisms is consistent with the Comanches' expansion onto the Plains as well as the Apaches' own tendency toward divisiveness and a semi-nomadic economy. Actually, divisiveness between Apache bands and variation among their subsistence economies worked for *and* against them. Spread out on and near the Plains, the Apaches' lack of clear political tribal unity precluded them from being divided and conquered while also preventing a collaborative stand against the Comanches and other aggressors. For instance, the Jicarillas, Flechas de Palo, Carlanas and Penxayes living in the north near Pecos, Picuris and Taos were "busy with the sowing of corn, frijoles, and pumpkins"[94] and especially open to the devastation of the Comanches, Pawnees and even other Apaches. The situation was desperate enough for "Captain Carlana" to approach Governor Don Juan Domingo de Bustamente to request protection because "the heathens of the Comanche nation…had attacked them with a large number in their rancherías in such a manner that they could not make use of weapons for their defense."[95] As Stanley Noyes observes, "Knowing where to find the northeastern Apaches during the growing season, the raiders were able to plan attacks from as far as two hundred to four hundred miles away. They would suddenly strike, kill and burn, then gallop away with scalps, plunder, and prisoners, escaping into the vastness of the plains."[96] In the south, the Faraóns, Natagés, Mescaleros, Pelones and Lipans were regularly on the move herding livestock and hunting buffalo, which made them harder, though not impossible, to pinpoint.

The southern Apaches' constant raiding of Spanish New Mexicans and other Indian groups contributed to their vulnerability to the slave trade, as they were always targets for retaliation and precariously positioned as the common enemy among New

[94] "The Diary of Juan de Ulibarri to El Cuartelejo, 1706" in Thomas, *After Coronado*, 64; Anderson 108-109.
[95] "Decree for Council of War, Santa Fe, November 8, 1723," in Thomas, *After Coronado*, 194.
[96] Noyes, 22.

Mexicans and the advancing Comanches. Even though, by 1700, the southern Apache bands had successfully pushed the Jumanos and Wichitas out of the way for control of the western reaches of the Southern Plains and the mountains of New Mexico, the Comanches moved in right behind them, threatening their hold. Rather than sinking into powerlessness and obscurity as the eighteenth century wore on, however, the Apaches' resilience and formidability kept them in the forefront of the political and economic maneuverings of the region. They never faded into the background; rather they remained important political and economic players because they provided "desperately needed resources to the economy," which they were able to do because they adapted to the region's changing ecosystems and made the necessary accommodations in their methods of production and in their socio-political structures.[97]

The name Apache itself appears to be a linguistic umbrella for a number of groups that originally hailed from present-day Canada and followed the buffalo to the Plains by the late fifteenth century. Apache mostly refers to Athabaskan-speakers, though some "Apaches," like the southern Pelones who came up from Mexico, were not of Athabaskan origin and acquired any one of a few dialects to assume the Apache identity. Athabaskan, or otherwise, Apaches tailored their lifestyle and economy to the Plains environment by following seasonal patterns like village farming or foraging along the river valleys and buffalo hunting on the Plains. The hunting-gathering Apaches found the agricultural Pueblos and began trade relations, which bridged political alliances that in some cases withstood the duress of Spanish occupation. In general, "The Teyas [Apaches]…were known by the people of the towns [Pueblos] as their friends."[98] Despite their predatory reputation perpetuated by Spanish chroniclers, the southern bands built alliances with Pueblos and other Plains people through trade and marriage to become increasingly powerful in the seventeenth century. Ironically, slave raiding was also an important piece to alliance building in the Southwest because it allowed groups

[97] Anderson, 95-96, 105; Calloway, 279-281.
[98] Anderson, 113, 115-117; "Gallegos' Relation of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez Expedition," in Hammond and Rey, *The Rediscovery of New Mexico*, 87, 90; Quote from "Castañeda's History," in Hammond and Rey, *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1940): 258.

like the Apaches, and later the Comanches, to adopt new members into their bands as well as to participate in the regional economy by selling captives for horses.[99]

Before the Spaniards showed up with their horses and other livestock, Apaches traveled on foot and moved their goods on "medium-sized shaggy" dogs tied "to one another as in a pack train" and carrying "loads of two or three arrobas" with "leather pack-saddles, using maguey ropes for halters."[100] The re-introduction of the horse into North America profoundly altered native lifeways throughout the continent and the Apaches were no less affected. By the early seventeenth century, Apaches had replaced their dogs with Spanish horses, which quickly became central to their way of life as they provided mobility for warfare and large hunting parties, relocating in times of drought and famine, and trading and raiding over great distances.[101] Not only did Apaches find tremendous utility and practicality in horses, they also found something mystical and magical. In fact, Apaches initially saw horses as gifts from the gods and wondered why they had been given to white men and not to them. Raids for horses became sacred missions, dependent upon the proper songs being sung, special language being spoken, taboos observed and rituals performed.[102]

For all that horses did to change the Apache way of life, they did not profoundly alter Apachean social class structures, or lack thereof. Early observers found no discernible class structure among Apache bands and even suggested near equal status in various gender roles. Whereas for the Comanches, an individual's possession of horses spoke to his wealth and status, the Apaches did not use horses in this way. Living fairly simply in relatively smaller bands, the Apaches had few "status" goods to facilitate class stratification and their nomadic hunting lifestyle made a "complicated sociopolitical structure within the one hundred or so members of each band" unnecessary.[103] As some Pueblos related to Hernán Gallegos:

> They indicated to us that the inhabitants of the buffalo region were not striped; that they lived by hunting and ate nothing but buffalo meat during the winter; that during the rainy season they

[99] Anderson 105-106.
[100] "Gallegos' Relation of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez Expedition," in Hammond and Rey, *The Rediscovery of New Mexico*, 90.
[101] Calloway, 279-280.
[102] LaVerne Harrell Clark, *They Sang for Horses: The Impact of the Horse on Navajo and Apache Folklore* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1966): 43, 85-90, 110-115.
[103] Thomas W. Kavanagh, *Comanche Political History: An Ethnohistorical Perspective, 1706-1875* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1996): 59; Noyes, xxiv; Anderson, 226 and quote from 108.

> would go to the areas of the prickly pear and yucca; that they had no houses, but only huts of buffalo hides; that they moved from place to place…[104]

As the circumstances changed in the mid-eighteenth century, the Apaches' horse-centered culture carried over to a horse-centered economy and subsistence. The Comanches' dominance significantly limited the Apaches' access to buffalo herds and hampered trade with other Indians. Moreover, the Comanches pushed the Apaches toward the Spaniards. Surviving and fighting Comanches to the north and Spaniards to the south was all-consuming. The squeeze resulted in even more Apache women and children entering captivity and Apaches being unable to get at enough buffalo—whose numbers were already in decline due to climate change and drought conditions—to produce meat, hides and other related goods for themselves or for trading. This setting similarly affected the Apaches' abilities to raise crops and herd livestock. Forced to regroup and abandon agriculture and hunting, Apaches turned to raiding and poaching to subsist as well as to compete in the southwestern economy. By the late eighteenth century, they moved further south and consolidated into larger and better organized bands, some of which clarified political leadership with "capitán grandes" and became somewhat more stratified and structured with the designation of economic roles and the influx of status goods like swords and guns.[105]

Apaches reacted to seemingly insurmountable challenges by modifying their socio-political structures and economy, which allowed them to prosper and remain a persistent nuisance whom the Spaniards were never able to conquer fully. By the 1730's, Spaniards were forced to close many of their mines in Sonora due to incessant Apache raiding. The Spaniards could not control the Apaches, but they regularly retaliated against them. They perceived the Apaches as "obstacles to Spanish commerce" and unrelenting menaces, encouraging other Indians to attack them and aggressively pursuing Apache captives. The Apaches likewise reciprocated. Spaniards and Apaches engaged in what Thomas Hall calls a "mutually predatory relationship." He explains that "Apaches raided Spaniards for food; Spaniards raided Apaches for workers to produce the food." Of course, for the Apaches raiding was not just about retaliatory reciprocity,

---

[104] "Gallegos' Relation of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez Expedition," in Hammond and Rey, *The Rediscovery of New Mexico*, 87.
[105] Calloway, 282; Dan L. Flores, "Bison Ecology and Bison Diplomacy," 465-485; Anderson, 120-122.

but subsistence. As Hall aptly notes, the Apaches were ecologically challenged in their territories wedged within the borders of the frontier on land that, for the most part, could not support buffalo herds or enough farming and gardening to live and trade. For the Apaches, their raiding economy grew out of necessity. Similarly, for the Spaniards, the demand for slave labor and the proximity of Apache groups made them a convenient source for slaves as well as a convenient scapegoat to rationalize retaliatory raids. [106]

The violent nature of raiding and the fact that raiding became the driving force of the Apache economy has fed the historical villainization of Apache people. Historians typically refer to Apache ferocity, antagonism, relentlessness–words I myself have used here in describing their place in the New Mexican context—causing them to be pegged the proverbial "bad guys" within the conventional wisdom. The net result of this line of thinking has been oversimplification, in which warfare and raiding have been treated synonymously. But for the Apaches there was a clear distinction between warfare and raiding as each held very different objectives. As Juan Bautista de Anza the Elder noticed, the purpose of warfare was to kill as many of the enemy as possible in revenge or retaliation while the point of raiding was "to run off livestock and 'to elude, not engage, their enemies.'"[107] Even though both warfare and raiding produced captives for trading, the distinction between the two is important because it humanizes the Apaches, highlighting how they reacted and adapted to changing circumstances to ensure their own political, economic, and cultural survival. Regrouping socially and redefining their economy translated to cultural adjustments that allowed them to remain Apache while accepting outside influences. The Apaches' ability to continue as powerful players in the southwestern political economy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was nothing less than the work of ethnogenesis, framing the cultural perspective for those Apaches who would become genízaros .[108]

---

[106] Donald Worcester, *The Apaches: Eagles of the Southwest* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 1966): xviii, 22; Thomas D. Hall, *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350-1880* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1989): 128.

[107] *Presidio and Militia*, 2, pt. 1:303, 306-307 as quoted in Calloway, 282.

[108] For further information on the "Apacheanization" of the Southwest, that is how both Apaches and non-Apaches engaged in the process of ethnogenesis to respond effectively to ecological and economic pressures through sociopolitical accommodation and cultural modification see Chapters 5 and 6 in Anderson's *The Indian Southwest, 1580-1830*.

The Apache experience in the Southern Plains economy, that is, being exceptionally vulnerable to captivity yet remarkably resilient and resourceful in confronting adversity and preserving political standing, bears striking parallels with the situation of their Athabaskan cousins, the Navajos. The Navajo experience in New Mexico was wrought with ambiguities. As in the case of the Apaches, susceptibility to slave raiding should not be confused with weakness; in fact, such vulnerability ironically seems to speak to the tribe's stature—being enough of a threat and enough of a competitor to be among the principal targets—as well as its success in adjusting to new lifeways born out of contact with Spaniards. Of course, as we saw with the semi-sedentary northern Apache bands, pastoral Navajos were often easy marks, especially as they eliminated the nomadic hunting component of their economy. They were also raiders and traders themselves, provoking retaliatory campaigns from both Hispanic New Mexicans and other native groups.

These factors help explain Brugge's high numbers for Navajo baptisms at different points in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to Brugge, for example, Navajo baptisms in the middle decades of the eighteenth century were at their highest levels and yet they actually reflected the peace brokered between Navajos and Spaniards by 1720. The truce involved a modest missionization effort and amplified the Navajos' role in trading textiles, baskets, hides, and captives with Spaniards and Pueblos. Although some Navajo conversions between 1720 and 1770 were forced after being captured through raiding and warfare, most were voluntary. Many of these baptisms happened when missionaries visited Navajo camps or when gravely ill Navajos requested baptism in the face of death. Brugge cites an incident in 1733 of a 14 year-old boy who was dying of smallpox in Albuquerque as the first record of a Navajo trend in requesting baptism "as a last resort when ill." Brugge identifies these last-minute conversions through notations in the records that defined them as baptisms due to "extreme necessity."[109]

These years of high baptismal rates correspond with the Navajos' gradual territorial expansion into geographic proximity with Spanish New Mexicans and their development of a shared economy. Although the Navajos had been in New Mexico at

[109] Calloway, 199; Brugge, 43-48.

least since 1600, they remained relatively confined to the *Dinetah*, the Navajo homeland situated around the northern drainages of the San Juan River, until about 1700. They organized themselves in "kin clusters of three to five nuclear family groups [that] lived in forked-stick hogans near the canyon bottoms, practicing a mixed economy of men's hunting and women's horticulture." Navajo culture and society was structured around a matrilineal organization that was reinforced by a tradition of gardening and farming. Like the Apaches, they followed seasonal living patterns between hunting and agriculture and traded surpluses in goods and food with the Pueblos. Navajos also participated in human exchanges with the Pueblos, which largely centered on trading as well as stealing women to be wives. Their interactions with the newly arrived Spaniards were less agreeable, as Navajos assisted Pueblo resistance efforts while Spaniards effectively upset Navajo-Pueblo relations.[110]

The intrusion of the Spanish and the onset of colonialism dramatically altered the Navajos' relationship with the Pueblos. In some cases, ties were strengthened as occasionally Pueblos joined the Navajos to flee Spanish subjugation. Fray Juan de Prada wrote in 1638 that "upon the slightest occasion of annoyance with the soldiers some of the baptized Indians, fleeing from their pueblo, have gone over to the heathen, believing that they enjoy greater happiness with them, since they live according to their whims, and in complete freedom."[111] In other cases, Pueblos were compelled to preserve themselves by working with the Spanish against the Navajos. As disease and military aggression took a toll on their populations and tributary burden limited their ability to trade amicably with Navajos, Pueblos actively pursued Navajo captives independently or as Spanish auxiliaries. Captives had cash value as slaves in the mines of northern New Spain while they also served to replenish Pueblo populations. Naturally, Navajos responded by taking Pueblo and Spanish captives themselves.[112]

In addition to disrupting Navajo-Pueblo trade relations and altering the nature and purpose of trading captives, contact with Spaniards resulted in the transformation of the Navajo economy and overall lifeways. The introduction of Spanish livestock and

[110] Brooks, 80-88, quote, 83.
[111] "Petition [of Fray Juan de Prada. Convent of San Francisco, Mexico, September 26, 1638]" in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 3:111.
[112] Gutierrez, 92-93, Brooks, 88-89.

husbandry, particularly sheep, into the Navajo economy initiated their transition to a culture and society defined by pastoralism. As their economy increasingly emphasized sheep herding and wool production, Navajos expanded their territory, military prowess and social hierarchy. Demands for land and labor to support large flocks forced a Navajo migration both west and southeast from Dinetah and an intensification of existing class divisions. Although both eastern and western Navajos prospered through the sheep industry, western Navajos remained somewhat isolated from global market pressures and conflicts with Europeans, while the eastern Navajos became increasingly enmeshed in the regional economy and all of its trappings.[113]

The Navajos' adaptation to sheep herding catapulted them into New Mexico's political economy as wool was an important part of the early colonial economy; recall that the need for labor in his Santa Fe *obrajes* was a motivating factor in Governor Rosas' slaving campaigns of the 1630s. The Navajos caught on quickly and aggressively acquired Spanish livestock. In 1679, Fray Francisco de Ayeta reported that "the province was totally sacked and robbed by their attacks and outrages, especially of all the cattle and sheep, of which it had previously been very productive."[114] Raids like this one, coupled with the Navajos' hand in abetting Pueblo resistance efforts during the *reconquista*, intensified hostilities between Spaniards and Navajos. Large horse and sheep herds, crops to tend to, and amassed supplies of cotton and wool limited Navajo mobility and left them open to attack and captivity until the beginning of the aforementioned period of peaceful Navajo-Spanish relations of the eighteenth century.

The dispersal of Navajos necessitated a social reorganization in which "outfits" led by headmen amassed and shared wealth in livestock and captives, but distributed labor along class lines. Some outfits were wealthier than others. The system allowed for upward mobility within an outfit while maintaining a lower tier of dependent poor families to provide labor. The matrilineal order continued as women owned and tended to the herds while men focused on raiding and defending. Raiding provided men a means for progressing through the social ranks since bringing home livestock and captives could

[113] Calloway, 198.
[114] "Petition [of Fray Francisco de Ayeta, Mexico, May 10, 1679]" in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 3:302. Ayeta refers to the raiding Indians here as Apaches, a common mistake among chroniclers who tended to treat Athabaskans-speakers as one homogenous group. Brooks too interprets Ayeta's account as more likely a reference to Navajos, see Brooks, 90.

elevate a man's status as he enriched his outfit and immediate family. Therefore, lower class, or poorer, Navajos had the most to gain through raiding and largely defined the raiding component of the Navajo economy. Navajos were among the main suppliers of captives to the Spanish while also incorporating many of their captives into their outfits as herders. They mainly went after nearby Utes but did not exclude other targets, including Hispanics. Like Apache raiding, Navajo raiding aggravated tensions with Hispanic New Mexicans, who pressured wealthy Navajos to reign in their poorer kinsmen—an impossible task given the lure of the potential for economic gain and upward mobility. The Navajos met ambivalent success in both the sheep industry and raiding. Their prosperity reinforced the Navajo class structure, fostering enmity along already sharp divisions between the so-called rich and poor, as well as contributed to the dissemblance of their fragile truce with their Spanish neighbors in the 1770s and reopening the Navajos' exceptional vulnerability to captivity through warfare.[115]

While Navajos and Spaniards managed to reach and maintain a period of peace, a period marked by a surge in Navajo baptisms but not necessarily captivity, open warfare between the two reappeared in the 1770s. In addition to the constant bother of ambitious Navajo raiders, the political climate of the Bourbon Reform era and increasing competition for rapidly shrinking space to accommodate the grazing needs for both Hispanic and Navajo livestock inspired renewed Spanish aggression toward Navajos. The ecological challenges that Thomas Hall outlined for the Apaches held true for the Navajos too. Initially, sheep provided the Navajos with a stable and renewable resource, one that could withstand drought better than agriculture and that was more reliable than highly competitive buffalo hunting. The downside was that sheep needed already limited grasslands. Some scholars have estimated that "forage in the Dinetah canyon bottoms was depleted" as early as the 1720s, forcing [the] Navajo migration both west and southeast from Dinetah. As the Navajos' pastoralist economy and population expanded, the same happened for the Spanish. The mid-century peace began as the two expanded into each other's space, creating a situation in which Spaniards and Navajos coexisted through shared settlement and grazing. While this coexistence was a mutually beneficial

[115] Brooks, 92,108.

pastoral exchange, it was also laced with old tensions over human and natural resources that eventually gave way to full-on warfare by the 1770s and never really recovered.[116]

As was evident with their Athabaskan cousins, the Navajo story reveals a cultural perspective shaped by ethnogenesis that Navajo captives would carry with them into servitude in Hispanic society. Navajo-Spanish contact and the inherent ecological reality of New Mexico forced a transformation of the Navajos' society, politics, and economy. The limited capacity of the New Mexican landscape and the Spaniards' interference in native exchange networks challenged the Navajos' viability within the New Mexican economy. Yet the Spaniards brought with them herds of cattle, horses, goats, and sheep that afforded new opportunities to disrupted native groups like the Navajos. Like other natives, the Navajos managed to tap into this new resource and remodeled their traditional matrilineal organization and already stratified social structure to accommodate a pastoral lifestyle and economy. They astutely saw the potential in sheep herding and wool production and replaced their seasonal hunting-agricultural subsistence practices by incorporating and emphasizing European livestock and textile production. This transformation enabled them not only to survive but succeed in the complex regional economy of New Mexico—a legacy that, no doubt, captives took with them as they involuntarily departed Navajo society.

Although Apaches and Navajos were the native groups most represented within the genízaro category, an examination of the contextual setting in which genízaros emerged would not be complete without a look at the Comanches. The number of Comanches who entered Hispanic society through captivity was considerably smaller than those of the Athabaskans. However, their role in the Southern Plains milieu significantly affected the factors that contributed to the Apaches' and Navajos' high rates of captivity and compelled them both to react and adapt to the ecological, political, and economic circumstances of a colonized New Mexico. Shortly after 1700, the Shoshone-speaking Comanches migrated into the Southern Plains area from the Great Basin region in search of horses and buffalo and by mid-century they had achieved political and economic dominance, having effectively turned Apachería into Comanchería. The strength of the Comanches by the end of the eighteenth century is reflected in the way

[116] Ibid., 90-91, 107-108.

both Spanish colonial authorities and later Mexican government officials more often than not chose diplomacy over combat in dealing with them.

The Comanches' rise to power took place fairly quickly after the beginning of the eighteenth century, when primary accounts first document their clear presence on the Plains. Sergeant-Major Juan de Ulibarrí mentioned the Comanches during his travels into Apache territory in the summer of 1706 when Apaches reported Comanche attacks on their rancherías.[117] Within 50 years, they accumulated an enormous wealth in horses, experienced tremendous growth in their population and developed profitable trade relations with New Mexicans. Through it all, the Comanches demonstrated political savvy by forming strong self-serving alliances with other natives on the periphery of their expansive reach as well as with Spanish colonials to dethrone the Apaches and assume their role as the dominant force of the Plains.[118]

The Comanches' realm, unified through language more than politics, encompassed much of New Mexico and western Texas. Their organization included several divisions or bands that were reasonably autonomous of each other, with their own leaders and tribal councils. As such different bands had different relationships with other Indians as well as with their Hispanic and French neighbors. In New Mexico, for example, Stanley Noyes finds a scenario for the Comanches that was quite different than in Texas. Part of this discrepancy can be explained by cultural differences between the bands, but much of it has to do with the cultural differences between New Mexicans and Texans. New Mexican settlers had long co-existed with local Indians groups like the Pueblos, enjoying mutually beneficial trade relations in particular. So the ability of officials like New Mexican Governor Don Juan Bautista de Anza in the 1780s to recognize the political, social, and economic benefits—specifically minimal raiding of New Mexican villages and livestock herds—that came with negotiating with rather than warring with Comanches made for a relatively peaceful coexistence there and ensured the sustainability of the treaty of 1786 brokered between Anza and the Comanche leader Ecuerapa. The treaty resulted in a lasting peace between New Mexicans and Comanches,

[117] Thomas, *After Coronado*, 16, 61, 76, 211.
[118] Anderson, 216-225.

and thereby contributed to the significant expansion of trade relations in the following century.[119]

The Comanches maintained leading wealth and military strength on the Plains until the early nineteenth century when a variety of forces, from disease to declining buffalo herds and continuously increasing competition for land and buffalo began to take their toll on the tribe's strength in numbers. Expanding Anglo-American settlement in Texas only exacerbated the tensions there and the birth of a new Mexican government in place of the Spanish colonial regime dampened negotiations between New Mexicans and Comanches. By mid-century, competing imperial interests and later the end of the American Civil War placed irrevocable damage on the Comanches' fortune of previous years.[120] Comanche resilience held on until the very end when the last of the Comanches were brought into the reservation after the Red River wars of the 1870s. Since they arrived on the Southern Plains, the Comanches managed to retain their social and cultural identity despite a significant drop in their population due to disease as well as the efforts of Spaniards and New Mexicans to control the Comanches through warfare and restrictions on comanchero trading. Having weeded out competing tribes, they continued to live as nomadic buffalo hunters and celebrate cultural values centered on male honor derived from wealth in horses and warrior status. Scholars of the Southwest often refer to evidence of a blending of Hispanic and Plains Indian cultures. In truth, however, the crosscultural effects sometimes seem rather unilateral. The folk portrayals of *Los Comanches* in the twentieth century reveal that perhaps the Plains people had much more influence on the non-Plains people than the other way around. Ultimately, the Comanches stayed Comanche as they reacted and adapted to a series of circumstances and events.[121]

---

[119] Ibid.; Kavanagh, Chapter 4.

[120] The end of the American Civil War allowed the American military to shift its attention to "taming" and opening the trans-Mississippi West to Anglo-American settlement. The War's end brought a renewed vigilance for military efforts against the remaining native groups who stood in the way.

[121] Calloway, 283-293; Anderson, 220; In *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations*, Kenner explains that "Comancheros" were New Mexicans who traded with Comanches, which "consisted mainly of two groups: the 'indigent and rude classes of the frontier villages' and the Pueblo Indians, avid traders from time immemorial (78)." He rounds out his work with a final chapter that offers a clean summary of key events and developments and throws in an examination of the many cross cultural influences, especially between Plains and Pueblo peoples, such as dances, folk dramas, dress and horsemanship.

The unilateral nature of crosscultural influences does not mean that the Comanches were above ethnogenesis. Cultural retention and ethnogenesis are not mutually exclusive. In fact, as Gary Anderson argues, the extension of Comanche influence was reinforced by the tribe's ethnic diversity, which both defined and strengthened the Comanche identity. His analysis of the Comanches' preference to incorporate rather than barter captives showcases a "cosmopolitan" Indian grouping that capitalized on the variety of languages spoken by the variety of captives who were initiated into the tribe. While they certainly traded away many captives, especially virgin girls who were particularly valued in New Mexican trade fairs, Comanches more often than not opted to keep their captives as wives, laborers, or warriors. Moreover, the Comanches did not induct all of their non-Comanche kinsmen through the force of capture. It was not uncommon for poorly-treated slaves to seek refuge with their original captors or for New Mexicans to escape the danger of unsecured settlements with the strongest Indian force. The Comanches' integration of other peoples, through force or otherwise, let the Comanches reinvent themselves socially and politically in a way that elevated them to an unquestionable position of supremacy on the Southern Plains.[122]

The social, political, and economic context that fed the emergence of genízaros in New Mexico encompassed a setting of cultural interactions muddied with obvious ambiguities and confusing contradictions. Because they were economically driven, relations were complicated between and among both Europeans and Indians. They developed in a context where both longstanding alliances and intense rivalries were subject to change at any given time. These fluctuations were indicative of an environment in which cultural groups had to concede certain lifeways and embrace others in order to endure and prosper. The aftermath of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 demonstrated that Pueblo people could not undo the effects of the Spaniards' presence, yet the terms of the Reconquest proved the Pueblos' determination to remain Pueblos. Further, the Pueblos' resolve altered the course of the slave trade, which helped set in motion the cultural adaptations that some of the most powerful Plains Indians made. The cultural experiences of the Apaches, Navajos and Comanches in particular most affected the materialization of a distinguishable genízaro consciousness. Their social, political, and

[122]Anderson, 221, 223, 224-226, 249; Kenner 49-52.

economic histories illustrated their own experience with ethnogenesis, which framed the Indian perspective that in turn helped shape the genízaro identity.

Chapter Three

The Genízaro Experience in Colonial Mexico

Referring to the genízaros settled at Valencia and Cerro de Tomé, established in 1740, Fray Miguel de Menchero writes:

> There are congregated more than forty families in a great union as if they were all of the same nation…the people engage in agriculture and are under obligation to go out and explore the country in pursuit of the enemy, which they are doing with great zeal and bravery in their obedience…[123]

Menchero's report captures the essence of the genízaros' drive to survive and make their way in colonial New Mexico.

The genízaro experience in New Mexico was, in fact, reflective of the human spirit, which carries with it the instinct to survive and the gift of intellect. The cultural histories of Native Americans have illustrated the persistence of this spirit and the history of the genízaros of New Mexico proves that they were no less motivated than other Indians or the Europeans who sought to dominate them. Chapter two demonstrated that the genízaros emerged in an atmosphere of controlled chaos that required a certain amount of elasticity for anyone to survive. This requisite adaptability was apparent among a number of native groups and for them it fueled the process of ethnogenesis that ensured their survival and even prosperity during the rapidly evolving circumstances of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Obviously, the genízaros' story plays out differently, but exemplifies ethnogenesis nonetheless. A close examination of ethnogenesis and the genízaros yields more than an anecdotal aside of a few "Hispancized Indians," as scholars of the Southwest so often deem them. While this common reference provides an easy explanation, it reduces genízaros to just another one of colonial society's numerous castes. Furthermore, a quick-fix definition presumes that genízaros transculturated and assimilated fully to the larger Hispano identity and fails to recognize that they possessed the instinct to preserve their traditions and the gift of intellect to do so.

Ethnogenesis allows for a more sophisticated and progressive approach to untangling the genízaros' story than analytical methods that rely on conventional dualities, which unfortunately still appear in some contemporary studies of the American Southwest. The traditional historical framework of the American Southwest, originating with Herbert Eugene Bolton, tends to operate in basic dualities such as good and evil,

[123]"Declaration of Fray Miguel de Menchero, Santa Bárbara, May 10, 1744," in Hackett, *Historical Documents,* 3:402.

civilized and barbarous, perpetrator and victim, Spaniard and Indian. The lens of ethnogenesis brings into focus the complexities and nuances within these oversimplified extremes and renders the Boltonian line of thinking as obsolete as Frederick Jackson's Turner's "frontier thesis." Gary Anderson's *The Indian Southwest, 1580-1830: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention* actually bucks the conventions and serves as a highly pertinent model for understanding the genízaros. By using ethnogenesis to reexamine the histories of the Jumanos, Apaches, Caddos, Wichitas, and Comanches, Anderson extracts those aforementioned complexities and nuances to escape the confinement of interpretive extremes. He branches out to "examine the native strategies and the cultural creativity that forced Spain to concede much of the Southwest to native societies" and finds "a history of people determined to survive and quite willing to reinvent culture or join other, stronger groups if necessary to do so."[124] Although the genízaros are not the center of Anderson's attention, his methods and conclusions are relevant to their history. Two of the groups in Anderson's study, Apaches and Comanches, comprised a significant portion of the genízaro population and experienced ethnogenesis and cultural reinvention in the interest of self-preservation. Anderson's analysis demonstrates that many of the southwestern Indians who became genízaros carried this legacy with them into captivity and servitude as they made their way in New Mexican culture and society first as slaves, then as soldiers, farmers, and traders. As "people determined to survive and quite willing to reinvent culture," the genízaros themselves could have easily filled another chapter in Anderson's book.

Moving beyond conventional dualities pushes us toward the middle and invites us to look at the Southwest as a cultural crossroads. This perspective brings issues related to cultural identity to the forefront. Richard White's study of the Metis' experience in the Midwest serves as a useful model in this endeavor. In *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, White's analysis of European-Indian relations in the Great Lakes area builds on the idea that identity is not confined to one concept that remains constant through time. Rather, identity consists of a

[124] Anderson, 6-7.

body of concepts that change in the context of human interaction.[125] Such an approach could not be more germane to the genízaros' experience in New Mexico. In Abiquiú, for instance, genízaros had the opportunity to acquire land and somewhat elevated social status on the condition that they give up their Indian identity. This conditional and limited acceptance into Hispanic society led to the fundamental genízaro dilemma: "they were not Spaniards because they were designated as an Indian pueblo, but neither were they typical Pueblo Indians because the wellspring of their Indian identity—their ceremonies, their religious beliefs, and their religious shrines—were from different cultures and were thoroughly repressed and destroyed by Spanish officials and priests."[126] In this setting, their identity developed by way of an ongoing process that reflected their capacity to maneuver within two polarized worldviews. The genízaros were discouragingly stuck, or perhaps strategically located, in the middle between Spanish and Indian. Discovering this middle ground allows us to realize the genízaros' significance in helping to form a bridge between Hispanics and Indians and functioning as a key ingredient to maintaining the delicate balance between mutually beneficial trade relations and a constant struggle for control over territories and resources.

As we saw in Chapter One, one of the most obvious shortcomings in the existing literature on genízaros is the tendency among historians to overlook the subtleties that complicate defining who they were and how they endured through adaptation and cultural reinvention. All too often, the phrase "Hispanicized" or "Christianized" Indians appears in secondary sources when historians need an efficient explanation for references to the unfortunately obscure genízaros who are only rarely the focus of discussion. They *were* Hispanicized, but only to a point. The common mistake among those who have not taken the time to be precise is a failure to appreciate that genízaros were *Indians* living in Hispanic society. Indeed many of these Indians spent most of their lives in Hispanic society, the victims of capture and removal from their native societies early in childhood. As such, it would be logical to assume that they assimilated. But, even as they practiced Catholicism, spoke Spanish, adopted a sedentary lifestyle, and participated in the New Mexican economy, their Indianness was always with them. It allowed them to fashion

[125] Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1991): ix-x, xv.
[126] Ebright and Hendricks, 3-4.

their own brand of Catholicism, "twist" their Spanish "somewhat," own and cultivate land communally, and trade with intimidating nomads like the Comanches on *their* turf rather than the relative safety of the rescates at Taos or Pecos.[127] As Indians of varied tribal ancestry, genízaros made these adjustments in community with each other but in isolation from the security of their original cultures and societies. The quick definition, then, if there is one, should not point to their Hispanicization but rather to their detribalization.[128] The common denominator for those whom New Mexican authorities assigned to the genízaro caste at different points in time was their shared experience or legacy of involuntary removal from their native families and communities and immersion into Hispanic society.

In Chapter One, we learned that considerable confusion remains regarding the definition of the word genízaro and about how primary sources from the colonial period and after have used it. Whether you accept that in some cases Pueblos could fit into the genízaro category or would limit the caste to include only Plains Indian slaves and their descendants; and whether you recognize that the word's Turkish roots in relation to the genízaros' military service record are too striking to dismiss despite a disconnect in chronology, you cannot help but notice the consistent fact that genízaros became genízaros after they unwillingly left their tribal homes and entered New Mexican households and communities. While Christianization and Hispanicization are other consistent features of the genízaro definition, the level to which genízaros actually experienced Christianization and Hispanicization is subject to debate and is the underlying issue for making the case that, through the process of ethnogenesis, a discernible genízaro cultural consciousness emerged during the colonial period and persisted at least through the nineteenth century.

A close examination of primary documents reveals that Franciscan efforts to convert genízaros found limited success. According to Malcolm Ebright and Rick

[127]From Dominguez' observation that "they are not fluent in speaking and understanding Castilian perfectly, for however much they talk or learn the language, they do not wholly understand it or speak it without twisting it somewhat," Adams and Chavez, 42 (see Chapter One, 23-24 for full excerpt); Kenner, 78-80; Anderson, 231.

[128] Weber, *Bárbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), Weber affirms this conclusion drawing a parallel between the word's meaning in eighteenth-century Spain—it "simply meant a Spanish-born son of a foreigner"—and its usage in New Mexico "to describe detribalized Indians (240)."

Hendricks, for example, genízaro religious leaders in Abiquiu during the 1760s would gather after a sermon by Fray Juan José Toledo, and actively decide what to believe and what not to believe and then share their conclusions with the rest of the pueblo. They did not "reject Christian teachings entirely, only those aspects that conflicted most strongly with their own religious beliefs." The situation was a source of profound frustration for Toledo who complained that adult genízaros were "next to impossible to convert" and admitted that he had become "aware that the Indians want[ed] freedom of thought and to be totally free."[129]

Baptisms in particular call into question the extent of genízaro Christianization. Like the priests of the colonial period, some scholars assumed that Indian captives who received the sacrament of Baptism did so out of a genuine understanding and acceptance of a new Christian lifestyle. However, since most of the Indians who became genízaros experienced conversion by way of captivity and enslavement, it is logical to consider genízaro conversions as forced, and therefore most likely, nominal. In "Missionization and Hispanicization," Gilberto Benito Cordova argues that "the significance of this symbolism escaped few Indians." What escapes Cordova, however, is how the Indians he writes about at Abiquiu in the mid-eighteenth century came to be there in the first place. They were there under the auspices of Governor Tomás Vélez Cachupín's community land grant and Reduction program, "a civil plan to settle pagan Indians into Spanish style towns," where the involuntary nature of their initial entrance into the Hispano-Christian realm is implicit. These genízaros were freed servants wandering aimlessly, "either unable or unwilling to assimilate into the fiduciary family."[130] Vélez Cachupín's solution for these lost members of New Mexican society was "*gathering* these roving families of Genízaro and settling them in a suitable site for their subsistence, with a doctrinarian who would instruct them in and administer to them the Holy Sacraments." The genízaros who settled at Abiquiu through the land grant did not choose to be baptized; rather it was part of the arrangement to gain access to arable land and

[129]Ebright and Hendricks, 248; "Fray Juan José Toledo to Governor Tomás Vélez Cachupín, February 15, 1764, *Archivo General de la Nación* (AGN), Inquisición, 1001: 217-266 as quoted in Cordova 173-174.
[130] Cordova, 137, 35, 46, 84; Abiquiu Genízaro Land Grant, 1754, Records of the Office of the Surveyor General (SG) 140, roll 26, frame 281.

escape the "clutches of their master[s]." [131] Since they were not of Spanish descent and returning to their native societies was not feasible, the Abiquiu genízaros—like their counterparts in other communities set aside for genízaros—had nowhere else to go, no other options available to them. To the extent that genízaros actually cooperated with missionization efforts at Santo Tomás Apóstal de Abiquiu, accepting baptism was more likely a mechanism for survival rather than an exercise of free will.

Those genízaros who flagrantly resisted the priests' efforts met severe consequences. The situation at Abiquiu, again, offers a glimpse of what happened to those who challenged the authority and control of the missionaries while also showing that genízaros would not be mindlessly subdued. Abiquiu experienced its own witchcraft outbreak from 1756 to 1766, which ultimately involved a number of Abiqueños being incarcerated and tortured, worship sites being exorcised, and several illnesses and deaths befalling both Spanish and Indian residents.[132] The priests viewed native religious practices as witchcraft and sorcery and in turn, the Indians used witchcraft and sorcery to defy "exploitation and forced Christianization." The Spaniards had little understanding or patience for the Indians' worldview, dismissing all but the few healing and sorcery practices that they found useful.[133] Meanwhile, the Indians rejected the Spaniards' worldview because it prohibited "an autonomous and prosperous indigenous population" and they were "unwilling to surrender [their] traditional belief system."[134] Historian Inga Clendinnen offers an explanation of the Franciscans' frustrations over Indian resistance in Yucatán that resonates in Abiquiu:

> The Franciscans were convinced that their labours would be aided by God himself. They lacked all recognition of the profound and systematic otherness of others. They had no sense of the intricate interrelationships between different aspects of Indian life, rather seeing here

[131] Governor Vélez Cachupín to Viceroy Marqués de Ervillas, March 29, 1764, AGN, Inquisición, 1001: 217-266 as quoted in Cordova, 84, italics mine.
[132] Ebright and Hendricks dissect the 10-year witchcraft outbreak in Abiquiu with a close examination of the main events and characters, including the genízaros, Governor Vélez Cachupín, and Fray Juan José Toledo.
[133] From early in the colonial period Spaniards turned to so-called Indian black magic in desperate circumstances. In the late 1620s, Governor Sotelo Osorio summoned an Indian woman from San Juan who was "versed in magic and black art…to save the life of a soldier who was said to be bewitched," from Frances V. Scholes, "The First Decade of the Inquisition in New Mexico," *New Mexican Historical Review*10 (1935): 205, 233-34; Ebright and Hendricks, 119.
[134] Ebright and Hendricks, 119, 149.

> the hand of the Devil, there the tender intervention of Christ, and so they could have no sense of the difficulties in the way of the reception and understanding of their message.[135]

As such, genízaro resistance to conversion perplexed Spaniards. In the polarized cultural climate of Abiquiu, as in Yucatán, the fundamental divide between Spanish and native worldviews precluded the Franciscans from grasping the reasons for Indian resistance and thus fed their own hysteria, with devastating consequences for some of the genízaros at Abiquiu.

More evidence of only partial Christianization among genízaros rests in the subtle point that the genízaros who settled at Abiquiu through Governor Vélez Cachupín's land grant and reduction plan were former captives. In theory, the missionaries and masters should have already Christianized them during their years in servitude. Spaniards' had certain obligations toward their ransomed captives, including housing, feeding, clothing, and educating them. Education naturally focused on the Catechism.[136] Yet, at Abiquiu, where genízaros had completed their service and presumably converted, the priests still found the need to perform baptisms and the genízaros still worshipped non-Christian idols. Despite a substantial period of time away from their native societies and immersed in the Hispanic Catholic culture, the Abiquiu genízaros arguably remained closer to their native belief systems than to Christianity.[137] Governor Cachupín lamented the genízaros' continued lack of Christian morality:

> …they grow up mischievous and foppish and with vices that are very grave to the country. The Genízaros are difficult to subjugate and settle…they support themselves from what they steal, without respect for magistrate…I know not what to attribute such bad qualities in this class of Indian. It may be because of their propensity to it or because of the carelessness of their masters in instructing them that expostulates this defect.[138]

Although his remarks reflected typical Spanish attitudes toward genízaros, Vélez Cachupín was able to recognize the potential "carelessness of their masters." No doubt in many cases, a genízaro's baptism was the extent of his conversion. Such "carelessness" allowed genízaros to cling to their native spirituality while taking advantage of Spanish preconceptions and fears regarding Indian ceremonialism. As Ebright and Hendricks

---

[135] Inga Clendinnen, *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatán, 1517-1570* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 114.
[136] Weber, *Bárbaros*: 239; Brugge, 124.
[137] Ebright and Hendricks, 274, note 8.
[138] Governor Vélez Cachupín to Viceroy Marqués de Ervillas, March 29, 1764, *Archivo General de la Nación*, (AGN), Inquisición, 1001: 217-266 as quoted in Cordova, 84.

showed in their study of Abiquiu's witchcraft proceedings, for the genízaros, witchcraft became a valuable tool for self-preservation and ethnogenesis as it facilitated opposition to Franciscan authority and ultimately led to the development of a distinctively genízaro community.

The failure of Spanish masters or owners to offer more than baptism to their Indian servants by placing them "under the tutelage of the missionaries" to provide a "pious upbringing" also promoted ethnogenesis in that it created a way out of the isolation that characterized life in captivity. Although conditions surely varied from household to household, many genízaros "grew to adulthood in squalor and neglect, or abusive households."[139] Since they were not technically "slaves" in the eyes of the colonial government, genízaros had certain legal rights, including the right to petition the governor for relief through release or reassignment.[140] Records indicate that genízaros utilized their legal recourse to report mistreatment, which often involved sexual abuse for females, and they almost always reported the failure of their masters to offer adequate instruction in Catholicism. Although their complaints were usually to no avail, some genízaros did win their appeals. In 1763, for example, two women of different masters complained to Vélez Cachupín that they had not received instruction in the Catholic faith and had to tend sheep, work normally left for males. One of the women reported that her master had raped her while out in the field. As part of the investigation into the women's charges, the governor ordered that the servants' knowledge of Christian doctrine be tested and they, of course, failed. Vélez Cachupín then had the women placed in new homes "where they might be instructed in Christian doctrine and customs, and be fed and clothed through household chores appropriate to their sex."[141] Although these women would remain in captivity, they utilized the legal system to change their circumstances. Victories like this one were more the exception than the rule. In this setting, fear of retribution from masters would likely deter mistreated genízaros from risking further

[139] Brugge, 125; quote from Anderson, 223-224.
[140] Ebright and Hendricks explain that "Spanish law differentiated between the purchase of captives for servants who would eventually be freed, and outright slavery, which was prohibited in the Americas…," 28.
[141] Proceedings in complaint of two genízara Indian women of the jurisdiction of Albuquerque against their masters, October 12-15, 1763, SANM II 9:524; translation of Vélez Cachupín's decision from Russell M. Magnaghi's "The Plains Indians in New Mexico: The Genízaro Experience," in *Great Plains Quarterly*(spring 1990): 88.

abuses in the aftermath of an unsuccessful formal complaint, but it might also incite anger that would fester and, over time, foster solidarity. In the meantime, until at least the late eighteenth century, the most practical recourse for poorly treated servants was flight.[142]

The significance of the 1763 case rests in the fact that the plaintiffs broke from the aforementioned isolation of their respective households and collaborated to formalize their complaint. Together, they might have counted on the governor's investigation to focus more on the servants' deficient Christianization as well as on the masters' disregard for Hispanic gender roles than on the alleged physical abuses. Such proceedings against Spanish masters suggest that genízaros understood what mattered to Spaniards and how they justified Indian servitude. In this context, genízaros played on officials' concerns for their redemption and proper conversion to Christianity. Whether or not they genuinely understood and accepted the tenets of Christianity themselves, genízaros seemed to know how important they were to the Spaniards and regularly used these concerns in making their cases. Even though the two women in this case likely knew little of Christian doctrine nor cared to, one cannot help but wonder if they might have failed their "Christian tests" deliberately in order to achieve their desired result—fully aware of the Spanish preoccupation with indoctrinating Indians and how proving their masters' failures in this area would only strengthen their case.

Using the "carelessness of their masters" to their advantage does not mean that genízaros rejected missionization entirely. In the same way that Spaniards found some aspects of Indian religions worthwhile, so too the genízaros found some practicality in Catholicism. While genízaro baptisms were involuntary even outside of captivity and thus likely nominal, the genízaros' apparent embrace of Spanish godparenthood, or *compadrazgo*, seemed authentic. Genízaros in captivity probably had no choice in selecting their own godparents and it is unclear whether they were able to choose their children's godparents. Regardless, the selection of godparents to children of Indians in captivity followed the norms of their parents—godparents were usually not the captives' masters and often not even related. Ramón Gutierrez explains the inherent conflict between godparenthood and servitude that might have affected how Spaniards chose

[142] Anderson, 224.

godparents for their captives and how their captives might have chosen godparents for their children:

> Baptismal sponsorship created a spiritual bond between the baptized person and his or her godparents, which entailed obligations of protection, instruction, and succor to help the person save his or her soul. Unlike slavery, which is a bond of domination over human volition expressed as control over another person's body and signified through servility, baptism is an expression of equality born of participation in the mystical body of Christ. Two rather incompatible states, spiritual freedom and physical bondage, were brought together when the Church insisted that captives be baptized. The contradiction was resolved by selecting a sponsor other than the slave master for the baptized person's liberation from original sin and rebirth in Christ's salvation.[143]

Having masters as godparents was no more in the interest of the master than it was the slave. Godparenting his own servant might have jeopardized a master's power, while having godparents outside the master's household and extended family presented at least a possibility for genízaros to have a third party looking out for their welfare after being torn from their native families and communities. David Brugge contends that "by giving ceremonial kin to captives, the system increased captives' ties within Spanish-American society, and it established checks and balances that helped prevent excessive mistreatment of captives."[144] Brugge's seemingly reasonable observation echoes the logic that drove the Church's concern for captives to receive baptismal godparents, but we cannot ignore the reality of conditions for many captives: that a significant gap likely existed between documented godparenthood and what the relationships were actually like. Compradrazgo obviously offered little to those genízaros who "grew to adulthood in squalor and neglect, or abusive households."

Yet compradrazgo must have extended kinship and its privileges for at least some genízaros in captivity since they incorporated this Catholic practice into their lives outside of captivity during the colonial period and beyond. In Belen, for example, Steven Horvath finds that freed genízaros, who had largely congregated in the Plaza de Nuestra Señora de los Dolores in the late eighteenth century, built and expanded kinship ties among each other. They baptized their children and often chose other genízaros to be godparents for them. Horvath concludes that 36 per cent of the godparents listed in the

[143]Brugge, 117-118; quote from Gutierrez, 182, drawing from the conclusions of Stephen Gudeman and Stuart B. Schwartz in "Baptismal Godparents in Slavery: Cleansing Original Sin in Eighteenth-Century Bahia," in Raymond T. Smith, ed., *Interpreting Kinship Ideology and Practice in Latin America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984): 35-58.
[144] Brugge, 115.

baptismal records were clearly identified as genízaros. He speculates that many of the other "unlabeled" or "uncategorized" godparents, which were most of the listings, were likely genízaros too because "genízaros and Indians were the only castas not given surnames in this period."[145] Since baptismal records indicate nothing more than the existence and identity of godparents, we can only hypothesize that most genízaros, shaped by their Indian worldview, did not baptize their children because they believed in having their souls cleansed from original sin but rather because it was necessary for their children to receive the benefits of compradazgo.

Unlike baptisms and godparenthood, marriage practices among genízaros do not necessarily help measure the extent to which genízaros rejected or incorporated Christian ceremonialism. But, they do help show how genízaros, by choice or lack thereof, developed cohesive communities. Church and State officials thrust the sacrament of baptism on Indian captives nearly immediately upon entering New Mexican society and, whether or not they genuinely professed the tenets that justified this rite, freed genízaros adopted its practice, perhaps principally for the benefits of godparenthood, and their descendants followed suit. Marriage for genízaros, on the other hand, did not receive the same attention from the Church nor the State and masters outright blocked captive marriages. Not surprisingly, genízaro marriage rates were low. Marriages among genízaros outside of captivity were not commonplace as well because marriage presented no real practical advantages. In New Mexican society, marriage often afforded individuals the opportunity to advance their social status by marrying into a higher caste. For genízaros, the lasting stigma of servitude and lacking property to offer precluded this opportunity from presenting itself; only rarely did genízaros marry Hispanic New Mexicans to become "full-fledged Spanish citizens," or *vecinos*.[146]

As noted above, marriage rates were low among captive genízaros because their masters rarely allowed it. For most genízaros, marriage was one area of Catholic ceremonialism that was simply never available for them to accept or refuse. Officially, Spaniards held Indian servants for as long as it took to work off their ransom—a period of at least several years, if ever—or until a servant married. Marriage was thus a

[145] Horvath, 142.
[146] Gutierrez, 201, 231, 296; Ebright and Hendricks, 32; Weber, *Bárbaros*, 240.

captive's opportunity for freedom and therefore not in the master's interest. As such, and with Church and State officials looking the other way, masters often kept their captives indebted and denied them permission to marry. Female captives, in particular, experienced this fate as they regularly lived as concubines to their masters, who were unwilling to give up their household labor or their bed partners. Fray Joseph Manuel de Equía y Leronbe exposed this common practice in 1734 as he struggled with the inherent hypocrisy in the supposed "redemption" of Indian captives. He wrote:

> They claim that by selling Apache Indians into slavery they will be redeemed from their lives as infidels. What benefit is it to condemn them so that they do not live as infidels? Enslave them so that they do not have freedom? I said condemn them and I can prove it. I have not baptized the child of an Indian woman servant who was not a coyote with father unknown, as the registers will certify. The masters of these Indian women are constantly vigilant so that they do not escape and so that they do not marry.[147]

Baptismal records of children with "father unknown" demonstrate a high rate of illegitimacy among children born to captive women and reinforce the point that genízaro parents more often than not lived in concubinage. Ramón Gutierrez maintains that 3,294 genízaro slaves entered New Mexico between 1694 and 1848 with only 20 slave marriages recorded during these years. While it is important to consider that many of the slaves to whom Gutierrez is referring were children who would not have been old enough to have married during their time in captivity anyway, Gutierrez' numbers coupled with Equía y Leronbe's observations are undeniably telling: genízaros had little use for or access to marriage. Captive women especially were denied any opportunity for marriage and thus a way of out of servitude. Women who had born children with their master were even more trapped since children would stay with the Spanish master as additional labor, if they were not given away or sold to another household.[148]

These circumstances skew the information for genízaro marriage practices and what they might reveal in terms of genízaro cultural reinvention through the process of

---

[147] Fray Joseph Manueal Equía y Leronbe, AGN, Inquisition 1734, 854: 253, 255-256, as quoted in Gutierrez, 199.

[148] Gutierrez, 252, 295, 187, 183; Gutierrez' total number of genízaro slaves is significantly lower than Rael-Galvez' tally of 4,601 from 1700 to 1880, a discrepancy in part due to a 26-year difference in the span of years being considered and in part due to a difference in what each is measuring: Rael-Galvez gives a total for the number of nomadic Indians who were "baptized and *entered* into Spanish-Mexican households" (18, his italics) while Gutierrez gives a total number for "genizaro slaves," (252) which suggests his number includes only those who he has found to have entered New Mexican society involuntarily.

ethnogeneis. But, this is not to say that marriage was not a conduit for ethnogenesis among genízaros. For those who did marry, it was. Genízaros who married tended to marry each other—a fact that spoke both to their marginalization and exclusivity, which encouraged the growth of a genízaro identity. The marriage records of Belen, for example, from 1743 to 1808 show that of the 72 marriages in which at least one of the two marriage partners was identified as genízaro, 68 per cent were between partners who were both identified as genízaros. Some, if not all, of the remaining 32 per cent of marriages in which at least one partner was genízaro were also probably between two genízaros as the other partners were listed as either "Indio criado," "coyote," or "uncategorized." These marriage practices are indicative of the somewhat unique situation in Belen, where genízaros tended to congregate by choice in one neighborhood, the Plaza de Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, as they did in Santa Fe's barrio Analco. [149] With nothing to gain economically or in terms of social standing, these genízaros likely married for love, and the fact that they went through the Church to formalize their relationships suggests a certain level of acceptance for Christian ceremonialism from Belen genízaros—but among themselves, with minimal interference from the surrounding Hispanic realm.

Evidence of a genízaro identity born, at least in part, out of the failure to turn genízaros into devout Christians comes from the missionaries themselves. Hints of genízaro cultural reinvention come to light in the derogatory commentary found in the reports of religious personnel, who regularly showed their disdain for the genízaros' persistent refusal to become true believers. These reports deliver some of the most revealing information on the extent to which genízaros were Christianized, or rather went though the motions and, with a blended cultural perspective, found their way in the New Mexican economy. For instance, Fray Francisco Silvestre Vélez de Escalante's journal entries from his 1776 expedition with Fray Dominguez reflect the all too common frustrations of New Mexican missionaries with the genízaros' deficiency in Christian values and their disregard for efforts to spread those values. Andrés and Lucrecio Muñiz, a pair of genízaro brothers who traveled with Escalante and Dominguez, offended the missionaries when it became apparent that the brothers, like many others on the trip, had

[149] Horvath, 130-132, 134-135.

broken their promise not to bring any goods for trading, as the purpose of the expedition was "God's glory and the good of souls." Escalante reported mockingly that Andrés and Lucrecio "proved themselves to be such obedient, loyal, and faithful Christians that they peddled what they secretly brought along, and most greedily sought weapons from the infidels. In this way, to our own sorrow, they betrayed their meager faith or lack of it, and how very unfit they were for ventures of this kind."[150] Escalante's words indicate that genízaros like the Muñiz brothers understood but did not necessarily care about the mission of the Franciscans—they agreed to the condition that they not bring goods for barter but brought them anyway in secret, apparently unable to resist the opportunity for economic gain. The priests understandably denounced this breach as an example of greed when it was actually an example of how genízaros attempted to capitalize on their connection to the Indian world and their contact with the Hispanic.

Similar insights come from Fray José de la Prada's 1793-1794 census report, which provides yet another example of New Mexican displeasure with genízaros for not being Spanish or Christian enough. Prada bemoans ineffective genízaro conversions when he describes how Abiquiu genízaros were "more of a hindrance than a help to the conversions of the nomadic Indians who visited the *reducciones*." Prada affirmed that genízaros tended to be "religious backsliders" and "were fond of dressing like the nomads." He went on to observe that they "raised a little corn, wheat and vegetables—but not enough to avert starvation for their families." Prada displays the Spanish proclivity to harp on the stereotypical indolence of genízaros while actually helping to show that genízaros were active participants in the local economy. He reports that the Indians of the reductions cultivated only a portion of their arable lands, leaving parts uncultivated to lease to vecinos at excessive rates. They also provided for themselves by hunting deer and selling the dressed hides and raising sheep, cows, and a few horses.[151] Reports like Prada's show that despite their coerced presence in New Mexican villages and towns and their marginalized position in New Mexican society as a whole, genízaros adapted and endured by taking advantage of what few resources they had.

---

[150] Entry for 1 September 1776, Fray Angelico Chavez, trans., and Ted J. Warner, ed., *The Dominguez-Escalante Journal: Their Expeditions Through Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico in 1776* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1995): 40-41.

[151] Swadesh, 41; Fray José de la Prada, Census Report of the New Mexico Custody, 1793-1794, *Archive of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe* (AASF), Loose Doc. 1795, #13, notes 3 and 5.

Both Escalante's and Prada's comments illustrate that while genízaros might not have "proved themselves to be such obedient, loyal and faithful Christians," they had figured out how to fit into the Hispanic world—by raising livestock, farming and, probably most of all, trading. The genízaros' pursuit of trade relations with surrounding Plains Indian communities exemplified the same adaptability and endurance that Prada's observations underscored. And this was to the dismay of secular and religious authorities who had ironically advanced genízaros' involvement in trading activities through land grant policies that sent disagreeable genízaros out onto the frontier where trading was central to economic opportunity, if not survival. Authorities tried repeatedly to contain trading activities but the intrusion of government regulations interfered only moderately with trading among Spanish and Indian New Mexicans and their nomadic neighbors. A 1778 order prohibited any Spaniard, genízaro or Indian from trading with the Utes. If a Spaniard was caught, he would be banned from holding public office; genízaros and other Indians who were caught were subject to a fine of 100 pesos and would suffer 100 lashes. The key here was not getting caught. Apprehending illegal traders was difficult enough due to sheer volume; add decentralization and vast distances to the mix and it becomes evident that any effort to keep a leash on entrepreneurial frontiersmen was an uphill battle.[152]

An important factor in the genízaros' capacity to participate in the varied sectors of the New Mexican economy was their unwillingness—or rather inability, as the Native American worldview was fundamentally opposed to that of the Spanish American—to assimilate fully into New Mexican society. As Cordova writes, "Trading skills of the genízaro were renowned during the Spanish colonial period…the genízaro was mobile and versatile in his ability to interact and deal with people on a cross-cultural level."[153] Not surprisingly, men like Vélez Cachupín, Escalante and Prada could not appreciate the genízaros' unique position and thus demeaned them as insufficiently Spanish or Christian and a threat to the larger Hispanic Christian social order. As a group, they were a

[152] Bando prohibiting trade with the Utes, Santa Fe, September 13, 1778, SANM II 10:1055; Joseph P. Sánchez, *Explorers, Traders, and Slavers: Forging the Old Spanish Trail* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1997): 92; Kenner's *A History of NewMexican-Plains Indian Relations* provides an orderly and logical chronology of events that made trading restrictions ineffective, in particular the peace treaty brokered by Governor Anza and the Comanche leader Ecuerapa in 1786. This "never-to-be-broken" accord only encouraged trading activities as it improved conditions for safe passage along trade routes.
[153] Cordova, 120-121.

problem that needed solving. This undesirable element of society combined with a need to rectify problems of abuse and inadequate indoctrination among those genízaros who remained in servitude were the impetus for a shift in government policy regarding the security of the New Mexican periphery. From early in the eighteenth century, Spanish authorities faced a persistent challenge from those genízaros whom governors like Vélez Cachupín found to be "mischievous and foppish with vices that [were] very grave to the country" and "difficult to subjugate and settle." Likewise, authorities were frequently burdened with charges of abuse and neglect from genízaros who remained under the theoretical protection of captivity. As discussed earlier, moving servants to a new household was often the means to resolve cases of mistreatment for Indians enslaved in Hispanic homes. At times, colonial governors also granted genízaros their freedom—or rather rendered their ransom paid—and relocated them to frontier outposts:

> It sometimes happens that the Indians are not well treated in this servitude, no thought being given to the hardships of their captivity, and still less to the fact that they are neophytes, and should be cared for and treated with kindness. For this reason many desert and become apostates. Distressed by this, the missionaries informed the governor of it, so that, in a matter of such great importance, he might take the proper measures. Believing the petition to be justified…he ordered by proclamation throughout the kingdom that all the Indian men and women neophytes who received ill-treatment from their masters should report it to him, so that if the case were proved, he might take the necessary measures. In fact a number did apply to him, and he assigned to them for their residence and settlement, in the name of his majesty a place called Valencia and Cerro de Tomé…[154]

Genízaros who successfully utilized the colonial legal system to escape the oppression of enslavement won their independence, but with certain conditions: that they practice agriculture—lest they return to their original nomadic lifestyle—and that they do so under obligation to defend and live in communities established along the frontier. So they were precariously sandwiched between relatively safer Spanish towns and dangerous Plains Indians whose livelihood largely depended on their relentless marauding of peripheral communities. Thus the frontier was the solution for genízaros who were problematic in one way or another. Border communities helped address the constant issue of provincial security by creating a buffer zone around uneasy Spaniards and furthered colonial efforts to "civilize" Plains Indians. In turn, such communities became

[154] Menchero, in Hackett, *Historical Documents,* 3:401-402.

fertile ground for the emergence of a unique cultural element within New Mexican society.

Detached from the larger cultural centers of Santa Fe and Albuquerque, towns along the fringes of the settled province created an opportunity for genízaros to indulge in a certain amount of autonomy. Even though the government compelled them to assist Spanish wars against outside Indians and receive Christian instruction, genízaros were able to maintain their own local governments, evolve their own form of Catholicism, and get away with illegal trading with Plains tribes. Above all, they were no longer cut off from each other in servitude. Genízaros acquired land at various locations on the New Mexican frontier, including Valencia and Cerro de Tomé, Abiquiu, Belen, San Miguel del Vado, and Ojo Caliente. Aside from Valencia and Cerro de Tomé in 1740 and Abiquiu in 1754, most of the genízaro resettlement took place late in the eighteenth century. These communities were not necessarily newly formed for genízaros; rather, they were part of a government strategy to revive settlements that Spaniards had abandoned, "harried by the Comanches and Apaches."[155] In 1769, Governor Pedro Fermín de Mendinueta noted that Ojo Caliente, for example, had been abandoned by Spanish settlers who refused to have any more of their horses taken, livestock killed, or their wives taken captive.[156] Circumstances like these opened the door for genízaro settlers.

While the proliferation of genízaro communities along the provincial borders clearly served political and military objectives for the New Mexican government, these frontier towns were not the brainchild of colonial military administrators only. Genízaros themselves first petitioned the government to resettle the abandoned pueblo of Sandía in 1733, offering their military service as guardians and scouts. Governor Gervasio Cruzat y Góngora denied the request, but not its lasting implication. Within merely a few decades of their emergence as an identifiable group, genízaros proactively engaged in trying to improve their circumstances by pursuing undesirable lands. Later in the eighteenth century, the comancheros—"the daring individuals who traveled to the Plains to trade with the Comanches"—and ciboleros, the New Mexican buffalo hunters, both of

[155] "Geographical Description of New Mexico written by the Reverend Preacher Fray Agustín de Morfi, 1782," in Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers*, 91.
[156] Proceedings regarding the settlement of Ojo Caliente, 1769, SANM I 4:346.

whom Charles Kenner celebrates in *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations*, were largely genízaros who wanted to participate in the Plains economy and were instrumental in building strategically located communities to be closer to native groups like the Comanches and Wichita Indians for trading. After the historic peace treaty of 1786, so-called comanchero towns like San Miguel de Vado, San José de Vado, Antón Chico and La Cuesta were founded along the eastern perimeter.[157]

Although they were no longer cut off from each other in servitude, genízaros living in frontier communities around New Mexico did not necessarily connect with one another from one town to the next. Marriage records of the late eighteenth century, for example, suggest that genízaros in Belen were isolated from those living in the nearest towns of Albuquerque and Tomé. Almost no marriages were contracted between genízaros from Belen and across the river at Tomé and likewise almost no marriages were contracted between genízaros from Belen and those from Albuquerque. In fact, genízaros living in Albuquerque had no appreciable connections to the genízaros of Belen. Even the sets of genízaros' surnames were completely different for Albuquerque and Belen. As discussed earlier, if they married at all, genízaros tended to marry each other and accordingly they married within their immediate domain.[158] Their group identity, then, was localized and came from within, a pattern that seems to hold in other communities with heavy genízaro populations as well.

Marginalized in every sense of the word, whether they concentrated in small towns on the edge of the province or within neighborhoods of relatively urban centers like Santa Fe or Albuquerque, genízaros developed, perhaps inevitably so, cohesive communities whose strength and resolve became most visible when bullied by the dominant master class. Belen again affords an opportunity to illustrate this point and why the genízaro consciousness remained localized to individual communities rather than a phenomenon shared across the province. In 1745, the self-proclaimed captain of the genízaros, Antonio Casados, a Kiowa-Apache genízaro, and his cohort Luis Quintana, an Apache genízaro, caught the attention of the Viceroy don Pedro Cebrian y Agustín in Mexico City by making a formal complaint regarding allegedly unjust intrusions on their

[157] Petition by various genízaros to settle ancient pueblo of Sandía, 1733, SANM I 6:687; Anderson, 231; Kenner, 63, 78.
[158] Horvath, 129.

lands by New Mexican settlers Diego Torres, Fulano Barreras and Antonio Salazar. Casados and Quintana charged that the Spanish New Mexicans had trespassed on Indian lands and forced out genízaros, leaving the colony undefended from the South. Casados and Quintana argued that the grant issued in 1740 was invalid because it involved land from a previously-established genízaro pueblo. After considering the genízaros' arguments, the viceroy referred the case to New Mexican Governor Joaquín Codallos y Rabal, ordering him to conduct hearings to determine ownership of the land in question. Any ground that the genízaros had gained in Mexico City was lost with the viceroy's order.

Codallos y Rabal took issue with the fact that Casados had left the province and gone to Mexico City without the proper permission from authorities and had rallied "70 Indians from all the different pueblos" to come to Santa Fe to support him in the hearings. Furthermore, the governor showed undue interest in Quintana's flight from the colony years earlier, while failing to pursue more relevant testimony regarding the genízaros' rights to land at Belen. After hearing numerous witnesses in favor of the defendants to discredit Casados' and Quintana's complaint, Codallos y Rabal recommended that the land remain with the New Mexican settlers.[159] Although the hearings marked a discouraging setback for Casados and his followers, the case provides an example of remarkable group solidarity among genízaros within one community around a unifying issue while demonstrating how the force of the dominant social and political order quelled the proliferation of a minority ethnic consciousness that could span the confines of individual localities. The Belen case shows that Spanish authorities were threatened when genízaros attempted to unify beyond their contained communities. Codallos y Rabal asked Casados directly why he had brought the 70 Indians from all the different pueblos—either uncomfortable with the very idea of genízaros banding together or with Casados' power to make it happen, or both. Casados' power came from his identity with a distinguishable genízaro community, a community motivated by injustice. Superficially, the governor's findings seem like the predictable disenfranchisement of a marginalized group of people. A deeper look exposes the genízaros' potential

[159] "Antonio Casados and Luis Quintana, genízaros, proceedings against Fulano Barrera, Diego Torres and Antonio Salazar over lands at Puesto de Belen," 1746, SANM I 1:1302-1327; Brooks, 133-135; Horvath, 174-181.

formidability and why the New Mexican power structure saw the need to nip it in the bud.

This case bears significance in that it reaffirms the notion that genízaros understood what mattered to Spanish New Mexicans and were not afraid to use it as leverage—as was apparent in complaints of mistreatment where genízaros attempted to manipulate authorities with allegations of inadequate Christian instruction against abusive masters. Casados deliberately left New Mexico without license, taking his complaint directly to the highest office in the land and cleverly attempted to manipulate the viceroy with his charge that the colony was undefended without genízaros possessing the land. Casados' strategy implies that he knew full well how vulnerable the frontier settlements were, how tenuous the Spanish government's hold was, and how valuable genízaro Indians were in minimizing that vulnerability and securing that hold.

The governor's ruling against the genízaros diffused the spread of a province-wide genízaro movement but it did not diminish the perseverance and resilience of local groups of genízaros. Merely three years later they mobilized again in Belen—this time successfully—against New Mexican Nicolas Chavez for "allowing his livestock to foul their acequias" (irrigation ditches).[160]

Similar efforts to wield leverage against the infringement of the Hispanic world surfaced in other areas as well. Genízaros of Santa Fe's Barrio de Analco rebuffed Governor Juan Bautista de Anza's proposal to move them to the frontier in 1779. The move would have been part of a larger military strategy that involved reorganizing the province and included an option to move Santa Fe's presidio to the south side of town, encroaching on the Analco neighborhood. Father Morfi referred to the plan and the local reaction to it in his 1782 report:

> …Anza wished to give a new form to the Villa and for this purpose to move it to the south bank of its river, razing all of the buildings of the old settlement. The settlers opposed him. He tried to point out to them the disasters and inconveniences which injured them and there being no judges in Santa Fe, twenty-four fled from the kingdom. They presented themselves in Arispe before the Señor Commander-General Cavallero de Croix, complaining of the injury. In view of what the settlers opposed …they won an order that the governor should not proceed in moving the Villa until there be demonstrated the conveniences which from that should ensue; that he should not disturb the *Genízaros* of Analco…[161]

[160] Brooks, 135; "Petición de los genízaros de Belén, 28 marzo, 1749," AASF, 52:68-72.
[161] Geographical Description of New Mexico written by the Reverand Preacher Fray Juan Agustín de Morfi, 1782," in Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers*, 92.

The Spanish colonial government's control of the province was shaky and Teodoro de Croix prudently saw no reason to disrupt their already tenuous hold by disaffecting genízaros, a valuable resource in the ongoing battle for territory and trade. Fray Angelico Chavez has argued that historians have overstated the genízaros' military role and value to the colonial regime—"in widely scattered instances, small groups of genízaros were martially employed"—but the fact that Croix was not willing to risk losing their military service and the fact that genízaros used it for bargaining power with the colonial government would suggest otherwise.[162]

As was the case in Belen 30 years earlier, a genízaro leader emerged who worked off the strength of a unified and distinguishable genízaro community to manipulate New Mexican government leaders in protest of a clear threat to the livelihood of genízaros living in the safety of the Analco neighborhood. Bentura Bustamente led the group of genízaros who traveled to Arizpe, the newly established seat of the Interior Provinces of New Spain, to argue against Governor Anza's plan. Bustamente's contingent declared that they had become devout Catholics through years of military service and living side-by-side with Spanish New Mexicans and that they feared "losing their women and children" should they be subjected to the exposure of the borderlands. The genízaros pulled out all the stops when they threatened to leave the colony altogether and join the barbarous Indians if the government forced them out of Santa Fe.[163] It is hard to ignore that this play must have been an empty threat given that the genízaros' own stated reason for opposing resettlement was their fear that Plains Indians would capture their women and children. Nonetheless, like others before them, these genízaros demonstrated shrewd sensitivity to Hispanic values and insecurities in an organized effort to advance their own agenda.

The Bustamente crowd's professed allegiance to the Crown and Church hint that they were more assimilated than other genízaros studied here. The testimonies alone in this case do not provide adequate evidence on which to make that determination responsibly. They might very well have been more Hispanic than Indian, as some

[162] "General Report of 1781 by Teodoro de Croix," Thomas, *Teodoro de Croix*, 107-108. Chavez, "Genízaros," 198.
[163] Bentura Bustamente, Communication to the Governor, protesting the treatment of the Genízaro Indians of Santa Fe, 1780, SANM I 6:323; Brooks, 138-141; Weber, *Bárbaros*, 240; Rael-Galvez, 38.

genízaros arguably were. For instance, Manuel Mestas of Abiquiu was a Ute interpreter and trader who managed to transcend caste lines and find acceptance in New Mexican society. The 1789 Abiquiú census had Mestas listed as a genízaro and by 1808 he was a vecino with his own land at La Cuchilla.[164] Mestas contradicted the generalization that genízaros had a low social status because they were neither Spanish nor Indian, with restricted access to the resources that would enable their inclusion in the Hispanic realm. Although he did not achieve vecino status until late in his life, Mestas' relationships with his original tribe and his adoptive community worked to his advantage in trading furs, livestock, and captives. And ultimately, his contacts with both cultural perspectives helped him in acquiring land and improving his social standing.[165]

As for the Santa Fe genízaros following Bustamente, the degree to which they assimilated remains uncertain. But, what the documents relating to their protest reveal is their awareness of what it meant to be both dubiously trapped and advantageously positioned between two worlds. On the one hand, these genízaros, who comprised more than 12 per cent of the local population, were dispensable in the newly-appointed Anza administration's plan to relocate Santa Fe's presidio and they feared their fate if the plan were to be implemented. On the other, whether they were actually willing to or not, Bustamente and his followers convinced colonial authorities that they could live with or without the Spaniards; that they could be Indian just as easily as they could be New Mexican.[166]

This cultural back and forth appears in less dramatic forms as well. As noted in Chapter One, some genízaros would drop their Spanish baptismal names and assume their original Indian names or adopt new ones after settling in frontier towns. Curiously, "some of these same individuals were again reinscribed as part of the same *nuevoamericano* society, participating in the same rituals and cultural practices, their former Christian names in place."[167] Rael-Galvez' dissertation points to Miguel Reano who, according to documents from 1741, supposedly changed his name to "Tasago." But, from 1755 through 1763, his name continues to appear in ecclesiastical records as

[164] Sánchez, 99-100; Swadesh, 43.
[165] Ebright and Hendricks, 31-33.
[166] Brooks, 139.
[167] Rael-Galvez, 38.

"Miguel Reano," along with that of his wife, Luisa de Sena, for the baptisms of their children.[168] Even if the continued appearance of their Spanish names was the result of the Church refusing to acknowledge these genízaros' preference for their Indian names, these detribalized Indians brought their children to be baptized nonetheless. This seemingly subtle detail was no less indicative of the capacity of genízaros to function in both worlds than the threat of genízaros joining their Plains relatives against the Spaniards.

The stories of genízaros throughout New Mexico and the colonial period represent a lasting and substantial history of cultural interplay born out of a longstanding, mutually beneficial trade relationship between New Mexicans and Plains Indians. Involuntarily thrust into the Hispano-Christian realm, genízaros instinctively exercised their own free will in reacting and adapting to unimaginable conditions that bore an eerie resemblance to slavery, whether or not authorities of the day were willing to call it that. New Mexicans rescued Indian captives from both the malicious acts of their "barbarous" captors and the error of their own native ways. Under the guise of religious morality, Franciscan priests and government leaders sought to liberate and redeem detribalized Indians in New Mexico by denying them their freedom. To an extent, these Indians went along with the plan. They baptized their children, they settled in permanent houses and towns, they farmed and traded, they even defended the Spanish Crown against their native brothers. Throughout the eighteenth century the genízaros regularly engaged with Hispanic culture and society in these ways, feeding the assumption that detribalized Indians simply assimilated. And yet, missionaries and governors routinely criticized the genízaros for their spiritual malnutrition, never owning up to the fact that they were the ones supposedly dispensing the food. The irony is that the Spaniards' own moral deficiencies blinded them to the genízaros' fundamental gift of intellect and instinct to survive.

The genízaros' capacity to carry on was in no small part due to the unique circumstances of their condition that provided an opening for them to assert themselves against injustice within their captive households or their adoptive communities. Unlike

[168] SANM II 8:67 and Thomas D. Martinez, Benito Estevan Montoya and Rosina LaSalle, *Santa Fe Baptisms, 1747-1848*, 1992 as cited in footnote 67, Rael-Galvez, 38.

slavery in other parts of the world, Indian servants in New Spain had considerable legal recourse that they often made use of to repudiate exploitation and abuse or to protest discrimination in land grants or government policies. Even though more often than not their complaints were dismissed, genízaros repeatedly acted to preserve their own interests, an exercise that promoted unity, organization and ultimately a group consciousness. Concentrated within a slew of communities along the New Mexican frontier, living together in a "great union as if they were all of the same nation," genízaros demonstrated "the cultural creativity that forced Spain to concede much of the Southwest to native societies" as well as "a history of people determined to survive and quite willing to reinvent culture."[169]

Moving beyond the extremes of conventional dualities like Indian versus Spanish and Pagan versus Christian brings to the life the complexities and nuances that color an informed historical perspective on how the genízaros of New Mexico remained, at times, discouragingly stuck, and at others, strategically located in the middle. The ongoing process of ethnogenesis during the eighteenth century continued into the nineteenth century as the genízaro culture became increasingly distinguishable and even institutionalized with the blended ceremonialism of the Penitentes and continued efforts to preserve genízaro lands, and the persistence of rampant trading in the face of the American military. From fairly early in the eighteenth century, genízaros showed signs that their blended cultural perspective made it so that being Indian or Spanish could be a matter of convenience. As the colonial period gave way to the republican era and the puritanical influences of the eastern United States trickled in through the American occupation and conquest, genízaros honed their capacity to play both sides of the cultural fence until finally being Hispanic became more convenient than being Indian—most of the time.

[169] Menchero in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 3:402; Anderson, 6-7.

Epilogue

The Genízaros in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

In a collection of essays entitled *Nuevo México Profundo*, the authors describe the genízaro legacy that lives in present-day Abiquiu:

> Almost every family in Abiquiú has stories about how one ancestor or another was taken captive or redeemed from captivity. This tribal memory is enacted at the fiesta by dancing children dressed in bright red cloth, buckskin, scarves, ribbons, feathers, and Tewa-style face paint. After mass at the church door, the little *cautivos* dance back and forth in rows, waving a single feather in each hand. The *Nanillé* dance is sung with vocable choruses to the cadence of the tombé…Later in the day, there are moments when the dancing suddenly stops and a pantomime of captivity and redemption is acted out. 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, which is paid to the singers…the cautivos are either strangers being sold off or former residents whose relatives are paying back their ransom.[170]

In contemporary New Mexico, the genízaro identity comes to life every November at the feast of Santo Tomás the Apostle; otherwise it is difficult to locate. New Mexicans themselves will tell you that over time the genízaros have folded into New Mexico's *mestizaje*, the mixed cultural heritage born out of mixed blood lines that characterizes the Hispano identity of New Mexico today. They say that the only place you will find those who might identify themselves as genízaro is in Abiquiu, where the struggle to preserve communal lands lasted into the mid-twentieth century and where remembrances like the one above still occur.[171] The historical record concurs and shows that gradually, since the late eighteenth century, the genízaros' discernible culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries blended with the dominant Hispano identity by the mid-twentieth century. The ongoing transition of the genízaro identity and consciousness throughout this period, however, has not undone the cultural reinvention that genízaros actively engaged in to survive and persevere under colonial, Mexican, and American rule. Rather, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have reflected the culmination of the process of ethnogenesis, as genízaros continued to respond to great challenges in the context of dramatic political upheaval. Within the nineteenth century alone, New Mexicans endured the demise of the Spanish colonial regime, the incorporation of Mexico's liberal republican rule, and the occupation and conquest of the United States military. All the while, genízaros carried on.

---

[170] Miguel Gandert, Enrique Lamadrid, Ramón Gutierrez, Lucy Lippard, and Chris Wilson, *Nuevo México Profundo: Rituals of an Indo-Hispano Homeland* (Santa Fe and Albuquerque, NM: Museum of New Mexico Press and National Hispanic Cultural Center of New Mexico, 2000): 57-58.

[171] From conversations in person and by phone with various archivists at the New Mexico State Records Center in Santa Fe, August 1996 and February 2007.

Despite the changing political dynamics in the region, a context of contradictions persisted and genízaros entered the nineteenth century with high visibility as an ethnic group. New Mexicans and surrounding Plains Indian groups continued to engage in the simultaneous conflict and exchange that characterized the eighteenth century and produced genízaros in the first place, but with Anglo-American traders and settlers complicating the mix. The positioning of genízaros in frontier towns put them right in the middle of this conflict and exchange and they did not hesitate to take advantage. The famed Treaty of 1786, which established peaceful relations between New Mexico and the Comanches, and the colonial government's eagerness to extend the Spanish presence in the East to counteract "growing American designs on the colony" expanded comanchero and cibolero buffalo hunting early in the nineteenth century. Governor Alberto Maynez "relaxed trade restrictions and allowed local commercial initiatives to flourish."[172] Genízaros represented a considerable number of those "daring individuals who traveled to the plains to trade with the Comanches" referred to previously; they were the "indigent and rude classes of the frontier villages," as Josiah Gregg described them in 1843 while Governor W.W.H. Davis compared some ciboleros that he met in 1853 to a "band of gypsies."[173] By early the early nineteenth century "the Plains were alive with commerce and conflict that connected the Indian world to both the Spanish and American economies."[174]

As long as New Mexico remained under the auspices of Spanish or Mexican rule, comanchero trading and cibolero buffalo hunting were of mutual benefit to both New Mexican authorities and the comancheros and ciboleros. While these activities helped the efforts of authorities to control the Plains economy and territory, comanchero trading and cibolero hunting provided certain opportunities for genízaros as well. Trading and hunting were sources for economic gain and provided genízaros a way to maintain ties with their native communities, helping them preserve a piece of their native identities. Charles Kenner demonstrates this point as he describes hunting techniques that ciboleros used:

---

[172] Brooks, 205.
[173] Kenner, 78; Joshiah Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, Max Moorhead, ed. (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954): 257; Davis, as quoted in Kenner, 102.
[174] Brooks, 206, citing "José Manrique, Draft of Report to Nemesio Salcedo y Salcedo," November 26, 1808, in Pinart Collection, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

> On the hunt, *cazadores* exercised skill and courage seldom seen on the American frontier. Stealing as close as possible to a herd of buffalo, they dashed into the midst of the fleeing animals. Each hunter singled out a victim, shouldered his horse next to the brute, and drove his lance downward past the animal's left ribs into its heart. Wrenching the lance loose, the hunter swiftly turned on another lumbering beast. During the course of a single chase, which often covered two or three miles, an experienced lancer could kill from eight to twenty-five buffalo.[175]

The significance in the fact that ciboleros chose to employ native hunting techniques rather than using guns, to which they certainly had access, cannot be overstated. Engaging in hunts this way gave genízaros a chance to renew their native cultural heritage while also giving them access to resources that allowed them to participate in and even prosper from the regional economy. Unlike the Spanish and Mexicans, the American military found the "nefarious traffic" obstructive to its campaign to remove the Indians and open the Plains to white settlement. But to the dismay of the Americans, the comancheros and ciboleros persisted through the late nineteenth century when trading finally came to an end with the destruction of the buffalo and the American defeat of the Comanches in the Red River War of the 1870s.[176]

Meanwhile, Spanish New Mexicans still looked at genízaros with simultaneous repugnance and efficacy. As Historian Russell Magnaghi notices, "Although individual genízaros were trusted as scouts or interpreters, as a group they were regarded as potentially traitorous and on a number of occasions some of them were tried for sedition."[177] Magnaghi refers specifically to a trial for sedition against genízaros that occurred in 1806. Then a mere two years later, Governor Maynez recognized the *tropa de genízaros*, a special military unit to conduct reconnaissance on the Plains, and even put it under the command of a genízaro corporal.[178] Likewise, the opening of the Old Spanish Trail in early 1822 loosened trade restrictions between the territory and the United States and "genízaros joined the caravans and traveled to St. Louis and back as guides and interpreters."[179] Pedro León Luján of Abiquiu was an established trader who first appeared in the military rolls in 1836. By 1839, he had become a captain, and submitted a report to the governor on militia troop strength in Abiquiu. That same year

---

[175] Kenner, 103.
[176] Ibid., 149.
[177] Magnaghi, 91; Trial of Genízaros for sedition, Santa Fe-Chihuahua, December 9-March 28, 1806, SANM II 15:1099.
[178] Salcedo, Chihuahua, instructions to Governor Maynez re his return to Chihuahua, August 12, 1808, SANM II 16:596; Brooks, 205; Magnaghi, 91; Weber, *Bárbaros*, 241.
[179] Magnaghi, 92, 90; Poling-Kempes, 79

he led a campaign against the Navajos, capturing "'six little slaves of both sexes' along with other plunder."[180] The apparent contradictions in the way that New Mexicans treated and regarded them show that genízaros were participating fully in the regional economy and society while New Mexicans still recognized them as genízaros rather than vecinos, a sign that they possessed a distinct ethnic identity.

This point is exceptionally important given the fact that, in the nineteenth century, the term "genízaro" disappears in official records as a result of the Plan of Iguala that precipitated Mexican independence from Spain in 1821. Mexican independence caused little change in the operation of the colony as it remained remote and under-funded from the capital in Mexico City. The Territory of New Mexico, as it was now called, retained the Spanish presidial system, military regulations, and the laws of Spain "to the extent that they [were] not contrary to the particular conditions of the country." Likewise, New Mexico had to fend for itself since the Mexican government had no more military or financial resources to offer the territory than the Spanish government had had.[181] The status of genízaros, however, did change. The Plan of Iguala proclaimed social equality for all inhabitants of the new country, granting equal rights in court and in every aspect of life for all social and ethnic groups and therefore called for the elimination of all caste labels. This declaration thus extended full citizenship to sedentary Christian Indians. At baptisms, the priests still used indicators like Indian "servants", "captured" or "bought" and even occasionally mentioned tribal affiliations. Such qualifiers remind us that regardless of what the constitution said, genízaros were still genízaros; they were still at the bottom of New Mexico's social hierarchy as Indians with the added stigma of servitude. But, officially, genízaros and vecinos alike were all Mexicans after 1821. The disappearance of the genízaro label in official documents has led some historians to assume that genízaros lost their group identity with the changing of the guard. But Pedro León Luján's story proves that this was not the case.[182]

---

[180] "Report on militia strength," Mexican Archives of New Mexico, 26:515, 516-519, as cited in Ebright and Hendricks, 42-43.
[181] Swadesh, 23, 53-56.
[182] Chavez, "Genízaros," 200; recall Brooks' casual reference to "their genízaro counterparts in the earlier era" when discussing the dispersal of settlers "to smaller villages on the outskirts of the settled territory" and their continued role as "coerced mediators," implying that genízaros faded into Mexico's cultural landscape in the nineteenth century, 240.

José Gonzalez' rise to fame as the New Mexico's first and only (known) Indian governor also disputes the notion that genízaros ceased to exist as an identifiable ethnic group in the wake of Mexican Independence. Gonzalez led a short-lived though successful revolt in Rio Arriba over taxes in 1837 and then served as New Mexico's interim governor. Because records from both his baptism in 1799 and second marriage in 1834 identified Gonzalez as a vecino, some historians have doubted his Indian, and specifically his genízaro, heritage. Fray Angelico Chavez has investigated the matter, however, and found that "on June 10, 1817, *José Angel Gonzalez*, the son of José Santos Gonzales and María Martín, both *genízaros* of Taos, married María Josefa Fernández, orphan daughter of Mariano Fernández and María Rosa Leyba of Santa Barbara." This finding, along with Chavez' careful analysis of Gonzalez' grandparents' racial backgrounds, leaves little doubt that Gonzalez was in fact genízaro. Gonzalez' ancestry inspired his support and determined his fall. His fate was reminiscent of the defeat that Antonio Casados suffered in his effort to protect genízaro lands at Belen. Manuel Armijo, who looked down on Gonzalez and his "motley mob," cut short the insurgency when he defeated Gonzalez at the Battle of Pojoaque and had him and his followers executed.[183] Although Casados did not face execution for his legal maneuvering against Hispanic settlers, bringing 70 Indians from all the different pueblos unquestionably hurt his case with the governor, who treated their presence as an insurgent threat. As it had in the eighteenth century, the genízaros' formidability intimidated New Mexico's power elite in the nineteenth century.

Despite the offering of full citizenship and, in theory, full acceptance in the Hispanic society under the new Mexican government, most genízaros considered themselves Indians well into the nineteenth century. Officially genízaros had gained social equality, but in practice New Mexicans continued to hold them in low standing. Rather than try to break past this social barrier, the genízaros' found it was in their own self-interest to perpetuate their Indian identity. The genízaros' awareness of this reality served them well when it came to preserving their lands. Citizenship brought up new challenges for genízaros over the issue of individual land ownership, particularly in

[183] Chavez, "José Gonzales, Genízaro Governor," *New Mexico Historical Review* 30 (July 1955): 191; Chavez, *My Penitente Land: Reflections on Spanish New Mexico* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974): 241; Magnaghi, 92.

Abiquiu where the genízaros' community land grant of 1754 became vulnerable to privatization. From 1815 to 1830, the Hispanic elite and Abiquiu's resident priest, Fray Teodoro Alcina, threatened Abiquiu's common lands. As they had in 1780 in Santa Fe, genízaros in Abiquiu had to organize to defend their land. This time they employed the strategy that Casados and Quintana had used in Belen in 1749—they asserted Abiquiu's identity as an Indian pueblo. The genízaros in Abiquiu started on much firmer ground than they had in Belen, as they had a known and documented community land grant that Veléz Cachupín had authorized in 1754. The assault on their lands resurfaced repeatedly into the twentieth century. The genízaros' maneuverings throughout this near-continuous battle reflected the culmination of their ethnogenesis. The Abiquiu genízaros retained remarkable cohesion in fighting outside incursions on their land and, unlike other Indian pueblos, managed to hold onto most of it. Abiquiu's residents achieved this by responding to the changing tides from the 1820s through the 1940s, adjusting the community's outward identity when changes in governing political structures made such adaptations prudent to their cause. Over the years, they conveniently transitioned from an Indian pueblo to a Hispanic land grant, and finally to a livestock cooperative association.[184]

Since the laws tended to work in favor of Indian pueblos—Indian individuals could not sell their lands easily—in the early nineteenth century Abiqueños argued their case as Indians. By the mid-1800s, however, it was unclear whether being an Indian pueblo or a Hispanic community would best serve Abiquiu's interests given that it was up to the United States government to decide. Confused by Abiquiu's unique land grant (it was a community grant but they were not Pueblo Indians), the newly installed American government did not include Abiquiu as either an Indian pueblo or a Hispanic land grant. The government ultimately designated it, "almost by default, 'the Town of Abiquiu,' a grant classification reserved for Hispanic community grants." The Abiquiu residents understood the significance of this designation and, by late century, most were beginning to consider themselves Hispanos, but the issue was not entirely resolved.

After a speculator named J.M.C. Chávez filed a claim "on behalf of the half-breed Indians of Abiquiu" in 1883, Surveyor General George Washington Julian could not

[184] Ebright and Hendricks, 252-256.

overlook Abiquiu's origins as an Indian pueblo under the 1754 grant. He recognized that the grant was one made to the genízaro Indians and thus recommended that the Court of Private Land Claims confirm Abiquiu's status as an Indian pueblo. The court confirmed the Abiquiu grant to the "half-breed Indians of Abiquiu" in 1894, but with a boundary approximately 1,000 leagues shy of where it was originally drawn along the Chama River in 1754. Abiquiu's residents protested the new boundary but a final decision and patent approval in 1909 left the boundary with the 1894 line. While the patent kept the community grant in tact, it also made the grant subject to taxes for the first time. The management of Abiquiu's grant remains under a board of commissioners with only about 150 acres of its land having succumbed to privatization.[185]

Even though their genízaro past had helped them preserve their lands, Abiqueños, continued in their move toward a decidedly Hispanic identity. In 1928, members of the Abiquiu grant held a vote to determine their identity as either an Indian pueblo or a Hispanic village.[186] They voted in favor of the latter because as Lesley Poling-Kempes writes, "their Native American neighbors were treated so poorly by the government that it would behoove the community to become a village not an official Indian pueblo."[187] This monumental vote resulted in a new tax burden for the residents of Abiquiu. Individuals paid their taxes on their houses and garden plots directly to the state, but one individual was to collect the taxes on the communal lands and turn the revenue into the state. At some time during the mid-1930s, the state of New Mexico seized most of the Abiquiu grant for delinquent taxes. Evidently, J.M.C. Chávez, the designated collector, had been pocketing the taxes. In response, the village pulled together to reinvent themselves yet again to form the Abiquiu Cooperative Livestock Association and enlisted the support of United States Senator Dennis Chávez to stall the sale of the land until they could raise enough money to buy it back.[188]

The 1928 vote marked a profound transformation for Abiquiu born out of political expedience. But unlike the politically expedient events and circumstances of earlier eras,

---

[185] Ibid., 253-255, Ebright and Hendricks provide an informative account of these developments relying largely on oral histories derived from interviews with contermporary residents of Abiquiu (Isabel, Floyd and Virgil Trujillo) in addition to records from federal and state land management agencies, 252-256.
[186] Ebight and Hendricks, 255; Lesley Poling-Kempes, *Valley of Shining Stone: The Story of Abiquiu* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1997): 143-144.
[187] Poling-Kempes, 144.
[188] Ebright and Hendricks, 255-256.

the decision to become a Hispano village did not necessarily translate into a fundamental change in the cultural perspective of the people of Abiquiu. Angelico Chavez contends that "the people of full or genízaro descent and upbringing are definitely more Indianic in their outlook than *castizo* [Spanish-American] by their Hispanic contact…they are the ones who join the agrarian and urban Mexicans or Mexican-Americans in their social protests, and consequently like to be called "chicanos" along with them." Chavez continues, "…the one with genízaro antecedents tends to identify himself with what he considers his brown brethren from south of the border."[189] While his condescension is palpable and it seem unlikely that "full" genízaros remain anymore than "full" Spaniards, when weighed against Abiquiu's modern struggle to preserve its lands, Chavez' observations hold merit. His observations reaffirm the idea that the word genízaro has different meanings at different points in time and, for that matter, so too does the concept of Hispanicization. From the start, Spanish New Mexicans and their genízaros intermingled, mixing blood lines, confusing ethnic identities and ultimately creating a *mestizo* culture that possesses both native and Spanish influences. In the modern era, it would seem that the genízaros of New Mexico became Mexican versus Spanish.

Genízaros also made their way toward a modern Hispano identity by accepting Catholicism, but with a twist known as Penitente cultism. The seeds of the genízaros' customized embrace of Christian doctrine date back to the late eighteenth century "when rural New Mexico had only a handful of Franciscan Friars attempting to serve missions scattered far and wide on the frontier, [and] isolated villages like Abiquiu had witnessed the beginnings of a folk religion".[190] During Toledo's tenure in the 1750s and 1760s, Abiquiu genízaros attended his mandatory services, conducted primarily in Spanish and Latin. The genízaros' crude understanding of Toledo's services, largely due to language barriers, provided the beginnings of a "homegrown Catholicism." Over the next several decades, many genízaro communities slowly turned to penitential confraternities, or *cofradías*. Church officials in New Mexico condemned the practices of the Penitentes as early as 1817, at which time most Penitente organizations withdrew into secrecy.[191] The need for secrecy is curious given that the Penitentes were decidedly Catholic, having

[189] Chavez, *My Penitente Land*, 270.
[190] Poling-Kempes, 90.
[191] Ebright and Hendricks, 259-260; Poling-Kempes, 90; Magnaghi, 91.

more or less replaced the former religious practices of the genízaros. As Poling-Kempes summizes:

> The Penitentes of Abiquiu and other frontier communities were primarily a group of Hispanic men whose purpose was to strengthen and assist their neighbors and communities: Physically, spiritually, and eventually politically. The Penitentes' duties and services included *rosarios* (rosary services), visits to the sick and infirmed of their communities, help to a neighbor in time of family death or illness, the singing of funeral chants or *alabados*, and grave digging and even outright financial aid. During Lent, they observed the Passion and death of Jesus, and during Holy Week the Hermanos had numerous prayer meetings.[192]

Hardly a departure from the work and practices of good Catholics, priests must have found the brotherhoods' self-determination threatening. The growth of the Penitente movement in Abiquiu seems directly related to the abusive residency of Father Alcina in the 1820s and his famed condemnation of the genízaros there when he told them they were all damned. By this time, the Abiquiu genízaros had become believers in their own expression of Christian doctrine and regarded Father Alcina as not fulfilling his religious duties. The Abiquiu genízaros, along with their Hispanic neighbors, refused Alcina's mistreatment and proactively tried to oust him. They even went so far as to recruit a replacement, Father Bruno González of Picuris, but Father Alcina's resistance got in the way and he remained in Abiquiu until 1823. It was during this period that Abiquiú was effectively without a priest and established its lasting religious identity.[193]

The emergence of the Penitente brotherhood provides another example of how genízaros responded to adversity with resolve. In solidarity and community with one another, genízaros responded to the punitive style of first Toledo and later Alcina with the same cultural creativity that helped them navigate other challenges that characterized their presence in New Mexican society from the start. Rather than reject Catholicism altogether for lack of understanding, the genízaros took what they could from it and branded their own version of it. As Penitente cultism evolved, it was not much of a departure from the traditional teachings of the Church. But, the fact that genízaros took it upon themselves—exercising their own free will—to worship in their own way offended religious authorities, forcing the brothers to meet in secret initially. The need for secrecy

[192] Poling-Kempes, 90.

[193] Petition to the ayuntamiento complaining of Father Alcina's neglect of duty and asking for changes in saying mass and in the amount of fees, Ojo Caliente, 1 October 1820. SANM II:2934, as cited, possibly incorrectly, in Ebright and Hendricks, 256, as I could not locate the document to consult it directly.

eventually fell to the wayside, but the Penitentes themselves did not. By the 1970s, two of Abiquiu's three *moradas* (gathering places) had fallen out of use. The Morada del Alto, however, has endured with the Hermanos serving as a "bridge between the old ways and the new" and even "inviting outsiders to some of their events and giving lectures and programs that explain northern New Mexico's past and present."[194]

The story of the genízaros in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is consistent with that of the earlier period. It reveals that, despite imposing challenges, they managed to function and remain a visible and discernible ethnic group by reinventing themselves to ensure their own survival. The story of Abiquiu, in particular, reflects a cultural creativity among genízaros that points to the ongoing process of ethnogenesis. The genízaro presence in Abiquiu has endured more so than in other communities in New Mexico, highlighting the fact that the genízaro consciousness was localized, but resilient nonetheless. As they did in the eighteenth century, genízaros of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have acted instinctively in their own self-interest, able to manipulate the contradictions within the context of New Mexican politics and society. When it came to religion, the Church expected them to convert to Catholicism, but gave them restricted access. As a result, the Penitentes emerged, threatening the Catholic power structure and quietly refusing to back down. When it came to preserving their lands, genízaros clung to their Indian heritage and identity for well into the nineteenth century. Within the community, they became increasingly Hispanicized, but it was not until 1928 that genízaros of Abiquiu made the conscious choice to be a Hispanic village.

For the genízaros, the process of ethnogenesis has involved a series of adjustments to changing political, social, and economic dynamics that culminated in the genízaros' ultimate acculturation to the Hispano identity, an identity that too has shifted from what it was during the colonial period. Perhaps it was not that genízaros became Hispanos but that the modern Hispano identity evolved out of the genízaros' blended Spanish-Indian cultural perspective. The genízaros did not submit to New Mexico's mestizaje. Rather, they became a critical component of it. In the end, however, Indians are still Indians, among the lowest of the social order. This, coupled with the stigmatized legacy of enslavement explains why today's Hispanic New Mexicans tend to identify

[194] Poling-Kempes, 241.

themselves as *mestizo* before *genízaro*. The genízaros' cultural evolution, however, has not rendered their Indian past forgotten. As gatherings for the annual feast of Santo Tomás tell, "almost every family in Abiquiu has stories about how one ancestor or another was taken captive or redeemed from captivity." The individual experiences relayed in these stories created a distinctly genízaro culture beyond captivity that featured a shared genízaro consciousness and enduring legacy.

Bibliography

Adams, Eleanor B. and Fray Angelico Chavez, eds. and trans. *The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Atanasio Dominguez*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1956.

Archibald, Robert. "Acculturation and Assimilation in Colonial New Mexico." *New Mexico Historical Review* 53 (July 1978): 205-217.

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *The Indian Southwest, 1580-1830: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.

Andrien, Kenneth J. Review of *Andean Journeys: Migration, Ethnogenesis, and the State in Colonial Quito*. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 28 (October 1996): 689.

Bailey, L.R. *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest*. Los Angeles, CA: Westernlore Press, 1966.

Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Brugge, David M. *Navajos in the Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, 1694-1875*. Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1985.

Calloway, Colin G. *One Vast Winter Count: The Native American West before Lewis and Clark*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

Chavez, Fray Angelico. *The Dominguez-Escalante Journal: Their Expeditions through Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico in 1776*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1995.

--------. "Genízaros." Vol. 9 of *Handbook of North American Indians*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1979.

--------. "Jose Gonzales, Genízaro Governor," *New Mexico Historical Review* 30 (July 1955): 190-194.

--------. *My Penitente Land: Reflections on Spanish New Mexico*. Albuquerque: NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Clark, LaVerne Harrell. *They Sang for Horses: The Impact of the Horse on Navajo and Apache Folklore*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1966.

Clendinnen, Inga. *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Cordova, Gilberto Benito. "Missionization and Hispanicization of Santo Thomas Apostal de Abiquiu, 1750-1770." Ph.D dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1979.

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

Flores, Dan L. "Bison Ecology and Bison Diplomacy: The Southern Plains from 1800 to 1850." *Journal of American History* 78 (September 1991): 465-485.

Gandert, Miguel, Enrique Lamadrid, Ramón Gutierrez, Lucy Lippard, and Chris Wilson. *Nuevo México Profundo: Rituals of an Indo-Hispano Homeland*. Santa Fe and

Albuquerque, NM: Museum of New Mexico Press and National Hispanic Cultural Center of New Mexico, 2000.
Gudeman, Stephen and Stuart B. Schwartz. "Baptismal Godparents in Slavery: Cleansing Original Sin in Eighteenth-Century Bahia." *Interpreting Kinship Ideology and Practice in Latin America*. Edited by Raymond T. Smith. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
Gutierrez, Ramón A. *When Jesus Came the Cornmothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.
Hackett, Charles W., ed. *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya and Approaches Thereto to 1773*, 3 vols. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution, 1937.
---------. *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermín's Attempted Reconquest 1680-1682*. 2 vols. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1942.
Hall, Thomas D. *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350-1880*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1989.
Hallowell, A. Irving. "American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturation." *Current Anthropology* 4 (December 1963): 519-531.
Hammond, George P. and Agapito Rey, eds. and trans. *Don Juan de Oñate: Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628*. 2 vols. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1953.
--------. *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1940.
--------. *The Rediscovery of New Mexico, 1580-1594: The Explorations of Chasmuscado, Espejo, Castaño de Sosa, Morlete and Leyva de Bonilla de Humana*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1966.
Hendricks, Rick and John P. Wilson, eds. and trans. *The Navajos in 1705: Roque Madrid's Campaign Journal*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.
Horvath, Steven. "The Social and Political Organization of the Genízaros of the Plaza de Nuestra Señora de Los Dolores de Belen, New Mexico, 1740-1812." Ph.D dissertation, Brown University, 1980.
Hill, Jonathan D., ed. *History, Power and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1592-1992*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1996.
Hotz, Gottfried. *The Segesser Hide Paintings: Masterpieces Depicting Spanish Colonial New Mexico*. Santa Fe, NM: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1991.
John, Elizabeth A.H. "Indians in the Spanish Southwest." *Major Problems in the History of the American West*. Edited by Clyde A. Milner II. Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company, 1989.
Jones, Oakah L. *Los Paisanos: Spanish Settlers on the Northern Frontier of New Spain*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.
Kavanagh, ThomasW. *Comanche Political History: An Ethnohistorical Perspective, 1706-1875*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
Kenner, Charles L. *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.

Kessell, John L. *Kiva, Cross, and Crown: The Pecos Indians and New Mexico, 1540-1840*. Washington, DC: National Parks, Service, United States Department of the Interior, 1979.

--------. *Remote Beyond Compare: Letters of don Diego de Vargas to his Family from New Spain and Mexico, 1675-1706*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1989.

Kinnaird, Lawrence, ed. *The Frontiers of New Spain: Nicolás Lafora's Description, 1766-1768*. Berkeley, CA: The Quivira Society, 1958.

Magnaghi, Russell M. "Plains Indians in New Mexico: The Genízaro Experience," *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.

Neuenfeldt, Karl W. Abstract of *The Kyana Corroboree: Cultural Production of Indigenous Ethnogenesis, Sociological Inquiry* 65 (winter 1995): 21.

Noyes, Stanley. *Los Comanches: The Horse People, 1751-1845*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1993.

Ortiz, Fernando. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.

Poling-Kempes, Lesley. *Valley in the Shining Stone: The Story of Abiquiu*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1997.

Powers, Karen Vieira. *Andean Journeys: Migration, Ethnogenesis and the State in Colonial Quito*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Sahlins, Marshall. *Islands of History*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Sánchez, Joseph P. *Explorers, Traders, and Slavers: Forging the Old Spanish Trail*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1997.

Scholes, Frances V. "The First Decade of the Inquisition in New Mexico," *New Mexico Historical Review* 10 (July 1935): 195-241.

Schroeder, Albert H. "Rio Grande Ethnohistory." *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*. Edited by Alfonso Ortiz. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1972.

Simmons, Marc, ed. and trans. *Border Comanches: Seven Spanish Colonial Documents, 1785-1819*. Santa Fe, NM: Stagecoach Press, 1967.

Swadesh, Frances Leon. *Los Primeros Pobladores: Hispanic Americans of the Ute Frontier*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974.

Weber, David J. *Bárbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

-------. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Worcester, Donald. *The Apaches: Eagles of the Southwest*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.