



PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

During the 1960s and 1970s there were a number of publications relating to the taking of captives and slavery in the Southwest. Most were by historians or were researched and written according to the standards of history as a discipline. Some had an interdisciplinary aspect, however.

The American Society for Ethnohistory, during its early years as the American Indian Ethnohistorical Conference, began publication of the journal *Ethnohistory* in 1954 and those of us doing research for Native American claims against the United States government found a degree of comradeship despite any differences of opinion. I suspect the society also found much of its early support from such workers, perhaps even owing them something for its origin. It has been, for instance, the only national level society in which I have held office and served on committees. It did, in any case, give professional recognition to interdisciplinary research between anthropology and history, which had been lacking despite the fact that it had been practiced informally in the Southwest for many decades.

The publications from the third quarter of the twentieth century that dealt specifically with captivity, slavery, and related topics were in large part narrative accounts. Broader treatments of major events such as the Navajo wars, or regional overviews such as histories of tribes or territories, dealt

with customs in passing. For example, we knew then that the Navajos had a ceremony for reintegrating their people who escaped captivity and that the Spanish Catholic saint who aided captives was the Santo Niño de Atocha.

In writing this book I utilized one set of records to look at practices shared by several tribes and nations, but focused on the Navajos and New Mexico and a time period of less than two centuries, making comparisons to other tribal groups as availability of data and relevance to my subject permitted.

As an old-time archaeologist, that is, before the time of sophisticated statistical analyses, I counted totals of data falling into recognizable classes, and in some cases computed averages, interpreting the significance of these figures in relation to both the cultures and histories of the peoples represented. My conclusions were relatively straightforward and I had hoped they might find some degree of acceptance and prove useful to others dealing with similar subject matter.

The first edition was published as Research Reports No. 1 by the Research Section of the Parks and Recreation Department of the Navajo Tribe (1968) and the second by Navajo Community College Press (1985). What had been adequate for my typology of Navajo pottery addressing only students of Navajo archaeology and religion was not applicable to a more fully ethnohistoric work. It was not until the 1990s that I was aware of it being cited by others. This late start may also have been in part due to the fact that the subjects of captivity and slavery had been seen as so insignificant that for two decades few workers took them into consideration in any depth, but I was left with the impression that my research for the book had failed to impress anyone. I was to learn eventually that my work had not been in vain.

Those who brought the subjects to the fore were Ramón A. Gutiérrez with *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846* (1991); James F. Brooks with *Captives & Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (2002); Enrique R. Lamadrid with *Hermanitos*

Comanchitos: Indo-Hispano Rituals of Captivity and Redemption (2003) and, in my own field, Catherine M. Cameron with *Invisible Citizens: Captives and their Consequences* (2008). Authors like these are making a record of in-depth research that is becoming a major contribution to our better understanding of ourselves as a species, one that can have an influence beyond that of the stories told in Navajo hogans on winter nights and songs performed in Hispanic village dramas in New Mexico, which were among the early beginnings of all our efforts.

Anna Walters, who was Navajo Community College Press and James F. Brooks, president of the School for Advanced Research, have found this work worthy of second and third editions. With gratitude I bid all young scholars, writers, curators, teachers, and artists who wish to continue the search for and dissemination of knowledge of ourselves—the most complex life form on our planet—have at it and may our collective efforts help bring about a time when all those who leave their natal societies to spend time among peoples of differing ways of life be able to do so willingly.

David M. Brugge
Albuquerque, NM
February 2010



PREFACE

This project began with research for the Navajo tribal land claim before the Indian Claims Commission when a limited number of baptismal and burial records were searched for data pertaining to the Navajos. Trends observed in a small sample from five parishes suggested that a more complete search of these records might be profitable. When a need for a better control of Navajo historical data for aid in analysis of Navajo archaeological data became apparent, the job of searching all baptismal and burial records that could be located dating prior to 1876 was initiated by J. Lee Correll and myself, under the auspices of the Navajo Tribe. The work was carried out intermittently in 1964 and 1965, resulting in a file of about seven thousand entries relating to tribes not under strong control by European governments.

Greatest attention was on entries that mentioned Navajos, most of which were copied in full. Notes were taken for similar entries relating to other free tribes and some of these were also copied in their entirety. The analysis of data has been more thorough for the Navajo entries because of the more complete information in our files and because of our better knowledge of Navajo history. A more complete integration of the information relating to other tribes we have left for other workers better equipped for the job. We hope that we have not made serious errors in our handling of data on other tribes and apologize in advance for any that may have crept in.

The presentation of the data here is ethnohistoric in orientation, with an effort made to take into account cultural factors of the various Indian tribes and the Europeans. In spite of efforts to be objective, I have, as an anthropologist, shown some partiality towards the Indians as opposed to the Europeans. The susceptibility of the data to quantification has, I hope, helped me to overcome a number of my subjective biases. On the other hand, the need to eliminate the inherent cultural bias of the white observers who documented contemporary history in the Southwest is best done by the use of data which can be tabulated and studied for both cultural and historical changes.

I have, however, accepted certain basic postulates and rejected others (particularly in the narrative sections of Chapter IV) which underlie the outlook in historiographic writings dealing with Indians. I have taken as a first premise the idea that the Europeans, whether Spanish-American or Anglo-American, as aggressors in land disputes, were ultimately the guilty parties in warfare between Indians and Europeans. I have rejected as not worthy of consideration by any serious social scientist the idea that the reason Indians attacked Europeans and stole from them was because they were bloodthirsty savages who had an inborn desire to kill and steal. I have assumed that the majority of contemporary documents written by Europeans were phrased in such a way as to uphold the moral position of the Europeans. I have not tried to give serious attention to the causes of warfare beyond the slave trade, the only cause upon which the church records shed significant new light. The fact that Christianity is a universal religion given to proselytization is doubtless significant beyond its effect in the attitudes of Europeans toward captives, but this has not been given special attention here.

The history of a nonliterate people cannot be written by "letting the documents speak for themselves," for the documents were penned by outsiders and aliens. A con-

scious effort has been made to understand events from the Navajo point of view without lapsing into the romanticism so frequently seen in writings of this sort. This book is not meant to be a definitive description of Navajo-European relations, but attempts to provide a framework for better understanding of the brief but numerous baptismal and burial records mentioning Navajos. The history of the Navajo as such, aside from a mere replay of Navajo-European relations, will not be written until there is a Navajo ethnohistorian ready to undertake the work for his own people.

Many thanks are due those who helped in this work. Particularly important was the cooperation of Monsignor M. J. Rodriguez, J.C.D., and others of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe for permission to search the records maintained in the archives there and for help in locating the records we needed. Similarly, the parish priests in many towns in New Mexico and southern Colorado were most hospitable in allowing us to search records in their care, even granting us working space in their often limited quarters. Dr. Myra Ellen Jenkins of the New Mexico State Records Center and Archives was of great assistance in our search for documents needed to supply the historical background. Many of these had been previously located by historians working on various land claim projects in the Southwest. Dr. Jenkins was one of these, but others who deserve mention for having contributed, albeit often unintentionally, to our documentary collections, are Dr. Frank D. Reeve, Mr. Albert H. Schroeder and Dr. Ward Allan Minge as researchers for the Justice Department and Acoma and Laguna Pueblos and Dr. George P. Hammond, Mr. Dale Morgan and Mr. Joseph Colgan as researchers for the Navajos. Mr. John P. Wilson of the Museum of New Mexico and Mr. Frank McNitt called our attention to a number of important documents which we would otherwise have missed. Typing and clerical help by Mrs. Helena Yazhe and Mrs. Jennie C. Baldwin contributed to the successful completion of this study. The

graphs were originally drawn by Miss Marlene Gleason. I owe considerable gratitude to my colleague, the late Mr. J. Lee Correll, who did a great deal of the archival and library research upon which the results are based. Both Mr. Correll and Mrs. Editha L. Watson read the manuscript and offered valuable suggestions. I must take the responsibility for all interpretations, however.

David M. Brugge



INTRODUCTION

It is commonly accepted that the documentary history of Indian tribes, being based upon the writings of Europeans, is the work of people who were frequently enemies and always alien from the point of view of the Indians. Anthropologists are well aware of the degree of cultural bias in such data and of the distortions that can result. While no anthropologist would think of using Indians of one tribe as the principal informants for the study of the culture of another tribe, we frequently are seduced by the written word and are all too accepting of deceased Englishmen, Frenchmen and Spaniards as informants regarding the past conditions of tribes in which we are interested. When working with living peoples we can frequently crosscheck the information given by a large number of informants. But when working with the remote past, we seldom find enough written material on any one subject to allow for certainty, while a widespread misconception about a nonliterate tribe might well have found its way into the writings of its literate neighbors. This highly selective preservation of data makes ethnohistorical study more akin to archaeological research than to ethnology.

An archaeologist frequently knows far more about the ceramics and the architecture of a people than he knows about the things that were stored or cooked in the pots or the people who lived and worshipped in the structures that he studies. So too, an ethnohistorian knows more

about the wars, trade and missionary contacts with a tribe than he knows about the thoughts of the tribal members who participated in these events, or what the Indians did during the long periods between fighting, trading and listening to missionaries. Just as the archaeologist finds the tabulation of pottery and other artifact types useful in studying cultures, so may the ethnohistorian tabulate events which were of recurrent types and were of sufficient interest to the literate Europeans to be recorded with some regularity. These events seem always to have been dependent upon contact between the Indians and the Europeans, and this makes them particularly valuable for studies of relationships between cultures. Identification of changes brought about in the Indian cultures are often disappointingly few, as the data to follow will reveal, but the trends in the conditions under which cultural contact took place are revealed in a manner which is not possible in a simple narrative history.

The baptismal and burial records of the Catholic Church in New Mexico were found to contain a large number of references to tribes who were not under the direct control of either the missionaries or the governments of the Europeans. Most of these entries can be divided into a relatively few simple categories. An analysis of the categories upon the basis of temporal and geographic distributions, and the native Indian groups involved, is the major aim of this study.

The categories found in the baptismal books include the baptisms of captives, the baptisms of individuals who were converted without the pressures associated with captivity, and the baptisms of the children born to converts of either type. The burial books contained records of people in all three of the above categories, as well as burial records of Catholics killed in wars with free tribes. A few miscellaneous entries identified spouses of converts, converts who acted as godparents, tribes who sold captives to New Mexicans and made other similar references, too few to be of value for tabulation. Time did not allow for a

search of marriage records, but an examination of a few marriage books revealed that these books were not nearly as informative as were the books of baptisms and burials. In spite of this earlier assessment, it is now apparent that even this latter source should have been examined for better answers to some of the questions raised by the study of the data.

The separation of entries by categories was not difficult, but there was an occasional uncertainty with individual entries. This was particularly true in the attempt to distinguish between willing and captive converts. In Chapter IV, the Navajo entries are treated in considerable detail in a historical context, and ambiguous Navajo entries are apparent. In general the prevailing state of affairs in relationships between a tribe and the New Mexicans allowed for placement of entries when type was unclear. The number of entries of a particular type made possible an estimate of the degree of friendship or enmity that then existed, an estimate not subject to the impressionistic biases of contemporary writings.

The trends that these records showed in the nature of relationships between New Mexicans and the surrounding Indian tribes are compatible with the history of these relationships obtained from government archives and other contemporary sources. But insight into aspects of history, not fully apparent in other documented sources, makes this study worthwhile as a supplemental record of history. This is particularly true in regard to the holding of Indian captives as servants or slaves by Europeans. Some of the tabulated events could be expanded upon by more complete reference to government archives, particularly regarding warfare, and further work along this line is contemplated when these data are correlated with Navajo archaeological records. In spite of the limitation of relying primarily upon church records for this study, valuable information was obtained on cultural contact in New Mexico for a period of about 180 years. While there are hints of cultural changes in these data, more definitive conclu-

sions must be based upon evidence derived from the Indian cultures themselves. For the Navajos this evidence is primarily archaeological, but native tradition generally supports the overall conclusion and also requires consideration.